By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 9480. A bill to amend title II of Public Law 480 (83d Cong.) so as to increase the amount of surplus commodities available thereunder and permit payment under certain circumstances of ocean freight; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BAUMHART:

H. R. 9481. A bill declaring the inundation of property because of, or aggravated by, wind, waves, or tidal effects on the Great Lakes to be property within the flood-control activities of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 9482. A bill to increase the amount authorized for the erection of adequate facilities for use of National Institute of Dental Research; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 9483. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 9484. A bill relating to the quality requirements for, and the inspection, certification, and labeling of, Irish potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 9485. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Construction Annuity Act of May 29, 1944, to extend the benefits of such act to certain individuals by change of the date limitation on the citizenship requirement contained in such act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 9486. A bill to provide equitable compensation for Saturday, Sunday, holiday, and overtime duty in the Federal Government service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 9487. A bill—

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE AND POLICY

To reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which among other things prohibit price discriminations; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discriminations is to secure equality of opportunity of all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9488. A bill to provide for Federal contribution to the election campaigns of major political parties, to reduce the importance of campaign contributions in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 9489. A bill to recognize and confirm the authority of arid and semiarid States relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water within their geographic boundaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 9490. A bill to provide a 10-year program for the construction and improvement of roads, trails, buildings, and utilities in national park and monument areas and other areas administered by the National Park Service and for the construction and improvement of parkways authorized by acts of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 9491. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 9492. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 9493. A bill for the relief of John Kousoumbris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 9494. A bill for the relief of Joseph David (Jerry) Malamud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 9495. A bill for the relief of Gerald Augustine Grant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 9496. A bill for the relief of Kiki Monoyioudes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 9497. A bill for the relief of Antonio Quijano, Lilia Quijano, and Aurora Quijano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. Res. 402. Resolution providing for sending the bill H. R. 5918 and accompanying papers to the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

562. By Mr. RIEHLMAN: Petition signed by Mr. Ivan M. Cash and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the enactment of H. R. 4627; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

563. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the executive secretary, American Mosquito Control Association, Inc., Selma, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their support of S. 2870 with certain amendments; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1956

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 22, 1956

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

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

Our Father God, who dost overarch our fleeting years with Thine eternity and dost undergird our weakness with Thy strength, in the midst of the pressures of another day, as we face its vast concerns, we pause with bowed heads and hearts at this shrine of our spirits. Without Thee even our wistful hopes for humanity are like winter's withered leaves, once verdant and bright—now brown and crumpled ruins blown upon a bitter wind.

Above all else we pray Thee save us from succumbing to the terrible temptation to become cynical and to be men of lost faith. Join us in kinship to those who in other times that tried men's souls went on believing in beauty and love and God in the midst of ugliness, hatred, and horror. For as with deep craving for reality we turn now to Thee we remember that we date this day's deliberation from the lowly cradle of One who died on the gallows of his day—mocked, reviled, insulted, outraged—yet that torturing cross of defeat sways the future. By its crimson sign which towers o'er the wrecks of time may we conquer. In the dear Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 22, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, informed the Senate that Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, had been elected Speaker pro tempore, during the absence of the Speaker.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 1887. An act for the relief of Dr. Tsi Au Li (Tsi Gziou Li), Ru Ping Li, Teh Yu Li (a minor), and Teh Chu Li (a minor);

H. R. 2430. An act to release certain restrictions on certain real property heretofore granted to the city of Charleston, South Carolina, by the United States of America; and

H. R. 8101. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to give 25 World War II paintings to the Government of New Zealand.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for action on the nomination on the Executive Calendar, under the heading "New Report."

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the Presi-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

dent of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Earl Freeman Hastings, of Arizona, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, vice A. Jackson Goodwin, Jr., resigned.

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations:

Franklin G. Floete, of Iowa, to be Administrator of General Services, vice Edmund F. Mansure, resigned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar, under "New Report," will be stated.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Douglas Maxwell Moffat, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nomination today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, with a limitation on statements of not to exceed 2 minutes.

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

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Min-Sun Chen from a report transmitted to the Senate on April 15, 1955, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with a view to the adjustment of his immigration status which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions adopted by Joan of Arc Council, No. 1992, Knights of Columbus, Port Jefferson, Long Island, and Corpus Christi Council, No. 2502, Knights of Columbus, Mineola, both in the State of New York, favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Associated Equipment Distributors, Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for a comprehensive national highway program; to the Committee on Public Works.

RESOLUTIONS OF SHEYENNE VALLEY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC., FINLEY, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the Sheyenne Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc., of Finley, N. Dak.

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

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

Whereas the Rural Electrification Act was passed by the Congress of the United States in 1935 to promote the general establishment of electricity in the rural areas of America; and

Whereas through diligent, honest, efficient direction by the various Rural Electric Administrators, this program has developed into one of the greatest achievements by the partnership of the people and their Government in the history of our Nation; and

Whereas the results of a Rural Electrification Administration has given our Nation an abundance of food and fiber together with other technical developments that are so necessary to the progress and well being of our Nation; and

Whereas the application of electricity on the farm has lessened the burden of the farm people and reduced human drudgery to the extent that rural America bears the torch guiding the people of other countries less fortunate in the way rural life can and should be enjoyed by all: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the board of directors of the Sheyenne Valley Electric Cooperative, sincerely want rural electrification to continue to exist and expand. We are fully aware of the detrimental effect that the Hoover Task Force proposal to the Congress of the United States will have upon this great program. We, therefore, urge our Senators to do all in their power to defeat this proposal; now, be it further

Resolved, That we, the board of directors of the Sheyenne Valley Electric Cooperative, urge and insist that our Senators inform their colleagues in the Senate and urge them to use their influence to defeat this proposal; be it further

Resolved, That our Senators check the background of those who are behind the task force proposal as we think they are picked men historically known to be opposed to rural electrification and public-power development.

Respectfully submitted.

SHEYENNE VALLEY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.,
JULIUS ANDERSON,
President, Board of Directors.

GENERATION AND TRANSMISSION

Whereas the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have worked together and constructed the Garrison Dam incorporating within its structure generation facilities, flood control, irrigation, and navigation; and

Whereas a great deal of energy generated at the Garrison site will be secondary and dump power which will be sold at a very low price; and

Whereas this cheap power can only be utilized by the rural electric cooperatives through a system of firming plants: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Sheyenne Valley Electric Cooperative, respectfully urge the Senators and Representatives from North Dakota to do all in their power to bring about legislation to appropriate funds for the Bureau of Reclamation, to be used to construct generation plants sufficiently large to firm up all dump and secondary power; be it further

Resolved, That this firmed secondary and dump power be made available to the cooperatives and municipalities according to the preference clause now in effect; be it further

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from North Dakota work toward the construction of transmission lines wherever necessary in order that this cheap power can be made available to the majority of the people in North Dakota.

Respectfully submitted.

SHEYENNE VALLEY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.,
JULIUS ANDERSON,
President, Board of Directors.

MISSOURI BASIN DEVELOPMENT

Whereas this development must be carried out to the fullest extent in order that it may help the largest number of people in the area adjacent to the Missouri River; and

Whereas the following developments in conjunction with the various dams now in progress of being developed and those that can be developed in the future should employ the following resources incident to total development:

1. Irrigation is a very important part of our economy when taking into consideration the increased production necessary to feed our Nation in the future and yet be able to carry our share of the food burden of those less fortunate nations who have peoples starving.

2. Navigation is an important phase in the cost of production and distribution of the various commodities raised in the areas adjacent to the Missouri River. This should be developed to its fullest extent.

3. Flood control: Flooding has been and still is one of nature's most destructive methods of taking human lives and destroying property unnecessarily. Many floods have occurred in the past along this great river resource, all of which would be prevented.

4. Reforestation is one of nature's most effective methods of preventing upland runoff erosion by water and wind. This is again a great natural resource and should be developed wherever conditions permit to the fullest extent.

5. Afforestation: Many acres of rugged barren land exist along the Missouri River as well as in its drainage area which should be planted to trees adapted to the soil and

climatic conditions, thus holding back additional water that would ordinarily go down the streams at flood stage.

6. Wildlife can be protected and developed by making wise use of the above-mentioned areas and should be protected so that the future generations can enjoy it in its wild state as has the past generations: Now, threfore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Sheyenne Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc., urge our Senators and Representatives of North Dakota to give their support to the full development of the Missouri Basin. Keeping in mind at all times, the welfare of all of the people and the necessity of the full development of the basin embodying the above-mentioned resources.

Respectfully submitted,

SHEYENNE VALLEY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.,
JULIUS ANDERSON,
President, Board of Directors.

ONE HUNDRED PERCENT PARITY FOR FARM PRODUCTS—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by patrons of GTA Grain Elevator Line, relating to 100 percent of parity for farm products.

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

RESOLUTION OF PATRONS OF GTA GRAIN ELEVATOR LINE

Whereas it is a well known and an undisputed fact, that the purchasing power of the farmer is way down to a point where he could be squeezed out of existence. Farming is an enterprise with a profit and loss statement like any other business and should be recognized as such. We ask for an income based on a 100 percent parity base, and urge that the GTA use every resource at its command to make the Congress of the United States conscious of this fact.

It is our desire as producers of food and fiber to enjoy all the rights and benefits equal to other business and segments of society.

By resolutions committee for GTA Elevator Line meeting.

FRANK LASSEY.
T. J. THORSON.
SEVERT SPONHEIM.

DAIRY RESEARCH CENTER, MADISON, WIS.—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I received today from Columbia County, which is a large producer of dairy products, a resolution, urging among other things that a bill which I introduced in relation to the establishment of a dairy research building in Madison, Wis., be passed.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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

Resolution

To the Honorable Board of Supervisors of Columbia County:

Whereas Columbia County is a great producer of dairy products; and

Whereas 80 percent of all dairy products produced in Wisconsin must be sold outside the State and competing dairy producers are paid at least $2 per hundred more than is received by Wisconsin producers producing Grade A milk; and

Whereas Senator ALEXANDER WILEY has introduced a bill to establish a dairy research building at Madison, Wis.; and

Whereas such research center would attempt to find new uses for and techniques to handle dairy products: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we commend Senator WILEY for his efforts in attempting to establish said dairy research center and authorize the county clerk to advise Senator WILEY of our action; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY and Representative GLENN DAVIS and request that they support Senator WILEY's bill.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; with amendments; (Rept. No. 1570).

Mr. HAYDEN subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a statement of my individual views with reference to the report on Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The individual views will be received and printed.

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 7201. A bill relating to the taxation of income of insurance companies; with amendments (Rept. No. 1571).

REVIEW OF AUDIT REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1572)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I submit, on behalf of the Committee on Government Operations, a report entitled "A Review of the Audit Reports of the Comptroller General." The report contains information developed by the General Accounting Office in 378 audit reports referred to Congress and to the designated agencies over the past 10 years. It also contains an outline of the comprehensive audits of the various departments and agencies of the Government, and a résumé of the progress made in auditing the financial transactions and activities of the Federal Government since the enactment of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950. In recommending enactment of this legislation, the Committee on Government Operations pointed out that it would be its continuing responsibility to keep in close contact with the activation and administration of the fiscal program of the Government, as approved by the Congress. This act provided the legislative impetus for the changes that have taken place in auditing the fiscal operations of the Government, and the report covers an outline of the improvements that have been achieved.

The Committee on Government Operations is required, under the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to give special attention to the reports of the Comptroller General and to the work of the General Accounting Office. The staff of the committee examines the information and recommendations contained in the reports, and frequently discusses the contents with the agencies involved. When necessary, conferences are held with representatives of the General Accounting Office with regard to further action that may be indicated on the more important recommendations, with the view of having the information and suggestions utilized, when approved by Committees of the Congress.

The committee has observed, from its review of the audit reports, that the better the internal controls of the agency the more attention the General Accounting Office is able to give to higher levels of operations rather than to detailed tests of transactions. The report stresses the importance of agencies in the executive branch adopting policies to increase their efforts to improve their own internal audits and controls, in order to enable the General Accounting Office to devote more of its efforts to broader fiscal studies and examinations of Government-wide activities and to further its effectiveness in serving the needs of the Congress.

The report cites many instances of savings that have resulted from recommendations of the General Accounting Office, either by agency actions or through the committees of the Congress, of which the following are cited as examples.

The General Accounting Office audit disclosed a large over-procurement of jet engines. When this was brought to the attention of the Department of the Air Force, an outstanding contract was reduced to the extent economically possible, with an estimated saving of between $50 and $60 million, and planned procurement was decreased by approximately $10 million. Further examination of requirements for spare engines phasing out of production revealed other instances of over-procurement and resulted in further cutbacks by the Air Force.

The General Accounting Office also made a review of certain procurement practices of the Army Ordnance Corps, encompassing a review of more than 700 negotiated contracts, involving expenditures of $9,700,000,000. The General Accounting Office reports that important matters were brought to the attention of administrative officials at the time they were observed, and many questionable practices were corrected, resulting in savings reported to be in excess of $2,700,000, as well as other savings from the strengthening of managerial controls which are not susceptible of measurement in dollar figures.

During the audit of one of AEC's large prime contracts, the General Accounting Office observed that a purchasing office was being maintained at Chicago, Ill., and that warehousing and accounting functions were being performed at Los Alamos, N. Mex. The Comptroller General recommended to the Commission that the functions be consolidated at

Los Alamos. As a result, all accounting functions were consolidated at Los Alamos and the Chicago purchasing office was closed. This is expected to reduce costs about $200,000 annually.

The General Accounting Office recommended that the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration be dissolved, and that its activities be liquidated by other agencies of the Federal or Insular Government in Puerto Rico. The Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs unanimously recommended enactment of legislation to accomplish an accelerated liquidation, and legislation was enacted granting the Secretary of the Interior broad powers to liquidate this organization. Officials of the Department of the Interior estimated that this action would result in an overall saving to the Government of $7 million to $8 million after payment of all expenses of liquidation.

The audits outlined in the analyses also include recommendations for the improvement of many other types of agency activities, which have resulted in reducing Federal expenditures, such as the reduction in the number of motor vehicles being operated in excess of agency needs; the assessment of fees for special services; and improvements in contract procedures, which accord with programs initiated and policies approved by the Committee on Government Operations. The report is replete with specific citations of savings resulting from the audits, which aggregate millions of dollars.

The audit reports, in themselves, are considered only as a medium by which information is transmitted or recommendations are made for improvement or corrective action. They provide a basis for action or decisions by the agencies or by the Congress. The committee recognizes that not all recommendations contained in these reports will be agreed to or accepted in their entirety by officials of the agencies or by the committees having oversight jurisdiction, but they form a basis for an independent appraisal of agency expenditures and activities.

The committee believes that the review of the audit reports of the Comptroller General should be of special interest and assistance to the appropriate jurisdictional committees of the Congress in their examination of agency programs and activities. The facts submitted in summary form should prove to be more readily adapted for committee use than would be possible through the study of all of the details contained in the 378 separate audit reports which have been submitted to the Congress by the Comptroller General, beginning with the 80th Congress and extending through January 15, 1956.

I ask that the report be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BUSH (for himself, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. DUFF, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. IVES, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. KERR, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania):

S. 3272. A bill to increase and make certain revisions in the general authorizations for small flood-control projects in the Flood Control Act of 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for Mr. CHAVEZ):

S. 3273. A bill to provide authorization for emergency flood-protection projects in areas of the United States where such projects are needed for the protection of life and property; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 3274. A bill for the relief of Marcos Go; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 3275. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the development, conservation for preservation, management and use of fisheries resources, to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON relating to the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 3276. A bill for the relief of Jan Hovorka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. J. Res. 148. Joint resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to a sound national minerals policy, and directing the Secretary of the Interior to take certain action in furtherance of such policy; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. J. Res. 149. Joint resolution to provide for a survey and study of the potential capacity of the harbors and ports of the United States for the repair and maintenance of atomic-powered vessels; to the Committee on Public Works.

URGENTLY NEEDED SMALL FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

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

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

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase and make certain revisions in the general authorization for small flood-control projects in the Flood Control Act of 1948. The purpose of the bill is to break through the bottleneck of time in the construction of urgently needed flood-protection projects. The bill would give the Corps of Engineers needed flexibility in pressing forward with construction of small, but vital flood-control works for the protection of communities in the State of Connecticut and elsewhere throughout the Nation, which have been so sorely afflicted by flood disasters in recent months.

Joining me in sponsorship of the bill are my colleagues the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE[, the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senators from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN and Mr. DUFF], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on January 5, I introduced a bill, S. 2853, to authorize the construction of flood-protection measures in the Northeastern States affected by the August and October 1955 floods which caused such great loss of life, human distress, and property damage. This was a companion bill, identical in all major respects, to H. R. 7870, introduced by the distinguished majority leader of the House of Representatives, Mr. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts.

There is ample justification for giving priority to the need for flood protection in the Northeast. The reasons why we face a greater emergency than other parts of the country were recently summarized by Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, before the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

First. There is a great chance that the hurricanes and storms that produce floodwaters in the Northeast are much more frequent than we had contemplated heretofore.

Second. Only 22 percent of the authorized flood-control program in New England has been accomplished to date, which is the lowest in any part of the country.

Third. The areas that are affected by floods in New England are extremely highly populated, highly developed and industrialized and developments are concentrated in a small area and a narrow valley, and therefore when they are affected by floods the result is extremely disastrous per unit of area.

Although we must, therefore, regard the Northeast's need for flood-control work as most urgent, it also should be recognized that floods are a national problem. This has been tragically demonstrated very recently by the disastrous

floods on the west coast. The records of our chief disaster relief agency, the Federal Civil Defense Administration, show that major flood disasters have affected the following States within the past 3 years: Texas, Florida, Indiana, West Virginia, California, Iowa, New Mexico, South Dakota, Colorado, Nevada, California, North Carolina, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Massachusetts, Oregon, and Connecticut. Accordingly, the bill being introduced today proposes to deal with this problem on a national basis.

The need for the proposed legislation arises from the restrictions placed on flood-control work under existing law. The law now requires that flood-control dams and reservoirs and other large projects must be specifically authorized by statute and that appropriations for each undertaking must be voted by the Congress before planning and construction can begin.

This is a necessary and proper procedure, essential for protection of the taxpayers' interests, when flood-control works requiring large expenditures are involved. But it is time consuming, usually requiring the passage of many years.

The Congress has recognized that in the case of small flood-control projects the laborious process of specific authorizations and appropriations can safely be omitted. The Flood Control Act of 1948 provides a general authorization for projects of this kind, with limitations on the cost of any single project of $150,000 and of $3 million on the total amount of expenditures in 1 fiscal year.

The recent flood disasters have demonstrated that these limitations are too restrictive, and are preventing much work which is urgently needed in the light of the emergency conditions confronting my State and other States, not only in the Northeast but on the west coast and in other areas of the Nation.

The bill would correct this defect in present law by raising the limitations in the Flood Control Act of 1948 to $500,000 for single projects, and $15 million for total expenditures in 1 fiscal year.

Local, State, and congressional authority over flood-control works would be safeguarded by the following conditions:

Concurrence must be obtained from the affected State, or political subdivision, prior to the commencement of each proposed project.

In the case of projects which would cost in excess of $150,000, justifications must be submitted to the Committees on Public Works of the House and Senate before work is commenced.

Additional safeguards include provisions requiring compliance with the provisions of local cooperation specified in section 3 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, as amended; and that the work must be complete in itself and shall not commit the United States to any additional improvement to insure its successful operation, except as may result from the normal procedure applying to projects authorized after submission of preliminary examination and survey works.

In a recent inspection trip through the Naugatuck Valley, the worst devastated area in my State, I visited a number of locations where the proposed authority would be invaluable.

In cleaning the river, under the limited authority conferred by Public Law 875, the engineers have deposited earth, gravel, and rock spoil on the banks in the form of dikes. These could be made permanent by reinforcement, rip-rapping, and so forth, and could be tied in with concrete flood walls and other flood-control structures to provide more adequate protection for the communities which were so adversely affected this past year. Moreover, unless these dikes are protected, another flood may wash them down the river, resulting in a waste of the money already spent.

In addition to locations in the Naugatuck Valley communities, opportunities for providing this kind of essential flood protective work at small cost exist in the flood-affected communities in the Thames River Basin in eastern Connecticut, in the Farmington River Valley in north-central Connecticut, and in Fairfield County in the southwestern part of my State. I am sure that similar work could be accomplished under the authority of the proposed legislation in many other States.

This Congress has recently voted, and President Eisenhower has approved, an urgent deficiency bill providing appropriations for an accelerated flood control program in the Northeastern States. At this time I should like to express publicly my appreciation to my colleagues in the Senate, especially the distinguished chairman and members of the Appropriations Committee, for their sympathetic treatment of our needs. This action will permit a savings in time, as much as a year in the case of some projects, in getting this work underway.

The President has, additionally, requested funds for the accelerated northeastern program in his budget for the coming fiscal year. In all, 19 flood control projects in Northeastern States are included in the accelerated program, involving a total Federal cost of $135,580,000.

Tables listing the construction projects included in the accelerated program for the Northeast follow:

Five projects included in fiscal year 1956 supplemental request for initial construction funds

	Estimated Federal cost
1. Barre Falls Reservoir, Mass	$2,680,000
2. Buffumville, Reservoir, Mass	2,820,000
3. Otter Brook Reservoir, N. H	4,800,000
4. Bear Creek Reservoir, Pa	17,900,000
5. Ball Mountain Reservoir, Vt	16,600,000
Subtotal	44,800,000

Fourteen additional projects included in fiscal year 1957 budget for initial construction funds

1. Thomaston Reservoir, Conn	$16,000,000
2. East Brimfield Reservoir, Mass	5,700,000
3. Hodges Village Reservoir, Mass	4,350,000
4. Worcester, Mass	5,030,000
5. Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, N. Y	4,840,000

Fourteen additional projects included in fiscal year 1957 budget for initial construction funds—Continued

6. Dyberry Reservoir, Pa	$7,630,000
7. Stillwater Reservoir, Pa	9,200,000
8. Prompton Reservoir, Pa	5,860,000
9. East Barre Reservoir (modif), Vermont	3,750,000
10. North Springfield Reservoir, Vermont	9,900,000
11. Townshend Reservoir, Vt	10,800,000
12. Waterbury Reservoir (modif), Vermont	860,000
13. Wrightsville Reservoir (modif), Vermont	2,660,000
14. Woonsocket, R. I.[1]	4,200,000
Subtotal	90,780,000
Grand total	135,580,000

[1] Fiscal year 1956 supplemental includes request for authority to use $150,000 of available construction funds for preparatory work on this project.

In addition to these projects, all authorized by law, other flood-control work in my State and region will be needed. The Corps of Engineers is presently engaged in studies to determine ways of plugging the gaps in the Northeast's flood-control plan which were disclosed by the 1955 floods. This work is being done under authority of a resolution adopted by the Committee on Public Works, at my request, on September 14, 1955, and I am informed that good progress is being made. Additional studies are being made under the so-called Bush Act (Public Law 71, 84th Cong., 1st sess.) to determine methods of preventing hurricane damage along the eastern seaboard.

However, the projects included in the accelerated program are dams and reservoirs and other large protective works, all of which cannot be completed before a considerable lapse of time. It is probable that a number of new projects arising from recommendations based on the studies now under way will require specific authorizations and appropriations. Again, a considerable amount of time must pass before these protective works can come into being.

Although we must wait for the completion of dams and reservoirs and other large protective works, smaller, but vitally needed flood-control measures can be undertaken in the coming months if the bill being introduced today is promptly enacted into law.

We dare not delay. Time is the bottleneck we must overcome to the maximum possible extent. We have been warned, on very responsible authority, there is grave danger of new flood disasters in this very year.

It is my hope that the Committee on Public Works will hold prompt hearings on the proposed legislation. The Corps of Engineers needs the flexibility in flood control work which it would furnish. The people in the stricken river valleys, not only in my State but throughout the Northeast and other parts of the country, need the protection it would provide. We must break through the bottleneck of time.

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

The bill (S. 3272) to increase and make certain revisions in the general authorization for small flood-control projects in the Flood Control Act of 1948, introduced by Mr. BUSH (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 205. (a) The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to allot, from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control, not to exceed $15 million for any one fiscal year for the construction of flood-control projects not specifically authorized by law when, in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers, such work is warranted, subject to the following conditions:

"(1) Not more than $500,000 shall be allotted for this purpose for any single project for expenditure during any 1 fiscal year;

"(2) The provisions of local cooperation specified in section 3 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, as amended, shall apply;

"(3) Concurrence shall be obtained from the affected State or political subdivision, or both, prior to the commencement of construction of each proposed project; and

"(4) The work shall be complete in itself and shall not commit the United States to any additional improvement to insure its successful operation except as may result from the normal procedure applying to projects authorized after submission of preliminary examination and survey reports.

"(b) (1) Before work is initiated under this section on any flood-control project or other flood protective measure which the Secretary of the Army estimates will cost in excess of $150,000 for any 1 fiscal year, he shall submit to the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives a report outlining the proposed plan of protection together with an analysis of the justification therefor. The report shall be delivered to both committees on the same day and while each House is in session. No work shall be initiated on any project or other measure with respect to which such a report is made until the expiration of the first period of 30 calendar days, of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the report is transmitted to the committees.

"(2) For purposes of paragraph (1)—

"(A) continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; but

"(B) in the computation of the 30-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain."

EMERGENCY FLOOD PROTECTION PROJECTS IN CERTAIN AREAS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide authorization for emergency flood protection projects in areas of the United States where such projects are needed for the protection of life and property. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement, prepared by the Senator from New Mexico, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3273) to provide authorization for emergency flood protection projects in areas of the United States where such projects are needed for the protection of life and property, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for Mr. CHAVEZ), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) in view of the urgent need for the immediate construction in many areas of the United States of flood-protective works which otherwise might be unduly delayed awaiting investigation and authorization under regularly established procedures, the Chief of Engineers under the direction of the Secretary of the Army may accomplish flood-protective projects not specifically authorized by law in any area of the United States where, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers, such projects are necessary and should be accomplished without delay for the protection of life and property. Flood-protective projects initiated under this act shall be subject to the conditions specified in sections 2 and 3 of this act.

(b) The authority provided in this act shall be in addition to that provided in section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948, as amended.

(c) No expenditures shall be made under the authority of this act after June 30, 1960.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to allot, from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control, not to exceed $20 million for any one fiscal year for the construction of flood-protective projects under the provisions of this act. Such construction shall be subject to the following conditions:

(1) Not more than $500,000 shall be allotted for any single project for expenditure during any one fiscal year;

(2) The provisions of local cooperation specified in section 3 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, as amended, shall apply to such projects;

(3) Concurrence shall be obtained from the affected State or political subdivision, or both, prior to the commencement of construction of each proposed project; and

(4) The work in each project shall be complete in itself and shall not commit the United States to any additional improvement to insure its successful operation except as may result from the normal procedure applying to projects authorized after submission of preliminary examination and survey reports.

SEC. 3. (a) Before work is initiated under this act on any flood-protective project which the Secretary of the Army estimates will cost in excess of $150,000 for any one fiscal year, he shall submit to the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives a report outlining the proposed plan of protection together with an analysis of the justification therefor. The report shall be delivered to both committees on the same day and while each House is in session. No work shall be initiated on any project or other measure with respect to which such a report is made until the expiration of the first period of 30 calendar days, of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the report is transmitted to the committees.

(b) For purposes of subsection (a)—

(1) continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; but

(2) in the computation of the 30-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CHAVEZ

I have introduced a bill to provide for emergency flood-protection projects in areas of the United States where such projects are needed for the protection of life and property.

We now have acts which provide for small flood-control projects in areas where projects are not specifically authorized and not within areas intended to be protected by projects so authorized; we have acts which provide for emergency activities by the Corps of Engineers in connection with flood fighting and repairs to flood-control works threatened or damaged by floods; we have acts which authorize the Federal Civil Defense Administration to assist in restoring essential public services and cleanup work after a flood, but we do not have authorizations which would allow for the construction of emergency works which would temporarily take care of flood problems and prevent widespread damage and suffering until permanent flood-control works can be planned and constructed.

In the State of New Mexico, particularly in Albuquerque, we have had several disastrous floods but no agency of the Federal Government could provide needed assistance in the form of emergency flood-control works. I understand that this is true in the New England, California, and other areas which also experienced great suffering during their recent disastrous floods. The bill which I am introducing is designed to provide for such emergency needs.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—NOTICE OF INTENTION TO SUBMIT AMENDMENT

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that I expect to submit an amendment to the agricultural bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, which is now under consideration. The amendment would add a new section at the end of title III of the bill.

I am not asking that my amendment be printed as such. My reason is, it has already been printed as a separate bill, and I wish to avoid the added cost of reprinting it. For the information of the Senate, I wish to say that my amendment will be identical with the bill (S. 2940) to establish a Commission to prepare legislation providing for increased industrial use of agricultural products, introduced by me on January 16, 1956. A copy of Senate bill 2940, and my statement in reference thereto, can be found on page 518 of the RECORD for January 16, 1956.

INDUSTRIAL USE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on January 16, 1956, on behalf of myself and other Senators, I introduced the bill (S. 2940) to establish a commission to prepare legislation providing for increased industrial use of agricultural products. If and when Senate bill 2940 is reprinted, I ask unanimous consent that the name

of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] may be added as a cosponsor.

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

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

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

By Mr. STENNIS:

Address on the conservatism of George Washington, delivered by Senator BRICKER on February 22, 1956, before the American Good Government Society, Washington, D. C.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address on International Security and Disarmament in the Light of Present Day Circumstances, delivered by him before the Interparliamentary Union meeting in Helsinki, Finland, in August 1955.

SENATOR MAGNUSON, OF WASHINGTON, AND CANCER RESEARCH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the March issue of the National Eagles' magazine contains an article which will be of considerable interest to us in the Senate, as well as to every citizen of this Nation.

The article deals with a subject of universal interest—cancer research and the progress being made at the National Cancer Institute under the direction of Dr. John R. Heller. It also graphically and chronologically tells the part the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has played in creating the National Cancer Institute and in getting this great research study under way.

A member of the Fraternal Order of Eagles for many years, the Senator from Washington stands for and has consistently worked for the humanitarian legislation which this great American fraternal organization advocates. He has been outstanding in many fields, but has achieved a special recognition for his work in the field of cancer research.

In addition to publishing the article, the Fraternal Order of Eagles, on behalf of its more than 1 million members, went a step further and presented the Senator from Washington its international civic award. The exact wording of that award, which took the form of a wall plaque, is this:

Presented to Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON in recognition of his humanitarian efforts and achievements in behalf of cancer research and establishing the National Cancer Institute.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article carried in the March issue of the National Eagles' magazine. I make this request, Mr. President, because of my great admiration and affection for the senior Senator from Washington, who has consistently, in his many years of service in the Congress of the United States, successfully worked and voted for those measures which the Fraternal Order of Eagles stands for in the field of social security, pensions, workmen's compensation, and better schools. The courage and integrity of the Senator from Washington have been proved on many occasions, and he has never forgotten that it is his job to do the best he can for the people of his State and the Nation at all times.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object to the insertion which the Senator from Montana requests—I want to associate myself with the sentiments of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, the award, and with the comments made by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], one of the ablest and most beloved Members of this body. For many years I have served with the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. We were desk mates, so to speak, on a committee in the House of Representatives for some 12 years. We have served in the Senate together several years. I know of no greater humanitarian, and I am familiar with no efforts made by anyone of greater value in the field of medical research. His work has been effective not only in cancer research, but in research on polio, multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy, tuberculosis, heart ailments, and many other dreaded diseases. The Senator from Washington has always led the fight for such research in the committee and on the floor. I should like the privilege of associating myself with the very fine tribute paid to him by a very fine organization and by our mutual friend, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the senior Senator from Texas.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Montana, my distinguished senior colleague.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to be associated with my distinguished colleague from Montana and with the distinguished majority leader in their expressions of appreciation and commendation of the work done by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] in the field of national health. As chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, which has jurisdiction of matters pertaining to national health, I wish to say that I know personally the important contributions and results which have been accomplished through the efforts of the Senator from Washington. He has always been in the front line, working with his well-known ability and energy for these humanitarian purposes.

So, Mr. President, I am very happy to join with my colleague in these comments and in expressing my personal appreciation of the excellent work accomplished by the distinguished senior Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

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

CANCER FIGHTER: EAGLE SENATOR WARREN MAGNUSON HAS BEEN FIGHTING FOR AN ENLARGED CANCER RESEARCH PROGRAM SINCE 1937, AND HE HAS BEEN VICTORIOUS

(By David Devlin)

On August 2, 1937, a youthful, taffy-haired Congressman from the State of Washington arose on the floor of Congress to make his maiden speech. Ordinarily such an event is of less interest than the results of a tiddlewinks tournament, but this time it was different. The House was full, and the galleries were jammed.

The occasion: WARREN GRANT MAGNUSON, a 31-year-old Eagle solon from Seattle, was presenting the case for his legislation to establish a National Cancer Institute, which was before Congress for passage. It was a big challenge for a freshman legislator, but MAGNUSON's words, ringing through the vast congressional chamber, aroused his colleagues to attention.

"It is a sad commentary," he declared, "that our Government today is spending only $100,000 a year to combat cancer—far less than the millions it is spending to fight disease among animals. We are actually spending less than $1 for each new case of cancer discovered.

"Yet cancer, that dread killer, is the modern menace of civilized nations. It kills more of our American citizens than all our wars combined. And the menace is growing each year."

Congress listened to the broad-shouldered young man from the West. Later that year the Magnuson bill was signed into law by Eagle President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the National Cancer Institute was established. In gratitude MAGNUSON arose to thank his colleagues.

"The Congressmen who have aided me in the passage of this bill," he said "have joined forces in one of the most impressive movements of modern times. We have made a real contribution to those noble scientists who have labored so long and hard in their endless search for truth. The altars of experiment can now be warmed by the fuel which you have provided."

His words were prophetic. Today, 19 years after passage of the Magnuson bill, the first blow of America's broad-scale war against cancer, the United States Government is spending $25 million a year—250 times as much as it was in 1937—in cancer research. It is working closely with private groups such as the FOE-backed Damon Runyon Cancer Fund and the American Cancer Society to curb the Nation's second biggest killer. These joint efforts have saved countless thousands from cancer through early detection.

"One of the things I've appreciated most during my 25 years as an Eagle," says MAGNUSON today, "has been the fraternity's unceasing work in the war against cancer. The Eagles' wonderful contributions to cancer research have stimulated the Government's effort in this field, and we have worked in perfect harmony together."

During his 2 decades in the House and Senate, WARREN MAGNUSON has been so closely identified with the campaign for expanded cancer research that his colleagues call him, Old Cancer Killer. Chuckles his fellow Eagle Senator, BILL LANGER, of North Dakota:

"Every time 'Magie' comes up to me and hands me a good cigar I figure he's after more money for cancer research. And we usually give it to him, too."

MAGNUSON's zeal has not, however, always been appreciated. Once a crusty elder colleague asked him why he was "wasting

time trying to promote money for a silly bunch of long-haired scientists to play around with test tubes at taxpayer expense."

"Senator," replied the Eagle solon, "we spend billions for bombs, battleships, and buildings. I see no reason why we should scrimp when it comes to the health of our citizens."

Later, when a close relative of the complaining Senator was afflicted with cancer, the man became a supporter of MAGNUSON's efforts to increase the scope of medical research.

The Eagle Senator developed his initial interest in cancer research when a boyhood friend of his in Moorhead, Minn., was stricken with the dread disease. There was another reason, too.

"A lot of the human misery I saw as a youngster was caused by the disease," recalls MAGNUSON. "I saw healthy men and women in the prime of life suddenly fold up and die or waste away—and no one knew why. It just made good sense to do everything we could to find the answers—and the cures."

MAGNUSON's interest in this kind of social issue—applied Christianity, he calls it—was reflected at an early age. Not long after his arrival into Seattle on a Great Northern freight train, he won election to the State legislature at the age of 27.

Despite his youth, Magie (as he's called by his friends) was named legislative floor leader for the most important piece of legislation before the body: the Eagles' old-age assistance bill.

MAGNUSON, a member of Seattle Aerie No. 1, handled the legislative infighting that piloted the bill through. "That fight taught me," says Magie today, "that you could do a lot of good for people in the legislative arena."

Later MAGNUSON returned from wartime service in the United States Navy under Admiral "Bull" Halsey. He found another opportunity to further America's program of medical research.

During World War II the research started by the National Cancer Institute was expanded to meet the needs of wartime medicine—and it did a magnificent job. So impressed was Eagle President FDR that he called in MAGNUSON and other congressional leaders to confer with Dr. Vannevar Bush, then the Nation's atomic head. "We have shown that the mobilization of medical and scientific research can produce real results," said FDR. "If possible, it should be carried over into peacetime."

The result was (1) the Bush report, Science, the Endless Frontier, which strongly recommended continuation of "the war of science against disease," and (2) a new Magnuson bill advocating creation of a National Science Foundation.

"If we are to maintain the medical progress of the last 25 years," declared the Eagle Senator, "the Government must expand its financial support to include research in cancer, polio, multiple sclerosis, and other so-called uncurable diseases."

The campaign for the National Science Foundation took 5 long years, due to intracongressional disputes over the scope and nature of the proposed foundation.

Finally, in May 1950 all the bugs were ironed out, and Eagle President Harry Truman signed the Magnuson bill into law. With a flourish he handed the pen to the beaming Washington Senator. "No one has done more to achieve this than you, Warren," said the President.

In the meantime MAGNUSON and other far-sighted Senators—among them Eagle solons MIKE MANSFIELD, ALEXANDER WILEY, and "BILL" LANGER—continued the campaign for increased research funds for four categories of national health: cancer, heart disease, mental illness, and dental care. When economy-minded colleagues attempted to slash these appropriations, MAGNUSON rose to answer.

"I am convinced," he told the Senate, "that more money for research now will save this Nation millions of dollars in the years to come. To those who would pursue a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy, I say, 'You may not only lose your pennies, but the very heritage of democracy itself.' Our best exhibit of our democratic experiment lies, not in talking about human welfare, but in continually practicing it. Our fight to save thousands of Americans from death at the hands of these chronic killers is the most accurate barometer I know of our real concept of human values. It is our firm answer to the totalitarianism which holds that the individual is insignificant, particularly the weak and the sick."

The ultimate effect of MAGNUSON's unceasing campaign for more funds for research in cancer and other dread diseases can be found in the United States appropriations figures. In 1946, the National Cancer Institute was granted $548,700 for its work.

Today, in 1956, the Institute is receiving $24,828,000—an increase of 4,600 percent in 10 years—for its farflung efforts to find the cause of cancer.

What has this expanded Federal support of medical research accomplished? A recent survey lists these tangible benefits: (1) Reduction in death rates from all causes of over 10 percent; and (2) increase in the average United States life expectancy of over 5 full years. In terms of statistics this has meant the saving of approximately 1 million American lives in the last 10 years. For the fiscal minded, this saving in human life has more than paid for the expenditures because it has increased the national income by over $1 billion.

Paradoxically, WARREN MAGNUSON is far from satisfied. "We've come a long way in cancer research in almost 20 years," he says. "But we've still got a long way to go. A recent survey made by the National Cancer Institute indicates that 34 out of every 100 Americans born in 1956 will eventually die of cancer.

"This is no time to be smug. Every year there are more than 500,000 new cases of cancer reported in the United States. At these rates, the number of cancer victims will increase by more than 50 percent during the next 25 years because both our population and our proportion of older citizens is expected to increase.

"This is an unhappy fact that all of us—the Government, the Fraternal Order of Eagles, and individual citizens—must do something about. We must continue to apply the rules of Christianity to this fight."

Judging from the inspiring record of the last decade, it appears that something will be done about it—thanks to many unsung scientists working tirelessly in their laboratories, public officials like WARREN MAGNUSON, and organizations such as the Fraternal Order of Eagles. Together they are closing the net around cancer.

THREATS TO NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the first President of the United States loved wildlife. Thus the season of the anniversary of George Washington's birth, on February 22, is an appropriate time to call to the attention of the Senate the lack of protection which wildlife is suffering under Secretary of the Interior McKay.

I think that recent events make it necessary to examine all the factors which might underlie this trend away from sound resource policies.

It is recognized that privileges can accrue to large corporations through passage of legislation. But this also can occur by administrative act. Whether benefit is dispensed to a special interest by enactment of a law or by order of a governmental agency, the net effect is the same.

The President, in his veto of the natural gas bill, suggested that atmosphere which surrounded enactment of that bill has given rise to a questioning of the manner in which special interests such as the oil and gas industry obtain their objectives.

He said that he could not sign the bill without creating "doubt among the American people concerning the integrity of governmental processes."

If, by his veto message, the President has intended to ask Congress to examine what, if any, pressures influenced an enactment by Congress, then it seems in order to also review recent administrative actions favoring the same industry.

I have no reason to believe that undue or improper pressures had any effect on congressional passage of the natural gas bill. But, if we are to inquire into the possibility that the gas and oil lobby wielded unseemly pressure on Congress, then the same cloud hangs over Executive acts which have also resulted in giving of benefits to these interests.

Recently, the Secretary of the Interior granted a 5-year renewable lease for oil drilling on the Lacassine National Wildlife Refuge. Because of the cloud which, according to the Presidential gas bill veto, hangs over resource management, I urge the President to suspend the lease agreement for a full restudy of that administrative decision.

I note from the testimony before a House committee on February 21 that Secretary McKay's office arranged a meeting between Interior Department officials and the president of the Seagram whisky distilleries. Two weeks after that meeting, the Interior Department agreed to a scheme of the Seagram company for oil drilling on 12,000 acres of the Lacassine National Wildlife Refuge in Louisiana.

The day after this agreement, Mr. McKay, according to the Washington Post and Times Herald, "revoked a 28-month-long stop order on refuge leasing and issued new regulations making the Lacassine lease possible."

The House committee also heard testimony from the Wildlife Management Institute that 577 oil leases have been issued on national refuges, not 82 or 89 as the Interior Department previously reported. About 50 of these were issued during the 28 months of Secretary McKay's stop order when such leases were presumably not to be granted. It is also obvious from the testimony that many were granted without consent or knowledge of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Mr. President, the Lacassine refuge is important to the survival of valuable

waterfowl flying between the Arctic and the Tropics. The favoritism of the order to permit oil drilling on the Lacassine Wildlife Refuge to the Seagram distilleries is of a piece with Mr. McKay's favoritism to the Idaho Power Co.—a favoritism which may result ultimately in the wrecking of the steelhead-trout runs and the elk range of the Clearwater River system, as an alternative to Hells Canyon. It is comparable with Secretary McKay's complete willingness to see passed such legislation adverse to conservation as the Ellsworth-Cordon timber-exchange bill, a measure opposed by virtually every leading outdoor group in America.

Mr. President, I am contrite over the fact that Mr. McKay is a former Governor of my State. I shall do everything possible to halt the oil and gas depredations on national wildlife refuges, which he has set in motion.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 22, by Mr. Warren Unna, entitled "Interior Aid Is Quizzed on Refuge Oil Grant," and an article from the February 1956 issue of Sports Afield magazine by Mr. Michael Hudoba, entitled "Refuges Doomed?"

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

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 22, 1956]

INTERIOR AIDE IS QUIZZED ON REFUGE OIL GRANT

(By Warren Unna)

An Interior Department official told Congress yesterday he started processing an oil lease on a national wildlife refuge after the Secretary's office had set up an appointment between him and Frank R. Schwengel, president of Seagram distilleries.

J. Clark Salyer, Chief of the Fish and Wildlife Service's refuge branch, said Schwengel, whose company owns the Frankfort Oil Co., visited him last August 30 and phoned him with final details November 15.

Repeated Salyer: "He said he was very much interested in wildlife—in fact he and his wife maintain a private sanctuary in New York—but he was also interested in oil too."

Two weeks after Schwengel's call, Salyer declared, Interior wrote Samuel Nicasian, Schwengel's Washington attorney, declaring the company's operating plan for developing oil on 12,000 acres of Louisiana's Lacassine National Wildlife Refuge was acceptable.

This was last December 1. On December 2, Interior Secretary Douglas McKay revoked a 28-month-long stop order on refuge leasing and issued new regulations making the Lacassine lease possible

Salyer told the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee the lease was formally issued December 6 and backdated for bookkeeping purposes of Schwengel's Frankfort Oil Co. to December 1.

Salyer said he had twice denied previous applications for the Lacassine land—but "then we had a visit from President Schwengel."

Schwengel, a retired major general and World War I colleague in arms of President Eisenhower, could not be reached for comment. Neither could Nicasian.

The 5-year-long, 5-year-renewable Frankfort Oil lease was issued on a noncompetitive contract at the minimum 50-cent-per-acre fee and 12½ percent royalty. Salyer was careful to point out that Schwengel's company "agreed to increase their costs some $1 million" in order to meet conservation standards.

Committee Chairman HERBERT C. BONNER, Democrat, North Carolina, wondered: "Why were you in such a hurry" to issue the new refuge leasing regulations?

Salyer said some 300 applications for similar leases had been awaiting processing since Secretary McKay's August 1953 stop order. He added Lacassine has been the only lease granted in the 2½ months since the new regulations, but two others are being considered.

C. R. Gutermuth, vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute, a conservation group, testified 577 oil leases on national refuges have been issued since 1920, all but 11 of them during the 28 months of Secretary McKay's stop order, when no leases supposedly were being granted.

Interior has said a total of either 89 or 82 leases have been granted in refuge history and on one occasion said all but 25 of these were granted during the stop order period.

[From Sports Afield of February 1956]

REFUGES DOOMED?

(By Michael Hudoba)

This is it. Sports Afield, alarmed over the immense power in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior, last June warned: One man can wipe out our wildlife refuges. Now it has happened. One man has proven that he has the power to defeat the very purpose of the entire refuge system.

With the plaudits of sportsmen still ringing in his ears for saving the 10,700 acres of the Wichita National Wildlife Refuge, Interior Secretary Douglas McKay has thrown the 17 million acres of national wildlife refuges wide open to exploitation.

Secretary McKay has made the lands of the national wildlife refuge system available to oil and gas leases. He has encouraged oil and gas drilling operations on these lands, reserved for wildlife restoration and vital to the future of our wildlife.

McKay has done what other interior secretaries have stoutly resisted over the years. He has reversed a long-standing policy to preserve the integrity of the wildlife refuges for wildlife conservation needs. He has put the Fish and Wildlife Service back on the sacrificial spot to try to defend every acre of national wildlife refuge lands against oil and gas exploitation.

In the past only several refuge areas acquired with public funds were potentially subject to oil and gas exploitation because the landowners who sold the lands to the Government reserved the mineral rights. McKay's action cancels the 2-year stop on any leasing of refuge lands and offers an invitation to exploit the refuge lands.

We can't charge an outright giveaway. While applications for oil and gas leases flooded the Fish and Wildlife Service the minute the gates were flung open, applicants will have to pay fees to the Government for the leases. Some 10 of the 272 refuges were exempted from leases. Among these were the ones conservationists defended with individual battles: Wichita, the Aransas whooping crane refuge, the Red Rock Lakes trumpeter swan refuge. And the leasers may be required to spend some money to do some things to prevent undue damage to the refuge land and protected wildlife in the oil- and gas-drilling areas. They won't be allowed to pollute the waters of the refuge area. Theoretically, the land will still be reserved for wildlife conservation.

But the fact that these national wildlife refuges are now open to oil and gas leasing applications will force refuge personnel who should be allowed to continue devoting their time to improvement of refuge lands for wildlife restoration, to become oil and gas experts. They will have to match wits with the exploiters to try to suggest ways exploring and drilling operations may be carried on to ease expected damage to the wildlife refuge purposes.

McKay's order, which had the approval of Assistant Secretary D'Ewart's office, piously says that wildlife values will be given first consideration in making leases for oil and gas operations. We thought all along that the refuge purpose was for wildlife. The order also sets up a code that gives the Fish and Wildlife Service the right to require the oil and gas lessees to submit proposed plans for drilling and operations on refuge lands to soften the damage to wildlife of the refuge area.

On the face of it, this seemed enough for the Interior Department and the administration to do for the public's national wildlife refuge system. Secretary McKay and those who got him into this may feel he should be commended for making the Fish and Wildlife Service the agency to monitor the oil and gas lease program plans by the drillers and exploiters. No thinking conservationist will be kidded by this token sop of conscience salve, however.

In reality, this order, opening the refuge lands to exploitation for the highly profitable mineral leases and fortified by Government tax incentive to do a lot of drilling, defeats and nullifies the basic refuge purposes. The refuges can now be only partially managed for the primary reason for which they were established. The refuge managers who represent the public interest must now divide their work and wildlife programs to save and salvage wildlife values on the lands which were specifically set aside for the primary wildlife needs. The management of the refuges for the public interest is now prostituted.

While we appreciate the secretary's seeming concern to have wildlife values protected on the refuges, it is little comfort to have the order outline details for the Fish and Wildlife Service to examine proposed drilling and exploitation operations for refuge lands. The effect of McKay's order openly invites the leasing of every acre of refuge land with but several exceptions.

We dislike to point out that the powerful pressures which forced the Interior Department under this administration to open up the refuge system (and which coincidentally got into the choice oil leases real early), have other points in their favor which could so easily nullify the intent of the wildlife protection factors in the oil and gas order.

Sports Afield readers will recall our serious concern over one of the first actions of this administration in taking office. That was to take the directorship and assistant directorships of the Fish and Wildlife Service from under the protection of career civil service and making these subject to political appointment, with all the vulnerability that such appointments have to face, especially when concerned with protecting public interest values holding valuable resources in their programs.

In the face of the oil- and gas-leasing order, it would be almost too much to ask protection for national wildlife refuges by administrators who had the backing of civil service. Even at that, no human being should be required to try to insist on wildlife values in the refuge system while subject to all the torments that political pressure can apply, especially when big money is at stake, as it is in this oil- and gas-lease operations program.

With McKay's signature on the order, the Fish and Wildlife Service was almost immediately swamped with applications for oil and gas leases. The Service now has to prove the value of the wildlife and the wildlife restoration lands against each oil- and gas-lease application and against each proposed drilling operation.

Prior to Secretary McKay's order, it was the other way round. It has been a long-standing policy that the 17½-million acres of refuge land—those bought with sportsmen's duck-stamp dollars, those with ap-

propriations by Congress for specific and primary wildlife conservation needs, and even those signed over from unwanted public lands—should be maintained as the last remnants of lands needed to hold hope for wildlife futures.

Where do we go from here?

Conservationists felt that Congress had taken steps to protect wildlife refuges when a last-ditch and last-minute effort brought amendments into the Atomic Energy and Mineral Leasing Acts during the last hours of the 83d Congress. These provided that any leases for national park, monument and wildlife land could be made only when the President, by executive order, finds and declares that such action is necessary in the interest of national defense.

Is Secretary McKay's order legal in view of this intent of Congress?

Is there any integrity in the administration that can rise to defend the limited lands reserved for the public interest?

Is it too much to hope that Secretary McKay will see the damage he has wrought and take steps to repair it?

Was this done with President Eisenhower's approval and will the President take the necessary prompt steps to save the national wildlife refuge system?

We can only hope that Congress will take a hard look at this order, and that the sportsman-conservationists of the country will take a harder look—with articulate expression.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

I should like to inform attachés of the Senate that we shall proceed with the quorum call and that I do not expect to ask that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

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

Aiken	Fulbright	McNamara
Allott	George	Monroney
Anderson	Gore	Morse
Barkley	Green	Mundt
Beall	Hayden	Murray
Bender	Hennings	Neely
Bible	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Payne
Butler	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Ives	Robertson
Capehart	Jackson	Russell
Carlson	Jenner	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Chavez	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kerr	Sparkman
Cotton	Knowland	Stennis
Curtis	Kuchel	Symington
Daniel	Langer	Thurmond
Duff	Lehman	Thye
Dworshak	Long	Watkins
Eastland	Magnuson	Welker
Ellender	Mansfield	Wiley
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Young
Frear	McClellan	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent in order to attend the funeral of a friend.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] are also necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

CRITICISM BY L. BRENT BOZELL OF HEARINGS ON SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am not a regular reader of the new, widely advertised, self-styled "conservative" magazine, the National Review. From what I have seen for it, I do not consider it either required or recommended reading.

I have seen enough of it, however, to be aware of its misstatements of fact, particularly when these misstatements concern my own activities. The issue of the National Review for February 22, 1956, is a case in point. In it Mr. L. Brent Bozell devotes a paragraph to the subcommittee on Government security which conducted hearings last year.

Mr. Bozell's misstatements are the kind that could be easily checked. Hence I can only conclude that they were written with a deliberate intent to deceive. The pertinent paragraph occurs in an article by Mr. Bozell called National Trends, appearing on page 17:

> A subcommittee that looked into the Humphrey resolution for setting up a special security commission had the first crack, and called as its star witness one Joseph L. Rauh, Jr. Rauh obligingly set forth the criteria for a good security program (arguing, generally, that the less security the better the program); whereupon the subcommittee called a spate of lesser personages (discharged Government employees) who obligingly proved with tales of their own "persecution," that by Rauh's standards the administration's program was very bad indeed.

Mr. President, these statements about the work of the Humphrey subcommittee are demonstrably false. Mr. Rauh did testify, but he was by no means a "star witness." The star witnesses were in fact high-ranking officials of a number of departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and the bulk of the testimony heard by the subcommittee was from such officials.

Mr. Rauh's complete testimony, including his prepared statement, consumed only 18 pages of the 1,350 pages of the published hearings. A number of witnesses from private life testified at much greater length. For example, the testimony of the representative of Douglas Aircraft Co. consumed 32 pages; the testimony of the representatives of the University of Chicago consumed 21 pages; the testimony of the representative of the Federation of American Scientists consumed 20 pages; the testimony of the representative of the CIO consumed 25 pages; the testimony of the representatives of Engineers and Scientists of America consumed 21 pages; and the testimony of the representatives of the American Civil Liberties Union consumed 22 pages.

In addition, contrary to Mr. Bozell's statement, the subcommittee did not call a single discharged Government employee and did not receive testimony concerning any cases of persecution or abuse or specific abuses of the security program. A scrupulous effort was made at all times to avoid bringing into the hearings any reference to specific loyalty-security cases or any particular situations of alleged abuse.

Mr. President, I am sure that this kind of journalistic distortion will not be countenanced by any of the other Members of the Senate or of the subcommittee, to whose attention I am bringing this matter. I think we can expect more honest treatment even from those journalists who disagree with us and even in the columns of the National Review. I hope that the editors of that publication will feel obligated to bring the comments I have just made to the attention of their readership.

Mr. President, I assure the Senate that this statement has been sent to the editor of the National Review, and I am looking forward to an appropriate retraction, because the comments in the article are unfair, biased, distorted, and do anything but justice to the diligence of the members of the subcommittee which reported unanimously on the security commission, and the measure was adopted unanimously by the Senate. The hearings were conducted in line with the most friendly, considerate, and objective points of view.

Mr. President, I now desire to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

MAJOR QUESTIONS ON THE INTERNATIONAL SCENE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the New York Times yesterday and today, Mr. James Reston has contributed two long and thoughtful articles on the major questions facing us on the international scene. These columns were written in anticipation of the appearance tomorrow of the Secretary of State before the Foreign Relations Committee. I should like to say that I consider Mr. Reston's questions precisely to the point, and I hope the examination which the Foreign Relations Committee will conduct tomorrow will be as searching an inquiry as Mr. Reston suggests.

Mr. President, it is my intention, at the meeting of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations tomorrow, to question Mr. Dulles in considerable detail on many of the points Mr. Reston has raised, as well as on other points about which I have made public comment from time to time in the Senate and in the press.

I am very definitely disturbed by what I consider to be the deterioration of

American foreign policy and by the failure of the Secretary of State and the administration to make clear to the American people what our foreign policy is in many of the crucial areas of the world.

I can think of no more important meeting than the hearing which will take place tomorrow afternoon before the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is my hope that it will be a public hearing. I think the business of the Government should be public, especially when the destiny of the Nation is at stake, and when great policies relating to the life and well-being of the Republic are to be discussed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two articles written by Mr. Reston may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times of February 21, 1956]

DULLES TO FACE AN INVESTIGATION ON FOREIGN POLICY—FUROR ON ARMS FOR MIDEAST SPURS CONGRESSIONAL DEMAND FOR CLEARER PROGRAM—CHANGING STAND SCORED—LACK OF STRATEGY TO MEET SOVIET BID FOR EXPANSION FEARED IN WASHINGTON

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 21.—Secretary of State Dulles will return from his vacation tomorrow to face a full-scale congressional investigation of the administration's foreign policy.

The investigation was called for Friday by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Walter F. George of Georgia. It will inquire into the twistings and turnings of the administration's arms policy in the Middle East.

It will range well beyond that region, however, for there is more apprehension in the Capitol today about the conduct of foreign policy than at any time since the Korean war.

This apprehension has been caused primarily by the Communist political and economic offensive in the Middle East and south Asia, and by the fear, which has been growing steadily here in the last few months, that the administration has miscalculated Communist strategy and has no effective policy to meet it.

THIRD CONTROVERSY OF KIND

During the last few days the sense of uneasiness in the Capitol about the conduct of foreign policy has been inflamed by the administration's discovery that it was about to ship 18 tanks to Saudi Arabia, by the sudden announcement from the President's headquarters in Georgia of an embargo on all such shipments of arms to the Middle East and the lifting of that embargo the following afternoon.

This is the third time that the administration has become involved in a major international controversy while Mr. Dulles was on vacation. The last time, the State Department issued a formal statement characterizing the decision to open diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and West Germany as a victory for the West, though this was widely regarded elsewhere as a dangerous defeat.

The time before that, the State Department, in Mr. Dulles' absence, rebuffed Communist China's offers of talks on the Taiwan (Formosa) crisis and had to be reversed when the Secretary of State returned.

These considerations have given rise to the question of who runs the foreign policy of the United States when Mr. Dulles and the President are away. The Saudi Arabian tank deal is coming in for special attention because it has followed fairly closely upon what are widely regarded here as a number of other foreign policy blunders.

FACTORS IN QUESTIONING MOOD

Among these are the following:

The Secretary of State's interview with Life magazine in which he created an international controversy by asserting that the Nation had been carried three times in the last three years to the "brink" of war.

Mr. Dulles' characterization of Goa as a "province" of Portugal, a statement that contributed to what Ambassador John Sherman Cooper is back in Washington describing as "the steady deterioration of United States relations with India."

The long and fruitless arguments between the United States and the so-called uncommitted nations of Asia over a number of issues at the last meeting of the United Nations General Assembly in New York.

Official assertions in Washington that the Soviet Union was being forced into a more reasonable policy by American "initiative" and by an economic crisis in the Soviet Union.

Finally, the failure of the President and the Secretary of State to make an issue of Communist maneuvering in the Middle East at the Big Four meeting in Geneva last July, though the Government had official knowledge at that time that the Arab States were in negotiation for Communist arms long before that time.

LOSS OF INITIATIVE SEEN

These factors have contributed to a widespread feeling here that Communist doctrine and Communist tactics have undergone a radical change since the death of Stalin, and that in the last year, particularly since the illness of the President, the United States has lost the initiative in the world struggle with the Communists.

Congress has heard solemn testimony in recent days that the Soviet Union has surpassed the United States in some aspects of the race for the development of long-range guided missiles.

It is particularly upset by official testimony that Moscow may well be the first to produce a 1,500-mile guided missile that would place many vital United States overseas air bases in danger and greatly strengthen the Soviet Union's power of diplomatic blackmail.

Reports from West Germany of the weakening of the pro-Western Adenauer coalition, reports of growing weakness in Turkey, and of misuse of American economic aid in South Korea have all led to widespread demands, not merely for an investigation of the Middle Eastern situation, but for a searching inquiry into the whole purpose and machinery of American foreign policy.

EARLIER DIFFICULTIES RECALLED

The atmosphere here today is much like that of the periods before the adoption of the Marshall plan and the creation of the North Atlantic Treaty shield for Western Europe.

Before these fundamental political decisions there was a general realization here that the policies that were being followed at the time were not working, that the Western nations were losing ground, and that conditions in the world were forcing the adoption of new concepts and new policies.

There was a period before the Marshall plan, similar to that today, when officials differed in their estimates of the danger and, therefore, in their recommendations of what should be done.

Then, as now, officials ran into the difficulty of slowing down the heavy and complicated machinery of Government; legitimate policy criticism became involved in partisan debate; and, as always, officials with vested interests in past decisions found pretexts for doing nothing.

All these elements are involved in the present situation. There is a general realization that the past emphasis on military alliances will not deal with the Communist economic and political offensive from the eastern Mediterranean to the Sea of Japan. There is agreement, too, that the main objective of Soviet policy now is to destroy Western connections and influence in this vast Asian circle, and that this must be blocked at any cost.

NO AGREEMENT ON PROGRAM

There is no agreement, however, about what should be done. Some United States naval and air power has been moved into the eastern Mediterranean to demonstrate that the West does not intend merely to be pushed out of that area, but the Government is divided about whether, and how much, and what kind of aid should be given to the Israelis.

It is this uncertainty that has contributed to so many contradictory acts by the United States in the Middle East and south Asia and even to the feeling in the Saudi Arabian deal that each department was acting on its own, without any strong leadership from the top, or even any check to see whether contracts signed long ago conformed with American policy at the moment of shipment.

The Democrats, of course, have tried to exploit these difficulties in the last few months, and one result of this has been to give many people the impression that the criticism is just so much political maneuvering in the presidential campaign.

The situation here is far too serious, and the criticism far too widespread within the executive branch of the Government, however, to be dismissed as campaign carping.

Officials here concede that never has there been such a note of confidence in Soviet utterances as in the last week; never so much evidence that the Russians do have an explorable surplus of some capital goods that they are exchanging for much needed food, and never since World War II a more subtle or complex international challenge for the United States.

A NEW SET OF CONDITIONS

In Europe, during the Marshall plan crisis the United States was dealing with industrial societies and with social systems that were familiar. It was not difficult to get good well-trained personnel to go into those areas.

In the Middle East and in south Asia and the Far East, however, the problem is much more difficult. Able personnel willing to work for years amid the pestilence of many of these areas are not easy to find. The fund of information and of good judgment about these areas in the Government here is not impressive, and the nature of the crisis itself is difficult to make clear to a vast electorate or even to Congress.

There is no military attack to dramatize the crisis, as in Korea. There is no established industrial system in any of these countries to be restored. Government, industrial, and even agricultural skill is in short supply throughout the region, and Congress in Washington is oriented to granting military rather than economic or political aid.

Thus Mr. Dulles has his work cut out for him. Many Senators are sure the cold-war policy of the United States is losing ground, but they have no clear idea about what should be done, and they have heard little from the administration in recent months to give them a sense of clear imaginative direction.

Consequently, they are demanding answers from the Secretary of State before the Secretary has even discussed some of the problems with the President.

[From the New York Times of February 23, 1956]

GEORGE FEARS LAG IN COLD WAR PLAN—SENATOR SEES UNITED STATES INITIATIVE WAVERING—IS DISTURBED BY CAPITAL'S UNCERTAINTY

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 22.—Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, said today he was afraid the Western nations had temporarily lost the initiative in the cold war.

He is "disturbed," he added about what seems to be the uncertainty of American actions in the Middle East and South Asia in the last few months.

However, he noted, he does not have sufficient information on which to base a definitive judgment on the present world situation, partly because, he said, there has been a noticeable decline in his contacts with administrative leaders since the President's heart attack last September.

Mr. GEORGE said he intended to question Secretary of State Dulles as soon as possible on the present trend of United States and Soviet policy. An appointment has been scheduled for Mr. Dulles with the full Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate on Friday.

These comments, made in a conversation with this reporter, are typical of many others being heard here these days, not only on Capitol Hill but among well-informed officials in the departments and agencies charged with the formulation and operation of foreign policy.

There is general agreement in the capital about the reasons for the uneasiness expressed by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. Among these are the following:

Both United States and Soviet foreign policy are in transition. Both the United States and the Soviet Union retain their same objectives, but their leaders agreed at the Big Four meeting in Geneva last July to rule out war as a means of achieving these objectives.

There is a crisis of leadership in the Western World. Sir Winston Churchill has retired, leaving his successor, Sir Anthony Eden, to deal with another perplexing economic squeeze. France is paralyzed by political instability, and President Eisenhower has been out of action or out of Washington most of the time since last August.

These conditions have coincided with a revolution in modern weapons, which has upset all the strategic calculations of the North Atlantic Treaty powers. They have also coincided with an arms race in which the Soviet Union has made much more rapid progress in the guided missile field than official Washington's estimates have indicated.

Meanwhile, the Western alliance has been weakened by the loosening of ancient ties with Egypt, the growing nationalism of the Middle East and South Asia, and the decline of Chancellor Konrad Adenauer's political authority in West Germany.

COLD WAR STRATEGY LAGS

In addition to the Communist initiative in Asia, the revolution in weapons, the crisis of leadership in the West, and the decline of Dr. Adenauer's power in Germany, another familiar complaint is being widely discussed in Washington.

This is that the United States Government has still not developed an effective cold war strategy, or even an efficient Government apparatus for developing such a strategy.

It is now agreed that a new phase of the cold war is on, and that under the Geneva Big Four Agreement it will be fought out in the fields of political, economic, and psychological warfare. Yet no one here professes that the Government is properly set up to conduct effective economic and psychological warfare, or that it has a clear policy that its economists or propagandists can follow in the Middle East and South Asia.

For example, responsibility for conducting the administration's foreign aid program has been steadily dispersed in the last 2 years. The military-aid program is now in the Pentagon; the distribution of agricultural surpluses, which could be an effective foreign policy asset, is in the Agricultural Department, and even officials at the Cabinet level concede that foreign economic policy is so widely distributed through the Government that it does not have the coordinated direction it needs.

This is one reason for the off-again, on-again performance of the Government on Middle East arms policy in the last few days.

A shipment of tanks for Saudi Arabia was authorized months ago. The Pentagon recommended it and the State Department authorized it, but nobody followed the order through to see whether it conformed with United States national interests at the point, months later, when the tanks were ready for shipment.

When the shipment was discovered and publicized, there was a hullabaloo here, and no one knew for a while whether this was actually a Government-authorized deal or whether someone was shipping tanks without a valid export license.

Consequently, with the Secretary of State out of the city, the decision was passed on to the President at Thomasville, Ga., where no one knew anything about the deal and an embargo was merely slapped on to give time to find out. The embargo was lifted the next day.

FACTIONS DISPERSE POLICY

In the foreign economic aid field, the Cabinet is divided, with one faction feeling that the United States should dramatize a much more ambitious program for the Middle East and Asia, while another faction is inclined to believe that the emphasis should be kept on military aid and that foreign economic aid should be kept at the present level.

Meanwhile, the post of Presidential Assistant for Psychological Warfare Questions has been vacant since Nelson Rockefeller left in December. William H. Jackson, of Princeton, N. J., will take over the job March 1, but there is still no agreement in the Government about what the job is.

This is an old Washington problem. Early in 1931, during the Korean war, there was strong feeling in the Government that a major effort should be made to develop a strategic concept that would put more order and drive into the Nation's worldwide struggle with the Communists.

At that time it was proposed that a chief of staff for the cold war be established, with responsibility under the President for developing and supervising a coordinated strategy.

This ran into opposition from the established departments of Government, which felt that their prerogatives and authority might be weakened, so a compromise Psychological Strategy Board was established under Gordon Gray, now Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs.

In the Eisenhower administration, the men who have tried to carry on the same kind of work—C. D. Jackson and Nelson Rockefeller—have run into constant trouble with members of the Cabinet who resented their interventions.

THE FINANCING OF POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, Mr. Chalmers M. Roberts devotes an interesting column to two proposals which have originated in Minnesota and which affect a major question now before the Senate and the country, namely, the question of the financing of political campaigns. Mr. Byron G. Allen, presently State commissioner of agriculture in Minnesota, and formerly Democratic national committeeman in Minnesota, has been instrumental in promoting both of these proposals.

The first of them has actually reached the statute books. Last April, Minnesota altered its income-tax laws to permit deductions for political contributions and for the campaign expenses of candidates for office. In his column this morning, Mr. Roberts discusses the details of this Minnesota law and its applicability elsewhere.

I might suggest at this point, Mr. President, that the statute or public law of Minnesota relating to tax deductions for political contributions is one which merits the immediate attention of Congress. It surely legitimatizes and regularizes the matter of campaign funds, and makes each and every one of them a matter of public record.

In the same column, Mr. Roberts discusses a more sweeping proposal, which has also been made by Mr. Allen. It would involve a congressional charter for a new nonpartisan foundation to collect funds for campaign contributions. I am certain this proposal, too, will be of interest to the Senate, particularly in the wake of the new bill, S. 3242, introduced by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], which has attracted considerable attention here during the past few days.

It is my intention, in cooperation, I hope, with other of my colleagues in the Senate who will join me, to introduce a bill along the lines which Mr. Allen has discussed in his excellent article. I have known Mr. Allen for many years. He has spent years of his time in a study of the particular subject on which I now address the Senate.

I am confident that Mr. Allen and other Minnesota officials would welcome an opportunity to discuss both the Minnesota law and this second proposal for Federal legislation before appropriate committees of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Roberts may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

CAMPAIGN DONATIONS: AUTHOR OF MINNESOTA CURBS HAS PLAN FOR NATION

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

If the coming senatorial investigation of lobbying and election practices is to have any lasting value, it must lead to major changes in the methods of financing political campaigns. Minnesota offers suggestions on what might be done.

Last April Minnesota altered State income tax laws to permit two new sets of tax deductions: for political contributions and for campaign expenses of candidates for office.

Any citizen may deduct up to $100 for his contribution "to a political party, candidate or political cause." County chairmen may deduct up to $150; congressional district committeemen up to $350 and national committeemen and State chairmen up to $1,000 each. (The $100 exemption idea applied to Federal income tax has been proposed by

Representative STEWART L. UDALL (Democrat, of Arizona) and Senator THOMAS HENNINGS, Jr. (Democrat, of Missouri), but nothing has been done about it so far.)

The Minnesota law also provides that candidates may deduct "unreimbursed campaign expenditures personally paid" by the candidate up to these levels: candidates for governor or United States Senator, $5,000; for other State office or United States Representative, $3,500; for State senator, State representative, presidential electors at large, $500; for presidential electors chosen by congressional districts, $100; for "any other public office," one-fourth of that office's annual salary, a provision covering mayors, councilmen and so forth.

The Minnesota law is the baby of Byron G. Allen, State Commissioner of Agriculture and former Democratic national committeeman. Allen has said that "as a working politician, I know the subterfuges that are used" to get around the current campaign expenditure limitations of the Federal Corrupt Practices Acts. "I know," he said, "that the realities require money which must be passed under the table."

Allen would like to see the Minnesota law serve as a model for a new Federal deductions plan. But he also has a more sweeping idea which he recently brought to Washington.

He wants to raise money, big money in total, but made up to small contributions, this way: Have Congress grant a Federal charter, such as that to the American Red Cross, to a new foundation for campaign contribution collections. The foundation would be run by a broadly representative board of directors not packed with practical politicians, as Allen puts it. It would seek contributions from 10 cents up with some unspecified limitation to be set.

Up to this point Allen's proposal is somewhat similar to the one the advertising council was prepared to take on for the 1956 presidential election.

But Allen goes further. He also proposes to distribute the money collected this way: 25 percent each to national committees, State committees, congressional committees, and county committees. But not on a 50-50 basis between the two major parties.

Allen suggests that of each 25 percent share half the money go to the majority party, as judged by the last election returns. The other half would be divided among opposition parties in proportion to their share of the minority vote at the last election. This would mean small amounts for Socialists, Prohibitionists, or splinter groups in various States and counties as well as on a national level. Of course, it also means that a Democrat's $10 contribution might end up helping the GOP or vice versa.

Allen would have the money paid out this way: The party committees would spend it as they see fit, drawing funds from the foundation on vouchers and accounting in detail on the public record.

If the scheme worked well, Allen figures State legislators could then charter State foundations to take over State and local contributions—or the Federal foundation might be limited to funds for Federal office, leaving to State foundations the job of raising funds for use in State and local campaigns. A good many variants on these ideas are possible. One point is important: A lot of people would contribute to a nonpartisan foundation who would not contribute to either party.

In Minnesota the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party sponsors the Minnesota Foundation for Political Education, modeled on European party fund-raising tactics and experiences. This foundation has begun to collect contributions from $1 to $100 and gets 1 percent of the net proceeds of such party affairs as the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners and congressional dinners for its endowment fund.

The idea of this foundation, in Allen's words, is to improve political ethics in the State to the end that campaigns in Minnesota will be educational in value rather than merely biennial emotional binges. The word "educational" includes the idea of lecture courses, political reading rooms on the Swedish model, schools for candidates, fellowships for youthful and impoverished candidates, and political internships such as some colleges and other groups now annually conduct in Washington Government and congressional offices.

Allen's ideas are certain to run into a lot of practical objections from practical politicians who would prefer to let things remain as they are. But the $2,500 campaign contribution to Senator FRANCIS CASE (Republican, of South Dakota) already has opened up the contributions issue despite the practical men in Congress who would have preferred to keep the lid on. If the future investigation turns out to be meaningful, such ideas as those Allen offers may serve as models for cleaning up one of the least odoriferous phases of the democratic process.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I hope the special committee which was authorized by the resolution agreed to yesterday will most carefully and in considerable detail consider the suggestions which have been made by Mr. ALLEN. If only we would seek it, there is a great fund of information to be obtained from many of the nonpartisan and thoroughly profesional groups throughout the country, which would contribute to the deliberations of the special committee.

At a later time I shall address myself in greater detail to this all-important subject matter. I commend the present Presiding Officer, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], upon the introduction of his bill. I think it is a very constructive proposal and one which merits the utmost consideration by Congress.

PROPAGANDA AGAINST COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I regret to say that in the propaganda now being circulated by organized opposition to the Colorado River storage project, some of which has appeared in the RECORD from time to time, there is a great deal of misinformation and distortion of fact.

Mr. Barnet Nover, a veteran correspondent and chief of the Denver Post Washington bureau, in his column of February 19 in the Denver Post, has ably pointed out some of these falsehoods and distortions. I ask unanimous consent to have the column printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

ROUNDUP ON THE POTOMAC

(By Barnet Nover)

WASHINGTON.—As the day nears when the House of Representatives will begin taking up the bill authorizing the upper Colorado storage project, the shrieking and shouting, the calculated distortions and out-and-out prevarications of the southern California water lobbyists are reaching new highs.

The theory they are operating on is the one dreamed up by Hitler and perfected by the Kremlin, namely, the greater the lie the more people are likely to believe it, particularly if the lie is repeated often enough and loudly enough.

A good example of this southern California "big lie" technique is to be found in the latest folder the Colorado River Association of Los Angeles has now begun to distribute literally by the millions.

The point of the folder is that it makes no sense to be taking "40 million acres of land out of production and put it in a so-called soil bank 'while adding' 580,000 new acres of arid mountain land in Colorado, Utah, New Mexico and Wyoming at a cost to the Government (you) of $4 billion."

"And these lands," the folder continues "would grow more surplus crops."

This contention would make sense if it were true. It happens that there is not a shred of truth in it, as the southern California water lobbyists know perfectly well.

They come from a State which has benefited more from the 54-year-old reclamation program than any other State in the Union.

They knew—since the figures are abundantly available—that only a negligible percentage of the irrigated crops produced in California or in any other reclamation State is in the surplus category.

In fact, their own propaganda bears this out.

On the front page of this particular leaflet are pictures of a bulging bin marked "butter, milk, cotton, wool," and a bursting crib marked "corn, wheat, rice, grains." These are the surpluses costing the Government $8 billion which are horrendously portrayed on the front page of the folder, aside from grains, which presumably would include feedstuffs grown on irrigated lands and not in surplus, not a single one of these products is produced in any considerable quantities on reclamation lands.

This fact was pointed out for the umptieth time by W. A. Dexheimer, United States Commissioner of Reclamation, in a speech in New York last week.

Paying his respects to what he described as "the scattergun attack" launched on the upper Colorado project by southern California, and to the "apparently limitless war chest" which "has enabled this opposition to take a one-sided story to the far corners of the country," Dexheimer recalled some of the extraordinary economic benefits the Nation has derived from reclamation projects.

He cited the Boulder Canyon project, the Imperial Dam, the All-American Canal, the Colorado-Big Thompson.

With the exception of some cotton acreage, he said, none of the millions of dollars of agricultural products produced by those projects was in surplus.

"Most of it," Dexheimer explained, "was high priced specialty crops such as head lettuce and carrots for your winter salads. The same holds true of our other projects as well. Only a small tonnage of price-supported crops is grown on reclamation projects."

Then there is this matter of cost. The leaflet in question uses again that wholly discredited figure of $4 billion as the alleged cost of the upper Colorado scheme.

The House measure, soon to be voted on, has a price tag of only $760 million. But what is a 500 percent plus distortion to the sun-tanned Goebbelses of Smogland? The bigger the lie * * *

Also, nowhere in the leaflet is there the slightest suggestion that any of the money to be appropriated for the construction of the storage plan will be repaid, even though most of it will; that it will take 20 to 25 years to complete the project; and that repayments will begin long before the project has been finished.

The further thought occurs that since President Eisenhower favors the project, as

he has repeatedly made clear, he, like its other advocates, is trying to perpetuate a fraud on the American taxpayer.

Is this what the Colorado River Association of Los Angeles wants the country to believe?

SUSPENSION OF WES SANTEE BY AMATEUR ATHLETIC UNION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, last Monday morning I called the attention of the Senate to what I described as the cruel and unfair treatment given one of our Kansas boys, Wes Santee, by the Amateur Athletic Union.

I can report that there is general indignation throughout the Nation over this incident. The American people believe in fair play, and the autocratic attitude of the AAU in suspending Wes Santee from amateur standing for life is more than they are going to take without moral indignation and resentment. They are expressing themselves in no uncertain terms.

Typical of the correspondence and telegrams I have received from all over the Nation are some of the messages I have received from Kansas, and I ask unanimous consent that they be made a part of these remarks.

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

GREAT BEND, KANS., *February 21, 1956.*
The Honorable FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: We are shocked and disturbed at the AAU-Santee ruling which in effect places the 1956 United States Olympic team at the mercy of the known professional athletes of Russia.

We request the Congress of the United States protect the distinguished reputation of this country's Olympic team, and protect the citizens of the United States from the humiliation of a Russian propaganda. Introduce corrective legislation if need be, to rectify this shameful undeserved abuse of our Nation's top miler from Kansas.

Respectfully,
THE GREAT BEND ROTARY CLUB,
WILLIAM C. COOK, *President.*

GREAT BEND, KANS., *February 21, 1956.*
The Honorable FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: The suspension of Kansas mile king Wes Santee strikes us as an outrage—ruinous to Wes, crippling to this Nation's 1956 Olympic hopes.

As one of the clubs of the national Jaycee organization pledged to help raise a million dollars for the Olympics, we feel the AAU owes this Nation and us an answer. We respectfully urge a Senate inquiry of this shocking affair, hopeful that any and all steps will be taken to protect the rights of the American citizen not be humiliated before the world next summer by the salaried professional athletes of the U. S. S. R.

Respectfully,
GREAT BEND JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
CHRIS HILDENBRAND, Jr., *President.*

LAWRENCE, KANS., *February 22, 1956.*
Senator FRANK CARLSON,
Senate Office Building:

We wholeheartedly commend and endorse your interest and efforts on behalf of our fellow Kansan, Wes Santee. We feel confident that the entire State of Kansas joins us in strenuous protest against the gross injustice and despicable treatment meted out by the AAU to Santee. It is suggested that you contact Vincent X. Flaherty, sports editor, Los Angeles Examiner, who has publicly stated in his column, that he has definite knowledge of one track athlete who accumulated $2,000 on four amateur track appearances, and further states that he has additional ammunition for Santee.

You are assured that you will gain the enduring gratitude and appreciation of all Kansans for your continued efforts in rectifying the base injustice done to a western Kansas boy.

SPORTS COMMITTEE, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, LAWRENCE, KANS.

GREAT BEND, KANS., *February 22, 1956.*
Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: Argonne Post, No. 180, American Legion of Great Bend, Kans., by proper motion unanimously and respectfully urges you to initiate a Senate inquiry into the shocking and disgusting AAU-Santee incident, and that corrective legislation be enacted if need be to free our athletes from such prejudiced and petty tyrannies so abhorrent to the American way of life. We appeal to you to help insure all of our American athletes fundamental fairness and freedom from such reprehensible and irresponsible attacks.

We feel action imperative not only because of the vicious, undeserved, and isolated crucifixion of our greatest United States distance runner, Kansas athlete, United States marine, and Legionnaire, but most of all because the final effect of this AAU hypocrisy might well be to bar every United States athlete of prominence from any competition, and to set the stage for the humiliating defeat of our heretofore distinguished Olympic team this summer.

We don't think the United States, because of AAU stupid and outmoded ideas of amateurism should be placed at the mercy of the known salaried professional athletes of Russia, and our citizens and way of life undergo another humiliating Communist propaganda defeat before the eyes of the world.

Respectfully,
ARGONNE POST, NO. 180, AMERICAN LEGION. BOYD, ADJUTANT.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in a recent issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald in regard to the suspension of Wes Santee by the Amateur Athletic Union. The article was written by Shirley Povich, who is one of the outstanding sports writers in the Nation.

There have been thousands of articles written in regard to the Santee suspension, and this one is not only typical, but is a correct statement of the situation.

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

THIS MORNING
(By Shirley Povich)

Always more or less present in the editorialists' precincts is the temptation to rear back and stomp on the AAU. Maybe that is because the AAU is an outfit with a high quota of badge-wearing stuffed shirts who come out of the woodwork at intervals and nibble at the edges of the fame of the athletes they have enrolled.

Usually, the deterrent is that it isn't a very sporting contest and sometimes is compared to shooting fish in a barrel, because there is no escape for the AAU people from their own entrapment. In fact, if it were not for the damage they sometimes do, they could be called career chumps.

However, in the Wes Santee case the other day in which they came up with the decision that there was cause for lifetime expulsion from amateur ranks, the AAU action had considerable merit. Too bad they bungled it by singling out the wrong defendant.

They should have brought not only Santee but those 22 conniving rules-breaking badge-wearing AAU track meet promoters before the bar of AAU justice. Theirs were the greater sins. Santee admitted taking more money than the rules allowed for his appearances in meets, but says he was baited into it by the AAU's own pious members.

Unless the AAU follows up the disbarment of Santee with similar action against every one of its officials involved in the mess, its decree against the Kansas miler must stand as an unconscionable thing more reprehensible than anything he has been accused of.

Santee told this bureau yesterday that he did not deny the allegations that he received more expense money than the rules allow, except in one instance when he denied knowledge of a $400 payment to his father-in-law.

"Here's the way it worked, though," Santee said.

"These people who run the AAU meets would phone me and ask me to run in their meets. I guess they wanted me because I've run the mile faster than any other American and would help their gate receipts.

Always, they asked me how much I wanted for expenses. They knew the rules put a limit of $15 a day and transportation on the expenses, but that didn't stop them from asking me my price.

"I never gave them a price. I never held out for any figure. They were the ones who always asked me if I would take, say, $200 for the trip. I'd say 'Yes' and I knew it was more than I was allowed. But so did the AAU promoters, and they were the ones who instigated the overpayment."

Certainly there are some questions to be asked of the AAU, as Senator CARLSON, of Kansas, has said he will ask in a congressional investigation of AAU tactics. The first one that pops into mind is, was it Santee's responsibility to keep in line those AAU track people who, in effect, bribed him to enter their special, favorite meets? That would be tantamount to reminding the enforcers to obey the law.

And how come the AAU did not show the same vigorous interest in investigating those AAU promoters who propositioned Santee into violating the rules? Their sins are down in black and white on the financial statements of the meets they conducted, yet all they drew was a wrist-slapping reminder not to do it again.

Oh, there were a couple of expulsions besides Santee's that were handed out. Two California AAU officials were given the heave; also a man described as a publicity director for one of the meets. In the case of the publicist, however, the AAU was tossing out a fellow who wasn't even an AAU member, it was later learned. But the big body of AAU promoters who offered the money that Santee accepted were given only a mild reprimand.

The overpayments to Santee added up to a sum something less than colossal, about $1,500 for the 22 meets in which he engaged. Granted that it was not the size of the payments but the principle of them, the action against Santee appears to be excessively harsh, particularly in view of the lack of action against the equally sinful AAU promoters.

It's rough on a lad who for 11 years has dreamed of winning the equivalent of the Olympic mile and now is branded for life. The tragic thing is that life ban, by itself, is a powerful association of words in the

public mind. It could leave a man undeservedly marked even if his sin were no more than picking violets out of season, which might earn him ban for life from the Great Eastern Region Horticultural Society Accreditation Department.

The treatment given Santee might be more easily condoned if it were not an AAU action. That outfit's contributions to amateurism are often suspected, particularly in terms of those expensive Olympic junkets on which badge-wearing officials are almost as numerous as the athletes. "Oceangoing hitchhikers," the articulate Phog Allen, Kansas University coach, once called them in what was, for Allen, mild disgust.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order entered on yesterday, the Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on yesterday during the course of the debate on the farm bill, I pointed out that only two provisions in the bill would give immediate help to the farmers of the United States during 1956. One of those provisions is an increase in the support levels; the other is an authorization of a quarter of a billion dollars to supplement section 32 funds. It will be recalled that under section 32, only one-fourth of the funds available can be spent for any one commodity. On the other hand, the $250 million provided for in this measure has no restrictions attached; all of it or half of it or one-fourth of it can be spent for any particular commodity.

On yesterday, Mr. President, I also pointed out that, contrary to the position taken by Mr. Benson, lower price-supports do not decrease the production of farm commodities. I think I demonstrated that fact in referring to what has happened in the last 3 years with respect to our basic commodities. I documented the fact that lowered support levels do not bring decreased production, or decreased plantings of allotted acres. On the contrary, as price-support lands have dropped, farmers have increased their per acre production and have planted all, or practically all of their acreage allotments.

At this time I wish to continue with my main address, which as I indicated yesterday, is a general statement of the provisions of the bill. I invite any Senator to ask questions at any time he may desire; and if I can answer them, I shall be delighted to do so.

Mr. President, before the hearings on the farm program began, I had high hopes that any new farm legislation would contain a formula whereby the Government could support the prices of readily merchantable commodities—that is to say, farm commodities for which a ready demand exists—at high levels, and could permit supports for less desirable commodities to flex downward to lower levels. I felt that by so doing we could stimulate the production of grades and kinds of farm commodities which could flow into channels of consumption, which would better meet the actual market requirements, and discourage production of less desirable types and grades of commodities.

Unfortunately, this idea had to be abandoned. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was informed by the experts of the Department of Agriculture that it would be impossible to write into law any standard which could be applied to determine which commodities are readily salable. In other words, the Department officials took the position that if we attempted to follow through on the theory of basing support levels for farm commodities on the desires of the market, we would place the administrators of the law in an impossible position. We were told that one grade of a commodity which is in demand today may not be in demand tomorrow. In addition, grades of commodities vary from region to region, from State to State, and from farm to farm. All in all, it seemed that it would be impossible to reach an agreement as to how to define, for price-support purposes, which commodities are readily salable and which are not.

I may add, Mr. President, that soon after we concluded the hearings last November I wrote to many millers, to spinners of cotton throughout the country, and to others who handle and process our basic commodities; I asked for their suggestions, ideas, and views as to whether or not we could write a formula to carry out the thought I had in mind. I was told by them that it would be a practical impossibility. Therefore, as I have said, the committee abandoned that proposal.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I offered an amendment—and it was approved by the committee—which would provide 90 percent supports on a quality basis for wheat. It would go only part way in that direction of quality. It would provide that 90 percent supports would be available to producers who plant wheat seed which normally would produce a good quality of wheat.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG. That would afford a limited provision based on quality.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG. It would provide 90 wheat which normally produce good percent supports for all varieties of quality.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is my hope that the yardstick, outlined by my good friend from North Dakota, will work. However, he will remember that members of the staff of the Secretary of Agriculture stated that 95 percent of the wheat produced would come within the 90 percent support price.

Mr. YOUNG. I do recall that statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my recollection.

Mr. YOUNG. The proposal which I offered would provide 90 percent for most of the wheat produced, but it would also provide lower support levels for a great deal of wheat of poor quality which is being produced today.

I think the Senator from Louisiana has reference to the 23 varieties of wheat which the Secretary of Agriculture this year discounts 20 cents a bushel. I think those are the varieties to which the Senator is referring.

Mr. ELLENDER. It might be entirely possible to devise a formula on the basis of the proposal which my distinguished friend from North Dakota offered, and which was written into the bill. I hope it will work.

Mr. YOUNG. Mine is a simple approach to the problem. If we attempt to go a step further, as we planned last fall, and base price support on the quality of wheat marketed by the farmer, we will run into a great deal of trouble. It is a slow process, for example, to test the protein and gluten content of each load of wheat which may be delivered to a country elevator.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to add that the proposal of the Senator from North Dakota has been considered by the Department of Agriculture for many years. The Department has been endeavoring to determine how to devise a formula to provide higher supports for good quality and lower supports for poor quality. One proposal which was made—I think it came from the State of the Senator from North Dakota—was that the support be based upon the salability of the variety. However, it turns out that that formula does not work either.

If we base the salability on the proportion of the crop which is turned over to the Commodity Credit Corporation by the producers as unsold, we find that under that formula the Eastern and Southern States would get the highest support level.

For the 4 years from 1950 to 1953, the States of Kansas, Missouri, Colorado, Nebraska, and Wyoming turned over 29 percent of the crop to the Commodity Credit Corporation. Minnesota, South Dakota, North Dakota, Wisconsin, and Montana turned over 20 percent of the crop. Iowa, Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, and Kentucky turned over 13.8 percent. Texas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Arkansas turned over to the Commodity Credit Corporation for those 4 years 31 percent of the wheat crop. Idaho, Washington, and Oregon turned over 23½ percent. California, Arizona, Nevada, and Utah turned over 3.6 percent. Virginia and the States north of Virginia turned over 9½ percent. The States south of Virginia, including the

Carolinas, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi, turned over 22½ percent. So we cannot judge the quality by the percentage of the crop which each State turns over to the Commodity Credit Corporation. So that formula was not practicable. I use that merely as an illustration of an effort to devise a formula under which higher support levels could be given to the better quality.

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe that in response to a question propounded by me to the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Morse, and his assistant, we were informed that the Department had been working for 20 years in an attempt to find a salability formula applicable to various crops. However, up to now they have not found such a formula. I suggested to them that they continue their studies, and perhaps they might come up with something.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I was greatly interested in the figures just submitted by the Senator from Vermont. I wish to be sure I understood him correctly. I wonder if he meant to have us infer that the quantity of wheat turned over to the Commodity Credit Corporation in a State would be determinative of quality. Is it not more reasonable to assume that the greater the production in a community, the greater the amount which would be turned over? Would that be a reliable basis for determining quality?

Mr. AIKEN. I read these statistics to show that we could not judge the quality by the percentage of the crop turned over to the Commodity Credit Corporation. Kansas, Missouri, Colorado, Nebraska, and Wyoming are grouped together. Kansas is a large wheat-producing State. I am sure the Senator knows how eastern Kansas compares with western Kansas. Missouri has become a large producer of wheat. Colorado, Nebraska, and Wyoming are grouped together. Some of the States in which very little was turned over to the Commodity Credit Corporation are not noted for producing large quantities of the highest quality of wheat. Nevertheless, the wheat had a ready market, presumably, in chicken feed and other types of feed.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. For instance in 4 of the States mentioned only a little more than 3 percent of the production was put into the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation. That 3 percent may be wheat that was not adapted to milling purposes but could be used for chicken feed.

Mr. AIKEN. In some States, however, production has gone up with respect to certain varieties of wheat; for example, a good hard wheat, which has the same analysis as wheat from western farms, but which for milling purposes is considered decidedly inferior. It may have a moisture content of 12 percent, and a protein content of 13 percent, just as is the case with wheat from another area, but nevertheless one wheat is good for milling purposes and the other type is not. They both weigh from 58 to 60 pounds to the bushel. It makes the situation very difficult but millers do make a distinction and they say that one is good and the other is not good.

In other words, the wheat that is used as a filler will still run to 60 pounds to the bushel and 12 percent moisture and 13 percent protein, but that wheat is not desirable.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Vermont has made a very accurate statement with regard to quality milling wheat. There is no question that quality is not based on test weight. The wheat grower in Kansas is interested in producing good milling quality wheat. We like to boast that we grow the best wheat in the world. We regret sincerely that in the last 2 or 3 years there has been some complaint about our wheat, and we are trying to correct the situation. The Secretary's statement last year that there would be a differential in payments brought about a shift in the production into higher quality plantings. In the next harvest we will have greatly improved the quality of wheat.

As I read the bill, it would set up a commission to work with the Department of Agriculture to assist the Department in determining the quality of wheat. That is the purpose of creating the commission as I understand.

Mr. ELLENDER. The purpose of the Commission is to determine which varieties of wheat are the best, and the farmers who plant that variety will get 90 percent.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe I am correct in my understanding. That is the intention, as I understand it.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Under the present law the Secretary of Agriculture, working with those engaged in research experiment stations, millers, and bakers, determines the quality.

Under the provision the Senator has referred to we would set up a commission consisting of an agricultural research expert, a miller, and a farmer. There would be three members from each of the principal wheat producing areas of the United States. This would be the first time that farmers would be given a voice in determining the quality of wheat.

Mr. ELLENDER. The commission would work from year to year, as I understand.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct. The Secretary makes that determination all alone at the present time. The committee would be advisory in nature.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNG. I may say that in my own State of North Dakota there are varieties of wheat which should not be grown. Ninety-eight percent of the wheat grown in North Dakota is of good quality. However, we have a few varieties that should not be planted. Among them are Golden Ball, Peliss, Pentad, and Premier, and 2 or 3 others. I do not see any reason why we should provide the top level of support to farmers who seed that kind of wheat which rarely, if ever, produces good quality.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wonder whether the chairman of the committee would object if I were to refer to another feature of the bill which was mentioned indirectly by him. I refer to the noncommercial wheat-producing areas which are to be set forth in the bill. For the moment I cannot find that particular section in the bill. As I remember reading it, each State would be given a quota of 240,000 acres of noncommercial wheat. There are States which would not have 240,000 acres. What would happen in such a case?

Mr. AIKEN. Any State that did not produce 240,000 acres would be taken out of the commercial area.

Mr. CARLSON. I want to be sure that we are not increasing acreage allotments for wheat in noncommercial areas up to 240,000 acres, and finding the wheat some place else in commercial areas.

Mr. AIKEN. Any State that has an acreage allotment of less than 240,000 acres would be put into the noncommercial area, and if it chose to go into the program, it would get only 75 percent of the support price in the commercial area.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Presumably 90 percent of the production would go into feed.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was what the testimony before the committee indicated, as I remember.

Mr. President, the committee also voted down the proposal to place a limitation on price supports—either a gross limitation or a limitation based on total production of a given farm. In his special farm message, the President recommended that we consider placing limitations on price support payments; however, careful examination of the problem convinced us that it would be unwise to do so.

Any limitation on price supports would, in effect, mean that market prices would stabilize at or just around the support level in effect on the majority of the crop.

Under the President's proposal, a gross cash limitation would be placed on price support payments. This would mean that the great bulk of our agricultural production could be marketed with no support levels in effect, depending on the amount of the limitation imposed. As to that portion, the fluctuations of the markets would, alone, affect farm prices. As to that portion of the crop which would be supported—and this would be production primarily from the small farms—the commodities would flow into Government storage. The proposal for a gross cash limitation on price support payments would, in practical effect, amount to a cash subsidy paid to the small farmers with the Government taking over their total production in return.

Under the alternative of placing a sliding scale support level in effect, and basing supports on the size of a farm or its volume of production, it was shown that market prices would tend to stabilize at, or just around, the support level in effect for the majority of a crop. Since any such limitation would fix support levels

for large producers at relatively low levels, and since larger farmers supply the majority of our production, this alternative, too, would mean that small farmers would produce almost exclusively for Government warehouses.

Under either proposal, that is, either a gross limitation on support payments or a limitation based upon support levels flexing in line with per-farm production volume, the small farmer would find himself unable to compete on the farm markets; the Government, on the other hand, would find itself the only purchaser for small-farm production. Neither result is desirable, and the committee voted to eliminate any provisions for limitation on supports.

Let me emphasize, again, Mr. President, that the result of an attempt to limit price supports would mean that the small farmer would be producing for the Government. Price supports were never intended as a subsidy. They are means by which a farmer may borrow money on what he produces so that he will not be compelled to dump his crop on the market all at once, and thereby depress prices.

I cannot believe that anybody will argue seriously that the administration sliding-scale formula, which is now the law of the land, will stimulate the farm economy and bring about increased income to the American farmer in 1956. On the contrary, I believe that it will further decrease farm income, and push the parity ratio down to a new low, and shrink still smaller the farmer's share in the consumer's dollar.

Mr. Benson, however, argues that the sliding-scale formula, plus the soil bank, will bring about a reversal of the present-day trend toward a major farm depression, and result in happier days for the farmer. I must disagree with the Secretary. There is no more rational basis for his optimism in this respect than there has been for the assurances of better times for the farmer that have come forth from his lips with such regularity over the past 2 years. I placed some of the now-discredited statements made by the Secretary in the RECORD yesterday. They demonstrate that the Secretary has frequently been so wrong in the past in his economic prognostications that I believe his forecast in this instance would be best disregarded.

When a farmer participates in the acreage-reserve program, the first phase of the soil bank, as is contemplated in the bill now before the Senate, he must agree to take out of production a designated number of acres allotted to him for one of the basic crops of corn, wheat, rice, cotton, and certain types of tobacco. For instance, a cotton farmer with 100 acres of land, on which he now plants 40 acres of cotton, 30 acres of corn, and 30 acres in hay or other crops, might be permitted to share in the acreage-reserve program up to, let us say, 10 acres. On this 10 acres, which otherwise he would plant in cotton in 1956, he must agree to plant no crops at all, neither cotton nor other crops, and to not even graze the land during 1956. Thus, aside from the payments he is to receive from the Department of Agriculture for diverting these 10 acres of cotton land, he will reap no harvest whatsoever in 1956. His only income from the 10 diverted acres will be the incentive payment the Department makes to him, which for the sake of argument we will say amounts to 50 percent of the support price for 1956 cotton, based on the normal yield of cotton per acre for this particular farm. The exact amount of the incentive payments under the acreage-reserve program will be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, under the terms of the committee bill; irrespective of what the price-support levels for the basic crops may be, he is given the widest discretion to make the incentive payment high enough to yield the farmer a net return on the 10 diverted acres which will be slightly larger than the return the farmer would otherwise get by planting it to cotton. But it will not represent any additional income to the farmer in 1956—it will be only a payment in lieu of what he would otherwise have made from the cotton he could have grown on the land.

The same holds true of the conservation-reserve payments to be made to farmers under the second phase of the soil-bank program. Under this feature of the soil-bank program, any farmer will be eligible to participate, who is willing to divert some of his cultivated acres from production and put them into either grass or trees or other conservation programs, and in addition agree not to graze them. This program is for a minimum period of 3 years, or as much as 10 years, to be agreed upon by the Secretary and the farmer. If trees are planted the contract can be for as long as 15 years. The Secretary is authorized to reimburse the landowner for the cost of establishing the grass or trees on the diverted acreage, and, in addition, to pay him annually the fair rental value of the land so diverted during the life of the contract.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. A few years ago we planted shelter belts. There was an agreement that the Government would pay the farmer so much an acre for the shelter belts, but payment was not made.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean for the cost of planting?

Mr. LANGER. Yes. Farmers did not receive payment for the planting of the shelter belts, and I am wondering what assurance the farmers will have under this bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. The shelter-belt plan came under the agricultural conservation program, as the Senator well remembers, which differs considerably from the soil-conservation programs contained in this bill. Only cultivated acres will go into either of these new programs—either the acreage reserve or the conservation reserve.

Mr. LANGER. I planted a certain number of acres for shelter, and the Government reneged on its agreement to pay so much an acre.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the pending bill as it is written, the farmer will enter into a binding contract with the Government to set aside so many acres. If the farmer should decide to participate in the acreage reserve, a contract would be entered into probably for 1 year, but it could be entered into for as many as 4 years. The only acres which could be diverted would be allotted acres on basic crops. For that program we are providing a $750 million appropriation for payments on each year's crops.

Mr. LANGER. But, supposing the Congress 2 years from now does not make such an appropriation?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have said, it will depend on the Congress to carry out the program; but I am sure that if my good friend from North Dakota is still a Member of the Senate, the Congress will vote for such an appropriation. I know I would. These appropriations are to be made each year.

If the bill is passed and becomes law on March 15, the farmer who enters into a contract on his allotted acres could receive payment before the planting season is over. If he agrees to comply by setting aside so many of his allotted acres in wheat, corn, rice, or cotton, he receives a certificate from the Department of Agriculture payable either in cash or in commodities. In order to encourage the holder of the certificate to obtain commodities for it rather than cash, there is a further inducement offered to him. That inducement is that the value of the certificate increases by 10 percent if the farmer agrees to take commodities which are in storage. The Commodity Credit Administration then sells to him at either the market price or 105 percent of the support price, whichever is the higher.

So, as I have said, there is full protection for the farmer, because he will be able to obtain his certificate, which is negotiable, before the end of the year. It is not a question of waiting for a full year, but he may get payment upon giving assurance that the contract has been carried out by him.

Of course, the conservation reserve acres are in a slightly different category, because the requirement in that phase of the soil-bank program is that the contract must be entered into for not less than 3 years nor more than 10. As I said a while ago, that period can extend as long as 15 years, if the acreage is used to plant trees. In that case, the farmer will also be compensated by the Secretary of Agriculture. In fact, under the bill, the Secretary has the power to make the proposal very attractive, so as to get out of cultivation the total number of acres which he determines should go into the conservation reserve program. As to those acres, the farmer will receive financial assistance in the planting of grass, other soil-building crops, or trees on them. In addition, the farmer will be paid a rental each year for the land he takes out of cultivation and puts into the conservation reserve.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator was a Member of the Senate, was he not, when the shelter belt bill was passed by Congress?

Mr. ELLENDER. That was in about 1933, was it not?

Mr. AIKEN. I think it was about that time.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was a little before I became a Member of the Senate. But I do not think the Senator from North Dakota need worry. This is an entirely different program.

Mr. LANGER. At that time the assurance was given to the farmer that, if he would plant trees, he would receive so much an acre for the shelter belt. The Government reneged on that proposal.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not think the same situation will prevail this time; at least, I hope it will not.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator may have already covered the point I have in mind, or he may do so later. But in reading the bill, I was somewhat disturbed by the limitation of $100 an acre which the farmer is to be paid for land withdrawn from cultivation. With respect to a good many crops, that would be adequate, but there are some crops as to which it would not be much of an inducement.

Mr. ELLENDER. The limitation of $100 applies only to tobacco.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the crop to which I am applying it. The average farmer who produces burley tobacco will get a thousand pounds an acre, which is a very conservative estimate. If the price were 40 or 50 cents a pound, he would receive $400 or $500 an acre for the production of the tobacco. If he were to be limited to receiving $100 an acre on acreage from which he could receive, $400, $500, or $600, that would not be any inducement to withdraw his land from production.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. Let me state the reason why that provision was included. The committee received reports from growers of cigar binder tobacco, which is used for cigar making. It seems that type of tobacco is produced in only two States—Connecticut and Wisconsin. A recent process makes it possible to take almost any kind of tobacco leaf, homogenize it, and remake it into a leaf which looks exactly like the binder tobacco. It is tobacco which is ground up, as it were, and pressed back into usable shape, so that it can be used in the making of cigars.

The committee found that the cigar binder tobacco producers were in bad circumstances, and it was agreed that if tobacco were included in the bill, the payments would have to be limited to $100. We understood that those growers would be satisfied with such a payment. It was subsequent to that action that the committee voted to include flue-cured and burley tobacco. I understand other tobaccos, also, probably will be added.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand the committee omitted dark-fired tobacco, because the committee was under the impression that the dark-fired tobacco producers did not want to be included. But I think that is a mistake. My colleague, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], and I have offered, or will offer, an amendment to include dark-fired tobacco in the program.

What I have in mind is that the bill as it is written, as I understand, does not differentiate among the types of tobacco which are to be limited to the $100 an acre.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. That would not be any inducement to a producer of burley or flue-cured tobacco. I doubt if it would be an inducement even in the dark-fired tobacco region, because in that area the average production is a thousand pounds to the acre; many acres produce more. Some acres produce a couple of thousand pounds. At the prices which have been prevailing since the farm program was inaugurated, $100 by itself would hardly be an inducement to any tobacco grower.

Mr. ELLENDER. The reason why the tobacco producers the Senator has in mind were left out was that the Department felt that the acreage planted in tobacco was so small that very few farmers, if any, could be induced to accept a payment, because the majority of the farmers have a half acre or an acre, and we had no requests for inclusion from such producers. For those reasons, it was decided to leave them out.

Furthermore, although the supply of tobacco is quite large, tobacco can be stored and readily preserved. It does not deteriorate. That was another reason why this basic crop was omitted originally.

Peanuts also were omitted from the acreage reserve. The acreage in that category is, I think, about 1,600,000, which is small in comparison to the acreage devoted to corn, cotton, and wheat, for instance. The supply of peanuts is not too far in excess of requirements. Therefore, that basic crop also was left out.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not wish to take the Senator's time now to discuss this question, because we shall probably discuss it at length when that point is reached in the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad the Senator asked the question about the $100 limitation. Tobacco was placed in the bill primarily to assist the growers of Connecticut and Wisconsin, who were in a very distressed condition. Many of them were on the verge of going out of business. They felt that rather than get nothing at all, they would accept a $100 per acre maximum. It was only when the bill was about to be reported that the other two kinds of tobacco were added. The limitation as to the amount per acre to be paid was left in the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. We can discuss the question further when that point is reached in the bill; I simply wanted to call attention to the fact that although the $100 limitation probably would help the growers of the particular type of tobacco to which the Senator has referred, the wrapper tobacco produced in Connecticut and Wisconsin—and I am all for that—it would not be any inducement at all to the producers of tobacco grown in Kentucky, Virginia, North Carolina, and many other States.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am in agreement with the Senator.

Now, Mr. President, it cannot possibly be argued that these payments under the conservation reserve program will result in more money being put into the farmers' pockets during 1956, because once again, it is just a matter of the Government giving the farmer money to take the place of the income the farmer would have obtained had he planted, cultivated, harvested, and marketed a food or fiber crop off the land he agrees to put in the conservation reserve program.

I repeat, Mr. President, that in both programs, whether the land be put in the acreage or conservation reserve, the acres which are to be set aside must be acres which are or which recently have been used in producing some kind of crop. The provision does not apply to just any land or to new land of any kind. The main purpose of the soil bank is to take out of cultivation the acres which are now producing crops which are in surplus.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I cannot quite agree with my colleague that taking out of wheat production 12 million of the 55 million acres will not have an effect on the market price of the remainder of the crop. One of the purposes of the soil-bank proposal is to reach that situation. If reduction of planting by, say, 25 percent will not have any effect on the market price of the rest of the crop, then the soil-bank program will be a failure before it is started.

Mr. ELLENDER. No. The Senator knows there is enough wheat on hand now for more than a year. I believe the amount on hand is over 1 billion bushels. We consume about 658 million bushels a year. The acreage-reserve program may bring about some slight rise in the wheat market by the end of the year. That is possible. But I am speaking primarily of 1956.

I may say to my good friend from Vermont there is no doubt that in 1957, if the program works as we contemplate it will, and if enough land can be taken out of production—say, 10 million acres of allotted wheat acreage, 3 million acres of allotted cotton acreage, reducing cotton production by, say, from 3 to 4 million bales—prices of crops next year are bound to be affected to some extent, but there will be but little benefit, if any, for the farmers this year by way of the acreage-reserve program, standing alone.

Mr. AIKEN. Not only would cotton and wheat be affected pricewise by taking some 20 million acres out of production, but producers of meats and vegetables, dairy products, and other commodities, would also be strengthened pricewise in the open market.

I think the estimates of a $2 billion increase in farm income this year, if the soil bank takes effect early in the season, are not very far out of line. Nobody can guarantee that, but I think that is as good a guess as it is possible to make, because we hope that it will redivert the extra land now used for other commodities whose prices are depressed as a result of planting and grazing on acres

diverted from the basic crops. Thus, the prices of those commodities will be strengthened on the market.

Mr. ELLENDER. At least $1 billion of the amount the Senator has mentioned would come out of the Treasury and be paid to the farmers; those payments would be made in lieu of the value of crops the farmer himself could produce on the acres if he had planted them.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct to a certain extent.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is exactly correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I say that if the farmer got 20 percent more in net income for not planting his crops than he would receive if he did plant them, that would be a substantial increase, but it would not reach the figure of the increased income which would come about largely from a strengthening the market and the elimination of some of the keen competition in the market which producers are meeting as a result of production from diverted acres.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Is it not true that under the bill the conservation reserve program applies to all cultivated acres, even though a part of them may be temporarily planted to some grass?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNG. I thought that was a little at variance with what the Senator said a moment ago.

Mr. ELLENDER. The point is that the first part of the soil bank program—the acreage reserve—is to be used exclusively to reduce the planting of basic crops which are now in surplus. The idea is to reduce those surpluses. That is the real purpose of the acreage reserve program. As a matter of fact, that is why the program is to be carried forward on a year-to-year basis. This year we may have farmers divert, say, 12 million acres of wheat, 3 million acres of cotton, 4 or 5 million acres of corn land into the acreage reserve. Perhaps we might have a bad crop year. If so, we could cancel out the acreage reserve program for next year, because supply and demand would more nearly approximate a fair balance.

Mr. YOUNG. We have gone a long way toward equalizing or bringing into line production and use of wheat. For instance, this year the crop amounted to a little over 900 million bushels, and the domestic use plus exports amounted to a little over 900 million bushels.

Mr. ELLENDER. That result came about under the wheat agreement.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Before the Senator from Louisiana was interrupted, he was saying that the land withdrawn would be land which would ordinarily be cultivated, that it would not be land which would lie idle, anyway.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Who would determine whether the land withdrawn was or was not land which would have been cultivated?

Mr. ELLENDER. I meant to say land that was in production. I meant cultivated acreage. In the bill we sought to define cultivated acres to mean acres whereon a crop is grown. Cultivation need not take place every year. As the Senator knows, tame hay or alfalfa can be grown without much cultivation. In my State alfalfa is planted only every 3 years, but the land is cultivated, it is disked, and then the alfalfa seed is drilled, and there are 2 or 3 crops of alfalfa in a year. Land of that kind would be considered cultivated acreage and could be placed in the conservation reserve acreage.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let us take another crop besides a 3-year crop like alfalfa and certain grasses. A farmer usually rotates his crops. He will plant one field in corn 1 year and maybe next year he will plant it in wheat or grass, and then in a year or 2 he will go back to corn. Would such acreage as would temporarily lie idle in any given year, which is cultivated in most part from 1 year to another, be eligible for retirement under the program, so the farmer would receive benefits for the retirement of that particular acreage?

Mr. ELLENDER. The farmer will be eligible if that is a regular practice in which he engages.

If the Senator will look at page 12 of the bill, section 207 reads in part:

> To establish and maintain for the contract period protective vegetative cover (including but not limited to grass and trees), water storage facilities, or other soil, water, wildlife, or forest conserving uses on a specifically designated acreage land on the farm regularly used in the production of crops. * * *

Mr. BARKLEY. "Regularly used" would not be interpreted to mean a farmer had to do it every year; would it?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. It would not, however, mean new land which the farmer had permitted to lie idle for years.

Mr. BARKLEY. And which perhaps he had no intention to cultivate at any time soon. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Such land would not be eligible for withdrawal benefits, would it?

Mr. ELLENDER. It would not.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. For the benefit of the Senator from Kentucky, I should like to call his attention to the fact that the Senator from Louisiana stopped reading before he reached the end of the sentence, which reads:

> acreage of land on the farm regularly used in the production of crops (including crops, such as tame hay, alfalfa, and clovers, which do not require annual tillage).

That would permit the farms in Kentucky, Ohio, Vermont, and other States to participate in the conservation program.

Mr. ELLENDER. I say to my friend from Vermont that I did not read the sentence through because I had previously explained that portion of it to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. AIKEN. Tame hay is included, but not land over the fence.

Mr. BARKLEY. It does not include land in wild hay or other wild grasses.

Mr. ELLENDER. There are provisions in the bill pertaining to that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Reforestation requires a so much longer period of time than the 3-year grasses that a longer period of time would be necessary.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is a provision pertaining to that subject.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to raise this point because I did not have an opportunity to hear all the Senator's presentation. He may have covered it in his statement, but when we use the term "soil bank," or bank, or putting something into a bank, we ordinarily think of putting something in a place of security, so that it will not be lost and will be preserved. When we speak of putting land in a soil bank, what is going to be done to preserve the idle acreage? What is going to be done to insure that there will not be deterioration of the acres? If the acres deteriorate, we may lose more than we gain.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, as to the acreage-reserve program, that will be left to the farmer to decide, in connection with his allotted acres; on those allotted acres he might also receive payments from the ACP program.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. He could put cover crops on such acreage, if he wanted to. But if he did that, he would have to follow certain practices, in order to obtain payments.

The idea in the first prong of the soil-bank program is not so much to conserve land as it is to prevent the planting of a crop which already is in surplus—so as not further to aggravate the surpluses we now have.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further to me before he proceeds?

Mr. ELLENDER. First, let me say, in regard to the other prong of the soil-bank program—that is to say, the conservation reserve acres—that in that regard the contract must be for not less than 3 years, and the farmer may plant on that acreage grasses which will preserve or enrich the land, or he may plant trees, or he may use it for any other purpose which would conserve the soil. He could even build a fish pond on it, if he wished to do so. But, as I have said, that land must be comprised of cultivated acres or land which produces crops, in order to be eligible.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield on that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. As to the first prong of the program, then it will be left entirely to the landowner to decide as to what, if anything, he will do to cover the land so as to preserve it. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Does not the Senator from Louisiana think it would be wise to tie this down in some way, so as to insure that those acres will not be abandoned and permitted to deteriorate or be neglected even for 1 year? Would not it be necessary to tie it down in some way, and make that a condition of the payment? Otherwise, in the areas where there is heavy rainfall and where the land is not level, but, instead, is hilly and subject to rapid erosion unless it is cared for, will not there be a terrific loss of land as a result of erosion, and a consequent loss in the value of the land? Of course, the Senator's State of Louisiana is different from the hilly land I have in mind.

Mr. ELLENDER. In the south Louisiana area, where I reside, grass grows wild; and so far as erosion is concerned, I do not think we have any there.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; the State of Louisiana is blessed in that way. But other areas are not so blessed.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is the committee's view that the farmer will receive—by means of the payments for participating in this program—quite an inducement. In other words, the Secretary will have to give the farmer quite an inducement to persuade him to curtail his production.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. In addition, if the farmer qualifies for them, he can obtain ACP payments.

Mr. STENNIS. I agree, and many of them no doubt will.

This is not in criticism of the suggested program as a whole; but my point is that this should be tied down, by way of a condition precedent to obtaining these payments. Some provision would have to be made by the landowner, so that at the end of the year the land would not have less value and would not be in a deteriorated condition, as compared with its condition at the beginning of the year—because in part the purpose of the plan is to preserve the land.

I do not mean to press the Senator from Louisiana about this point now; but if he has a recommendation about it, he can make it to the committee staff, and perhaps they can prepare a provision to cover it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure that if the Secretary of Agriculture found it necessary in some areas, he could include that as a part of the contract, if he desired to do so.

Mr. STENNIS. I think that is a splendid suggestion, and I hope the Senator from Louisiana will include it as one of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, let me refer to page 8 of the bill:

The acreage reserve program may include such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically provided for herein, including provisions relating to control of noxious weeds on the reserve acreage, as the Secretary determines are desirable to effectuate the purposes of this act and to facilitate the practical administration of the acreage reserve program.

Mr. STENNIS. Do those provisions apply to both prongs of the program to which the Senator from Louisiana has been referring?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; this provision applies only to the acreage-reserve program. The Secretary would have the right to incorporate conditions in the agreement into which he entered with the farmer.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the Senator's suggestion. At this time I shall not ask him to yield further in regard to this matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize to my good friend, the Senator from Mississippi, that the acres which were taken out of the allotted acres of the farmer, could still be put by him into cover crops, and no doubt he could obtain ACP payments if he wished to do so; and no doubt any good farmer would do so.

Mr. STENNIS. I feel sure he would. But some would take this money and would neglect the land. So that would be a serious matter, and that is a point which should be covered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Louisiana stated that a farmer could put a fishpond on this land.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Could the farmer raise fish for commercial purposes on that land, without restriction?

Mr. ELLENDER. That possibility was not brought up in committee, but I do not believe the amount of money which would be paid on a per-acre basis would permit any large areas to be used in that way. The larger the area, the greater the cost of the dam would be; and the size of the dam to hold back the water probably would be regulated according to the dollars received and the acres to be covered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will permit me to make a brief statement, let me say that a number of people in my State have approached me about this matter. They have found that putting water upon the land is an excellent way to enrich the land, and that it adds great strength to the land; and, of course, once water is put on the land, fish can be put into the water. These people are contemplating doing that very thing.

If they took acres out of their cotton or rice acreage, and put those acres under water and raised fish—of course, they would buy fingerlings—would such an operation qualify under the provisions of this bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, riceland is included in the acreage reserve—that is to say, in the case of allotted acres.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the farmer turned that land into a fishpond, it would be eligible, would it?

Mr. ELLENDER. Eligibility could be extended to any soil-conservation or water-conservation program.

Let me read the requirement which appears at the bottom of page 12, under paragraph (3):

(3) Not to harvest any crop from the acreage established in protective vegetative cover, excepting timber (in accordance with sound forestry management) and wildlife or other natural products of such acreage which do not increase supplies of feed for domestic animals.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Could that farmer still raise fish in the pond thus established?

Mr. AIKEN. Let me say that it is my understanding that any kind of wild crop could be harvested—for instance, the farmer, if he wished, could raise frogs, so as to market frogs' legs, or raise berries.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But would fish qualify? I do not know whether fish are wild or not, but I know there are many fish farms in the area I have in mind.

Mr. ELLENDER. The provision includes the words "wildlife or other natural products."

That would certainly include fish in a wild state.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was hoping to make such legislative history here as to clarify that point.

The Senator from Louisiana will recall that one of the witnesses from my State suggested—and I also submitted the suggestion to the committee—that this matter be covered or included; and I wish to make sure that it is included.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not believe fish would furnish increased supplies of feed for domestic animals, other than in the case of a cat or possibly in the case of a dog. As a rule, domestic animals do not eat fish. I will say for the RECORD that I think this provision is intended to cover fish.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure it is.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it is intended to cover recreational fishing, and probably commercial fishing as well.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Fish could be raised commercially?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wished to make clear what the farmer would recover. He would receive the regular payment for taking the land out of production. That is the No. 1 payment. Can the Senator tell us whether or not he would receive anything for soil-conservation practices resulting from covering the land with water? I am told that that is a very fine way to build soil.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator has just indicated, the only payments would pertain to farm land, cultivated acres. What the farmer would receive on those acres would be the cost of putting them in grasses, if he used grass, the cost of building a levee to retain the water, if he chose to do so——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would it include that?

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, yes. In addition, he would receive an annual rental per acre for as many years as he might contract. With respect to this conservation-reserve acreage, the contract could not be for less than 3 years, and might be for as long as 10 years, at a yearly rental.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am very glad to make it clear that he would receive 80 percent of the cost of building levees on the land to hold the water.

Mr. ELLENDER. The proportion is left to the Secretary. The Secretary could make it 100 percent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thought it would be 80 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has reference to what is in the report. The language of the bill, as found on page 14, under subparagraph (1) is as follows:

(1) To bear such part of the cost (including labor) of establishing and maintaining vegetative cover or water storage facilities, or other soil, water, wildlife, or forest conserving uses, on the designated acreage as the Secretary determines to be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act, but not to exceed a maximum amount per acre or facility prescribed by the Secretary for the county or area in which the farm is situated.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that is clear. I had not noticed the phrase "or water storage facilities," although I was looking for it.

Mr. ELLENDER. The 80 percent to which the Senator refers appears on page 16 of the report, but it is not written into the bill. Under the proposed measure, the Secretary is granted broad powers, in order that he may make the contracts attractive enough to induce farmers to carry out the soil bank program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will say for the record that from what I have learned in my State, the building of water storage facilities is not only an excellent method of providing water supply, but is one of the finest ways to enrich the soil. In many respects it builds the soil more rapidly than any other practice.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I think it is important that we try to make a legislative record, so that the record will show what will be included in the conservation acreage, based upon cultivated acreage. Most good farmers have a soil conservation rotation program of planting legume crops. Let us assume that a farmer has 40 acres in alfalfa or clover. It is already planted. Would that acreage be a part of the new acreage program? Could the farmer draw payments on that acreage?

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it cultivated?

Mr. CARLSON. He planted alfalfa on it 5 years ago.

Mr. ELLENDER. If that is his practice, he is entitled to place it in the conservation reserve. For example, in Idaho and other States tame hay is planted over 4 or 5 years, and crops are obtained each year. In order to maintain those crops, the land is harrowed after each cutting. As I understand the provisions of the bill, those acres could be used in the program, because crops are produced upon what we term cultivated acres. In other words, the crops do not grow wild. The crops are planted. That is really the difference.

Mr. CARLSON. I think that is a very important statement. For example, there are areas where the land is already planted to alfalfa. It may have been planted for 5 years. It will grow 2 or 3 or 4 crops a year. What will be the basis of payments? As I understand the application of the bill to alfalfa, for example, the farmer is not permitted to harvest any of it after he has placed the acreage under the conservation reserve.

Mr. ELLENDER. The payments with respect to such acres are not on the basis of the value of the crop, but on the rental value of the land. Much will depend on what the rental value of the land is in the particular area, and how much the land produces in dollars and cents. The Secretary will have broad powers to fix the rental values. He will also have broad powers to fix the cost of putting the acreage into grasses, if that is the conservation method agreed upon by the Secretary and the farmer.

The situation with respect to trees is similar. The payment will depend upon the cost of the trees, and the labor entailed in planting them in the area where the land is located.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. It is my understanding, from talking with the Department of Agriculture officials, that they expect the annual rental will be approximately 10 percent of the value of the land. If the land is worth $50 an acre as crop land, the rental will be $5. If it is worth $100 an acre, the rental each year will be $10. If the land is worth $200 an acre in a particular county, the rental will be $20 an acre for the term of the contract. That scale may not hold exactly true in every case.

If trees were set out, payments would extend over a period up to 15 years, and might be smaller. However, the same amount of money, overall, would be paid. Contracts for planting legumes and enriching the soil would normally run for a period of from 3 to 10 years, depending upon the probable future need of the land for crop production, and other circumstances.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me say to my good friend from Kansas that a while ago I explained the factors the Secretary would have to consider. Let me read from the bill itself. I turn to page 14, under subparagraph (2), beginning with the second sentence:

The rate or rates of the annual payment to be provided for in the contracts shall be established on such basis as the Secretary determines will provide producers with a fair and reasonable annual return on the land established in protective vegetative cover or water-storage facilities, or other soil, water, wildlife, or forest-conserving uses, taking into consideration the value of the land for the production of commodities customarily grown on such kind of land in the county or area, the prevailing rates for cash rentals for similar land in the county or area, the incentive necessary to obtain contracts covering sufficient acreage for the substantial accomplishment of the purposes of the conservation-reserve program, and such other factors as he deems appropriate. Such rate or rates may be determined on an individual farm basis, a county or area basis, or such other basis as the Secretary determines will facilitate the practical administration of the program.

In other words, the door is wide open for the Secretary of Agriculture to offer such an attractive inducement that the farmer cannot help wanting to enter into a contract. The first part of the soil bank—that is, the acreage reserve—is to alleviate, and not further to aggravate, our present surpluses. No doubt that is the part of the program which will cost the most. It will probably include some of the best land in our country—land which is usually planted to the basic crops. Insofar as the conservation acres are concerned, land of less value—productive and otherwise—will be used for that purpose.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. As I said, in order to make the program work, the Secretary has the authority to make it very attractive.

I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Is there any limitation as to the amount of acreage a farmer can take out on his farm?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is left to the Secretary. Under the bill before the Senate, the Secretary will utilize the services of soil-conservation workers and experts from the land-grant colleges, Federal and State agencies. In other words, he will use the services of people engaged in agriculture throughout the country—people who are now under the Department of Agriculture or who work cooperatively with it. What will happen is that a survey will be made, let us say, in certain areas of the country. For instance, let us take prong 1 of the soil-bank proposal. There is no doubt that in a few weeks the Secretary could ascertain pretty well, merely by going around and talking to the farmers, how many acres of cotton, let us say, in the various cotton States would be put into the program. In other words, an average of how much would be put into the program could be quickly obtained.

By the same token, he could come to some determination with respect to the conservation feature, because under the pending bill the estimation must be made by February 1 of each year. The program would then be worked out as to how many acres he could put into either of the programs.

Of course, the number of acres that he would be able to put into conservation would depend on the report he got, and of course it would have to come within the limitation of the money provided by Congress.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I think that is a very important point. I have received letters from farmers who are greatly concerned with this provision. There are some people who live in cities and own farms, who are glad to let the Government take over land. That brings up two problems. The first is with respect to people who have been farming the land; they will run into difficulties. The second point is that if in a given community too much land is taken out of cultivation and made unproductive, it will affect the whole community and all the people who live there. That is something to which we must pay attention, or we will get into some difficulty.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee gave a good deal of thought to that subject. That is why we placed in the bill a provision to the effect that the program would have to be first worked out by the Secretary of Agriculture, in order to find out how many acres the farmers throughout the country would be willing to contract to place in the soil bank. From the data to be gathered in that way the Secretary can tell pretty well how

much money will be required. He can also tell, should the acreage be far in excess of what he desired, whether he will have enough money to spend. The amount of money he has available will depend on how much Congress gives him.

The Secretary would not have to go personally into any particular area. He would have very wide authority to take out of production that number of acres that would best meet the problem.

For instance, let us take cotton. It might be that in some parishes in my State the Secretary would not be able to get more than 2 or 3 or 4 farmers interested. Perhaps in other parishes he might get half the farmers interested. He would not have to require each county to reduce its acreage by a certain amount. He could theoretically, at least get the entire amount of land in one county. From the survey which will be made he can judge where contracts should be entered into so as to carry out the program to the best advantage. I say that because the main purpose of the acreage reserve is to get a great many acres out of cultivation, so as not further to aggravate our existing surpluses.

Insofar as the conservation reserve is concerned, the problem will be much easier to handle because in the acreage reserve the Secretary will have to be guided primarily by how much of a reduction in production he desires. Under the conservation reserve, about the only limitation will be the amount of money available for payments.

We have also included in the bill a provision to protect tenants and sharecroppers. It reads as follows:

> In the administration of the conservation reserve program, the Secretary shall provide adequate safeguards to protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers, including such provision as may be necessary to prevent them from being forced off the farm.

Throughout the bill we have included provisions which, we believe, will adequately take care of tenants and sharecroppers.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished chairman has been very generous with his time in answering questions. Yesterday he announced he would answer questions propounded by any Senator if he could do so.

Mr. ELLENDER. If I could; yes.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from North Dakota receives many letters, and he would like to ask a favor of the distinguished chairman of the committee. I hope the Senator will be able to answer the question I am about to ask him, so that I can use his answer in replying to my correspondents.

Let us take, for example, a farmer in Minnesota or in North Dakota or in Montana. He writes, "I have 320 acres of land. It is worth $100 an acre." He wants to take full advantage of the plan in the bill, and he wants me to figure out for him in dollars and cents just what he will get. Can the Senator do that for me?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I certainly cannot do that. It would depend, first, on the total number of acres which the program would cover in a given year. Let us assume that the Secretary decides that the $350 million provided in the conservation reserve program is sufficient to pay benefits on 25 million acres, in round figures. Let us say that, after he makes his survey, he finds that farmers all over the country are desirous of putting 50 million acres of land into this phase of the program.

With that information before him, the Secretary will have to consider where the requests come from and try to give each vicinity and each county and farm in a State or in each area a just and realistic share of the acreage to be put into the program.

Therefore I could not say to a farmer in Minnesota, for example, who has 320 acres in his farm, or a farmer in Louisiana, or one in North Dakota, that he would get so much under the program.

As a matter of fact, until the plan is prepared and drafted and everyone who applies is considered, the Secretary himself cannot do so. He must first see how far the money made available will go and fit it in with the demands and requests of the farmers.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Suppose a farmer had a 320-acre farm and took out 40 acres. How much would he get for the 40 acres?

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us assume that the acres which the Senator has mentioned are allotted to wheat.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator will refer to page 17 of the report he will find an example for North Dakota, by the way, Ward County, N. Dak.

The county normal yield is 13.2 bushels per acre. The size of the farm is 320 acres. The acreage allotment is 120 acres. The acreage put into reserve is 30 acres.

Mr. LANGER. Let us make my example 30 acres, then.

Mr. ELLENDER. The county loan rate per bushel is $1.80.

The payment rate per acre would be $13.50. Therefore, the entire payment on the 30 acres would amount to $405.

If the Senator will look through the report he will note that several tentative estimates have been made. I wish to make it plain that they are only tentative. It may be that the Secretary will have to pay a little more than he suggests in these preliminary figures in order to get the job done.

Mr. LANGER. That is the first part.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; that is the acreage reserve.

Mr. LANGER. What is the second part?

Mr. ELLENDER. The second is the conservation reserve—acres on which the farmer agrees to plant grasses, and to otherwise engage in soil-conservation practices.

Mr. LANGER. Thirty more acres?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Will the Senator tell me the average rental that would apply?

Mr. LANGER. It is $30. The 30 acres cannot be used for stock or anything else; is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. When the farmer signs his contract for the conservation practice which is agreed to by the farmer and the Secretary, if he agrees to plant grasses, the Secretary will agree to pay all or the greater part of the cost of planting grasses in that area, or planting trees, if they are more adaptable.

In addition to the acres planted to grass or trees, the Secretary will agree to pay the farmer during the length of the contract—and it must be for not less than 3 years—$10 or $15 an acre, if that happens to be a fair rate in the area under the formula from which I read a moment ago.

Mr. LANGER. I have received letters from the Stockmen's Association saying that they do not want the land used for anything.

Mr. ELLENDER. If it is used, the farmer violates his contract and loses not only his payment, but will be in debt to the Government for the payments already made.

Mr. LANGER. So the farmer would be almost compelled to fence the land, would he not? If it is not going to be used for anything, in order to prevent cattle or sheep from wandering onto it, it would have to be fenced.

Mr. ELLENDER. The farmer would have to keep out stock in some way.

Mr. LANGER. I think that answers my question.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the bill which we are now considering, it is my judgment that the Secretary could even go so far as to help the farmer to pay a part of the cost of the fence. In other words, the Secretary is given, I would say, almost carte blanche authority to make the program effective. He must make inducements great enough to take in as much of the acreage as may be possible.

Mr. LANGER. Even going to the extent of helping to build a part of the fence?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. There is nothing in the bill to prevent it.

Mr. LANGER. If the Department could build a part of the fence, it could build all of it.

Mr. ELLENDER. That might be used as one of the incentives.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The questions propounded by the Senator from North Dakota are exceedingly helpful, because they pinpoint typical situations. I did a little figuring while the Senator from North Dakota was discussing with the Senator from Louisiana the situation of one 30-acre piece of land, and I find that under the present loan rate available in the particular county mentioned, the total gross income from that farm would have been $729. There would be 405 bushels, the average yield being 13.2 bushels per acre. The amount of money available for payment under the acreage reserve benefits would be $405, but that

would be the net amount. The gross take under the loan rate would be $729. The net would be $405.

So, what we tried to do in the bill—and the chairman, more than anyone else, continued to insist upon it—was to give to the Secretary as much authority and as much opportunity as might be possible under the terms of the bill to pay as large benefits as he could and to do everything possible to make the program work.

Mr. ELLENDER. To make it attractive.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. If we are going to have the voluntary principle in the bill, the attitude of the majority of the committee, and, in this instance, I believe, all the members of the committee, was to make the program so attractive that it would be economically desirable for the farmer to take out of his allotted acres a certain number of acres for purposes of extra crop reduction.

Mr. LANGER. Which amount should the farmer take—$729 or $405?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think I would take $405, because there would be no cost of seeding, no cost of harvesting, or other items involved. It would be $405 for doing one thing, namely, being willing to take out of production 30 acres of land with no risk in terms of weather, in terms of hail, or in terms of any kind of insect infestation. There would be no cost for fertilizer, for seed, or for threshing. In other words, it would seem to me to be a pretty good net. I think if Mr. Farmer figures $729 as his gross, if he could make $405 net, he would be doing fairly well.

It appears to me that we should recognize that the formula we are talking about is something which the Department has said it is their intention to follow. It is not written, per se, in the bill, but the chairman, in order to fulfill the intention and make the intention as binding as might be possible, has placed it in the legislative history in the report of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, since we are discussing that feature of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the report dealing with the tentative suggestions made by the Secretary of Agriculture be printed in the RECORD at this point in connection with the debate.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 1484) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TENTATIVE PROPOSALS FOR ADMINISTRATION OF THE SOIL BANK ACT

ACREAGE RESERVE

The acreage reserve plan is designed to induce farmers to leave unplanted a portion of their allotment acreages for corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and certain types of tobacco. Tentative plans are as follows: The county ASC committees would set a farm yield rating for each farm for each of these allotment crops based on the average or normal yield for the last 5 years except for wheat for which the last 10 years would be used. The local ASC committee would advise each farmer of the dollar payment per acre he might receive for underplanting one or several of his allotments. The rate of payment would be based on a percentage of the loan rate times the approximate normal yield. The farmer would have to designate lands to be placed in the acreage reserve of equal quality to those used for the crop and agree that the acres so designated would not be harvested or grazed.

In the case of small farms, under the tentative plans, the farmer would be permitted to participate in the acreage reserve to the full amount of his acreage allotment up to 30 acres for grain and 10 acres for cotton. For large farms, the maximum would be 50 percent of the allotment. There would also be a minimum acreage which could be placed in either the conservation reserve or the acreage reserve. Provisions would be included in the program requiring protection of the rights of tenants and sharecroppers.

CONSERVATION RESERVE

The conservation reserve plan is designed to take lands out of the production of crops for periods of 3 to 15 years and place such lands in conservation uses such as grass, trees, and other approved conservation practices. The establishment of vegetative cover, water storage facilities, improving and expanding forest cover and other conservation measures which will be obtained under the conservation reserve program, will contribute to flood prevention by retarding runoff of rainwater, prevention of soil erosion, and by providing storage of water. Water storage will be accomplished both by increased soil storage capacity and by water storage structures. These same measures, coupled with the less intensive use provided for, will conserve and rebuild soil fertility and retard soil depletion.

It is tentatively planned that in each county, the ASC committee would offer to enter into contracts specifying (1) the acreage to be placed in the program; (2) the payments to be made; and (3) the use to be made of the acres. Nationally, the annual payment on such lands would probably average about $10 per acre. Rates within a county would vary with the quality of the land. Payment rates would be determined by areas. In addition, it is tentatively planned that the contract would provide that the Government pay up to 80 percent of the cost of applying the agreed-upon conservation practices on such lands. So far as practicable, the conservation practices which would qualify for cost-sharing payments would be the same and at the same rates as under the ACP program.

To provide further detail there follows background material developed in the Department to illustrate how the proposed soil bank program would work, what administrative regulations might have to be made, suggested rates of payment for participation, and other pertinent information. This material (amended to include tobacco) was presented to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, February 3, and has been made public by it. The Department emphasizes that the information included in the attached statement is necessarily very tentative and should be treated accordingly. Extensive checking with farmers in the field will be needed. Final arrangements for carrying out the soil bank will of course, depend upon the final form of legislation involved. The Department of Agriculture will welcome continued suggestions and recommendations from farmers.

PLANS FOR IMPLEMENTING THE SOIL BANK (TENTATIVE)

These are the types of administrative regulations which might be needed assuming the legislative proposals which have been made.

1. ACREAGE RESERVE—OBJECTIVE: REDUCE PRODUCTION OF ALLOTMENT CROPS

A. Establishment of yields to serve as a basis of payment:

1. Follow this procedure:

(a) Use check yields during 1951–55 as a base.

(b) Break the national yield figure down by States and counties.

(c) County committeemen determine normal yields for community (these weight out to county normal yields).

(d) Community committeemen establish a normal yield for each farm in the community which grows the allotment crop concerned. Each such farm will be placed in one of 5 or 7 yield categories, ranging above and below the community average. Adjustment procedures will be used to line yields with community average. (Up to this point everything can be done in the county office and will move rapidly.)

(e) Individual farmers will be invited to offer land for the acreage reserve which is equal in productivity to land which has been used for the given crop on their farms. Thus they can be quoted a dollar figure per acre for typical land for the allotment crop on the farm. With the possible exception of the first year, farmers should indicate their intention to participate prior to planting time. Farmers may sign up for land better than average for the farm in which case they will receive payments based on a higher yield. If below average, a lower per acre payment will be made.

B. Preliminary payment rates, minimum and maximum participation and cost:

1. Payment rates, the extent to which these rates need to be varied according to quality, location, and other factors is still under study (these figures are preliminary and are being checked in the field):

(a) Cotton, 50 percent of the average support price.

(b) Wheat, 50 percent of the support price (legislation may not be forthcoming in time to make a program this year on winter wheat practical).

(c) Corn, 50 percent of the support price. Discussions continue on the serious difficulties of including corn in this program.

(d) Rice, 50 percent of the support price.

2. Maximum and minimum participation (these should be administrative matters, not specified in the law; also there should be discretion to take care of farmers who for reasons of sickness or disability may not wish to operate their farms):

(a) Maximum: Grain, 30 acres or 50 percent of allotment, whichever is larger; cotton, 10 acres or 50 percent of allotment, whichever is larger.

(b) Minimum: Grain, 10 acres or allotment, whichever is smaller; cotton, 2 acres or allotment, whichever is smaller.

3. Participation and cost, national basis (highly tentative):

	Acres which might come in millions	National average yield per acre	Rate of payment based on normal yield	Approximate cost per acre	Total cost (in millions)
Cotton	3–5	303 pounds	50 percent of loan level	$50	$150–$250
Wheat	[1] 12–15	15.8 bushels	do	17	200–250
Corn	4–6	44.2 bushels [2]	do	38	150–220
Rice	.3	2,500 pounds	do	60	18–20
Tobacco	.1	1,250 pounds	do	100	10
Total	19.4–26.4				528–750

[1] Based on both winter and spring crop.
[2] Commercial corn area yield.

NOTE.—These are based on 90-percent supports and optional parity.

C. Agreement—landlord-tenant relationship:

1. Compensation is to be divided among interested landlords and tenants on the farms in the same proportion as they would have shared in the crop in the absence of a reserve acreage program, unless division on another basis is agreed upon by landlords and tenants and their agreement is approved by the county committee in accordance with standards prescribed by the State committee.

II. CONSERVATION RESERVE—OBJECTIVE: TAKE OUT THE LESS PRODUCTIVE CROPLAND

A. Conservation reserve rental rates:

1. Establishment costs, $19 per acre, national average:

(a) Pay 80 percent of costs, not to exceed a maximum of $25 per acre for either forage or trees.

(b) Keep incentives alined with ACP so as not to upset the ACP program.

2. Rental rates:

(a) $10 per acre, average for the United States.

(b) State rental rates established on basis of land values, productivity, and other factors.

(c) County rental rates would vary on the basis of such factors as county yields and value of farmland. County rates would be adjusted so that the weighted average did not exceed the State rate. No county rate would exceed $20 per acre.

(d) Farm rental rates would be established on the basis of specified acreage placed in conservation reserve. Rates would be based on relative productivity of specified acreage.

(e) Rental rates would need to be adjusted if grazing is permitted within the contract period.

B. Practices:

1. Eligible land should be land which was used for the production of row crops or small grain during at least 1 of the last 3 years.

2. Forage (enough seed to plant about 14 million acres in 1956):

(a) Prefer perennials.

(b) Annuals satisfactory when seeded with perennials.

(c) Annuals satisfactory alone when no perennial seed available and appropriate practices can be followed. Due to seed limitations, some latitude may be needed regarding soil protective practices during the first year or two.

3. Trees (enough stock to plant about half a million acres in 1956):

(a) Adapted forest trees.

(b) Shrubs when interplanted for shelterbelt purposes.

4. Water storage:

(a) Cost of water retention dams shared.

III. OPERATING PROCEDURE

A. We are now checking our tentative inducements and procedures in the field.

B. Develop data as soon as legislative action permits.

C. Hold educational meetings, perhaps on a county basis.

D. Arrange for signup dates and meetings.

E. Minimize the number of farm visits by handling as many things at one time as can conveniently be done.

F. There are no funds for administrative work until and unless the Congress acts.

G. If legislative action is not taken prior to April 15 it will be extremely difficult to get a program this year, except for wheat seeded in the fall of 1956.

IV. THE CERTIFICATES

A. Draw them in terms of dollars.

B. Redemption, if the farmer elects it, to be accomplished by purchase of the relevant commodity at specified rates.

C. Interest rate probably 3½ percent.

D. Maturity date probably at the time the loan normally would mature. Loans for the various commodities might all be matured at the same date.

Cotton

Bolivar County, Miss.:	
County normal yield (pounds per acre)	389
Size of farm (acres)	240
Acreage allotment (acres)	70
Acres put into reserve (acres)	15
Farm normal yield (pounds per acre)	450
Payment rate per acre	$67.50
Payment	$1,012.50
Orangeburg County, S. C.:	
County normal yield (pounds per acre)	323
Size of farm (acres)	60
Acreage allotment (acres)	15
Acres put into reserve (acres)	5
Farm normal yield (pounds per acre)	300
Payment rate per acre	$45
Acreage reserve payment	$225
Conservation reserve acreage (acres)	20
Cost of establishing grass	$500
Payment at 80 percent of cost	$400
Annual payment	$140
Conservation reserve payment, 1st year	$540
Soil-bank payment, 1st year	$765

Wheat

Ward County, N. Dak.:	
County normal yield (bushels per acre)	13.2
Size of farm (acres)	320
Acreage allotment (acres)	120
Acreage put into reserve (acres)	30
County loan rate (approximately) (per bushel)	$1.80
Farm normal yield (bushels per acre)	15
Payment rate per acre	$13.50
Payment	$405
Cheyenne County, Kans.:	
County normal yield (bushels per acre)	20.7
Size of farm (acres)	240
Acreage allotment (acres)	90
Acreage put into reserve (acres)	15
County loan rate (approximately) (per bushel)	$1.80
Farm normal yield (bushels per acre)	19
Payment rate per acre	$17.10
Payment	$256.50

NOTE.—If 40 acres were put in the reserve, payment would be $684.

Corn

Blue Earth County, Minn:	
County normal yield (bushel per acre)	56.8
Size of farm (acres)	160
Acreage allotment (acres)	50
Acreage put into reserve (acres)	10
County loan rate (approximately (per bushel)	$1.30
Form normal yield (bushels per acre)	70
Payment rate per acre	$45.50
Payment	$455.00
Marshall County, Iowa:	
County normal yield (bushels per acre)	58.4
Size of farm (acres)	320
Acreage allotment (acres)	140
Acreage put into reserve (acres)	40
County loan rate (approximately) (per bushel)	$1.32
Farm normal yield (bushels per acre)	58.4
Payment rate per acre	$38.54
Payment	$1,541.60

NOTE.—If he elects to put 25 acres into the reserve his payment would be $1,137.50.

Rice

Arcadia Parish, La.:	
Parish normal yield (pounds per acre)	2,177
Size of farm (acres)	400
Acreage allotment (acres)	100
Acreage put into reserve (acres)	20
Parish loan rate (per hundredweight)	$4.16
Farm normal yield (pounds per acre)	2,400
Payment rate per acre	$49.92
Payment	$998.40
Plus	
Cotton-acreage allotment (acres)	40
Acreage put into reserve (acres)	10
Farm normal yield (pounds)	400
Cotton payment	$600
Total payment	$1,558.40
Colusa County, Calif.:	
County normal yield (pounds per acre)	3,084
Size of farm (acres)	280
Acreage allotment (acres)	90
Acreage put into reserve (acres)	10
County loan rate (per hundredweight	$3.50
Farm normal yield (pounds per acre)	3,000
Payment rate per acre	$52.50
Payment	$525.00

Conservation reserve

1. Farm in western Kansas:	
960 acres.	
100 acres put into conservation reserve.	
Total cost of establishing grass cover at $7 per acre	$700
Payment to farmer at 80 percent of the cost	560
Yearly rental, based on productivity of the specific acres at $5 per acre	500
Payment to farmer the 1st year, $560 plus $500	1,060
Payment in subsequent years for duration of the contract	500
2. Farm in the Piedmont:	
120-acre farm.	
Takes out 60 acres, puts 30 in grass, 30 in trees.	
Total cost of establishing 30 acres of grass at $30	$900
Total cost of establishing 30 acres of trees at $12	360
Payment to farmer equal to 80 percent of costs	1,008
Annual payment, based on productivity of the reserve acres, at $8 per acre	480
Payment 1st year, $1,008, plus $480	1,488
Payment in subsequent years for duration of the contract	480
3. Farm in New England:	
150-acre farm.	
Puts 30 acres into conservation reserve.	
Total cost of establishing grass cover at $35 per acre	$1,050
Payment to farmer at 80 percent of the costs but not to exceed $25 per acre	750
Rental at $10 per acre	300
Total payment, 1st year, $750 plus $300	1,050
Payment in following years for duration of the contract	300
4. Farm in the Corn Belt:	
320-acre farm.	
Puts 20 acre hill field into conservation reserve.	
Total cost of establishing grass cover at $25 per acre	$500
Payment to farmer at 80 percent of the cost	400
Rental at $15 per acre	300
Total payment, 1st year, $300 plus $300	700
Payment in following years for duration of the contract	300

Corn and wheat

Montgomery County, Ill.:	
Size of farm (acres)	320
County corn yield (bushels)	56.1
Corn acreage allotment (acres)	100
Farm normal yield (bushels per acre)	60
Acreage put into reserve (acres)	50
County loan rate (approximate)	$1.42
Payment rate per acre	$42.60
Payment	$2,130
County wheat yield (bushels)	24.4
Wheat acreage allotment (acres)	40
Farm normal yield (bushels per acre)	25
Acreage put into reserve (acres)	20
County loan rate (approximate)	$1.90
Payment rate per acre	$24.75
Payment	$495
Total acreage reserve payment	$2,625

For reference purposes there follows a statement showing data on planted acreages, production and CCC loan and inventory stocks of the commodities eligible under the acreage reserve program.

United States Department of Agriculture, Commodity Stabilization Service—Acreage, production, CCC stocks, and CCC loan operations, principal crops

All cotton:	
Acreage in cultivation July 1, 1955 (acres)	17,489,000
Production 1955 (bales)	14,476,000
CCC-owned stocks Feb. 8, 1956 (bales)	7,115,816
Under CCC loan Feb. 3, 1956 (bales)	6,602,887
Corn:	
Acreage planted 1955 (acres)	81,577,000
Production 1955 (bushels)	3,184,836,000
CCC-owned stocks Jan. 18, 1956 (bushels)	745,377,000
Under CCC loan Jan. 15, 1956 (bushels)	200,300,000
Wheat:	
Acreage planted 1955 (acres)	58,284,000
Production 1955 (bushels)	938,159,000
CCC-owned stocks Jan. 18, 1956 (bushels)	857,471,000
Under CCC loan Jan. 15, 1956 (bushels)	256,480,000
Rice (rough):	
Acreage planted 1955 (acres)	1,842,000
Production 1955 (hundredweight)	53,420,000
CCC-owned stocks Jan. 18, 1956 (hundredweight)	18,532,000
Under CCC loan Jan. 15, 1956 (hundredweight)	14,925,000
Tobacco: [1]	
Cigar binder, type 51—	
Acreage harvested 1955 (acres)	7,900
Production (pounds)	12,401,000
CCC-owned stocks Dec. 31, 1955	None
Under CCC loan through associations, types 51 and 52, Dec. 31, 1955 (pounds)	7,660,000
Cigar binder, type 52—	
Acreage harvested (acres)	5,700
Production 1955 (pounds)	10,117,000
CCC-owned stocks Dec. 31, 1955	None
Under CCC loan Dec. 31, 1955. (Included with 51 above.)	
Cigar binder, type 54—	
Acres harvested 1955 (acres)	4,700
Production 1955 (pounds)	6,815,000
CCC-owned stocks (pounds)	95,000

United States Department of Agriculture, Commodity Stabilization Service—Acreage, production, CCC stocks, and CCC loan operations, principal crops—Continued

Tobacco—Continued	
Under CCC loan through associations, types 54 and 55, Dec. 31, 1955 (pounds)	5,541,000
Cigar binder, type 55—	
Acres harvested 1955 (acres)	9,700
Production 1955 (pounds)	12,778,000
CCC-owned stocks	None
Under CCC loan. (included with 54 above.)	
Burley—	
Acres harvested 1955 (acres)	322,300
Production 1955 (pounds)	509,835,000
CCC stocks	None
Under CCC loans Dec. 31, 1955, of which 72,800,000 lbs. is 1955 crop (pounds)	476,100,000
Flue cured—	
Acres harvested 1955 (acres)	991,700
Production 1955 (pounds)	1,504,075,000
CCC-owned stocks	None
Under CCC loan Dec. 31, 1955, including practically all of 1955 that will be covered (pounds)	597,500,000

[1] All tobacco data except acreage are on farm-sales-weight basis.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that these are only tentative suggestions advanced by the Secretary. In our discussion of the matter with his assistants, it was made plain to us that if the suggestions were not sufficient to do the job, the inducements could be made more attractive, as my good friend from Minnesota has said. That is why the committee gave the Secretary the power to proceed to prepare a program which would be so attractive that the farmers would accept it.

When we discussed the matter at first, I was one who thought that the best way to accomplish the first phase of the program—namely, the reduction in planting of allotted acres—would be to pay a fair rate and make the reduction compulsory.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. But when the Secretary appeared before the committee and suggested that he could make a voluntary plant so attractive that compulsion would not be necessary, all of us agreed to give the Secretary the power and to let him proceed to do it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the record ought to be made perfectly clear that the intent of the committee, as I interpret it, at least, was to say, "Mr. Secretary, you have asked for a voluntary program. We are providing in the bill an authorization of funds which is very generous. You have the authority; it is unrestricted."

I do not think there is any restrictive language in the bill in terms of payments, except as to minimums, and, as I recall, a maximum of $100 an acre on tobacco. Is not that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But we have said to the Secretary, in effect, "If you want to get acreage reduction in an acreage reserve program on a voluntary basis, you will have to make it so attractive that any farmer figuring what he can produce on the land on the basis of the average production will find it more desirable to go into the program than to stay out of it." That means the Secretary will have to act on the generous side, because every farmer will feel that he will get a bumper crop this year on the 30 acres.

Mr. LANGER. That is what I was coming to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thought I saw the gleam in the Senator's eye.

Mr. LANGER. The greatest gambler in the world is the farmer. In that respect he has everybody in Wall Street beat. The farmer will plant his 30 acres. He will say, "This year I am going to get 30 bushels to the acre." Does the Senator from Louisiana think the farmer will voluntarily go into the program?

Mr. ELLENDER. My hope is that the farmer will cooperate. He must realize that so long as heavy surpluses dangle over the market, he can expect to receive depressed prices. I am quite certain the farmers are realists; and if the amount to be paid to them is made attractive, as is contemplated, I really believe they will cooperate to the fullest extent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It appears to me that if the farmer in his wisdom and judgment, and, as the Senator from North Dakota says, in accordance with his well known and well established gambling spirit, in terms of the productivity of his soil, decides not to go into the program, he still will have allotted acres.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He will still receive price support only on his commodities produced on allotted acres. The worst that could happen would be that the Department of Agriculture estimates, based on expert opinion with regard to allotted acres, would be fulfilled. The number of acres allotted is according to the best judgment of the Department of Agriculture as to the needs of production for a particular year in a particular commodity.

The only reason why the acreage reserve idea was injected into the program was, as I gathered, so that the Department could empty its warehouses by cutting down on the production of allotted acres below what the domestic expert opinion would figure for a particular year.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think we have made that very plain during the course of the debate this afternoon.

Mr. LANGER. So instead of getting cash, the farmer will receive a commodity.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. He can take the commodity instead of cash.

Mr. LANGER. If he gets a commodity, will it mean that he can get wheat? Is that 10 percent more than cash?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. In order to encourage the farmer to use some of the surpluses, he can buy the commodities and get a 10-percent increase in the value of the certificate.

Mr. LANGER. What can the farmer do with the wheat if he gets it from surplus?

Mr. ELLENDER. He can feed it, or use it in any other way he pleases.

Mr. LANGER. Can he sell it on the open market.

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, yes.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Who will handle the program when it goes into effect? If the bill shall be passed, who will administer the program?

Mr. ELLENDER. It will be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, with the assistance of all the State committeemen and those handling the technical phases of the soil conservation program, including the land-grant colleges. I read section 218 of the bill:

In administering this act in the continental United States, the Secretary shall utilize the services of community, county, and State committees established under section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

Section 219 provides:

SEC. 219. With respect to conservation aspects of any program under this act, the Secretary shall consult with the soil-conservation districts, State foresters, land-grant colleges, and other appropriate agencies of State governments in the formulation of program provisions at the State and county levels. The technical resources of the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service, the land-grant colleges, the State foresters, and other appropriate technical services shall be utilized, so far as practicable, to assure coordination of conservation activities and a solid technical foundation for the program.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That means, does it not, that in the States, the State ASC committees will have the primary authority within the States to execute the law in accordance with the specifications issued by the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. ELLENDER. They will assist in formulating and administering the program.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator from Louisiana believe that the program should be administered at the grassroots; that is, that the county committees should have something to say? Or should the program be operated by the State committees?

Mr. ELLENDER. The program will be operated, so far as possible, from the grassroots. Those in the field certainly will insist not only in administering the program, but in formulating the plans.

The State foresters will be consulted. As the Senator knows, the reason is that for many years there has been a cooperative program between the States and the Federal Government in effect with reference to forestry. I think title VI of the bill has a special provision for afforestation and reforestation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not want to labor the point, but does the Senator feel that the county committees in the various States are important in the execution of the program?

Mr. ELLENDER. They are very important.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator feel that the office managers of the various county committees should report to the county committees, or that the county committees should report to the office managers?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is something I would prefer not discussing now. I am familiar with what the Senator has in mind, but I would not care to engage in a debate on it now. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is, I think, looking into that matter so far as it pertains to Missouri. Let us hope the problem can be settled in some way.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question on this matter, which I consider to be important?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I suggest that the Department of Agriculture has now issued a directive to the effect that the office manager can approve the payroll of himself and those who work for him without any reference to the county committee. Does not that really mean that the office manager is now working independently of the county committee, and under the direction of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. ELLENDER. If I am to judge by the case cited by the Senator from Missouri, I do not think there is any doubt about it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I want to support the Senator in obtaining the passage of the bill to the best of my ability and in every way I can, but I am wondering if there are adequate safeguards in the bill as to its execution. After all, a bill in itself means literally almost nothing. It is whether or not the bill will be administered properly in accordance with the wishes of Congress that really counts.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Secretary is given ample opportunity to administer the bill along the lines which we are now speaking. It is my sincere hope that it will be administered in that manner. As I said yesterday, and again this afternoon, it is my hope that whoever will administer the bill after it has been passed will be sympathetic with what Congress is trying to do. If he is not, the President ought to get somebody who is.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator. He has covered the point.

Will the Senator yield so that I may make inquiry regarding another aspect of the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The president of the National Farm Organization, a new farm organization, told us, in a meeting of the Missouri delegation, that in some parts of the country he represented 25 percent of the farmers would go bankrupt in the next 60 or 90 days, because the banks had stated they could not continue to accept obsolete farm equipment as collateral for loans, and the farmers do not have the money with which to pay off the loans. Therefore, the farm people were anxious that the bill give them some immediate relief.

Will the Senator from Louisiana tell us whether he thinks the pending bill will at least in part answer that request?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I indicated yesterday and again today, the only immediate income relief provided in the bill will be through adoption of the 90 percent of parity support provision. The rest of the bill relates to long-term benefits. It is entirely possible that next year may bring better prices for grain, and, in fact, even cattle, poultry, and dairy products. This may occur because grains will cost more. There will probably be a shorter supply of grains. That possibility will help stabilize the livestock industry.

It is my judgment that if as much as 25 million acres are put into the conservation reserve, there will be less oats, barley, and grain grown. Those crops are now in surplus because of diversion of other acres to those crops.

On the other hand, under the acreage reserve program, whereby acres which are allotted to basic crops are to be taken out of production, if a sufficient number of those acres can be taken out of production, there will be a tendency not to aggravate further our surpluses. If that occurs, it is bound to increase the prices of the commodities next year, because there will be less production.

That, however, as I said, would come about on a long time basis. It might take 2 years, or perhaps 3 years, to get rid of the surpluses which are now glutting our market and which are so destructive to the price structure.

There is another provision in the bill which could give immediate assistance, if properly utilized. As the Senator knows, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to use section 32 funds to purchase perishable commodities and to stabilize markets. Those funds are equal to 30 percent of customs duties. The Secretary had about $462 million available from the source as of July 1, 1955. He could spend no more than 25 percent of that amount for any 1 commodity.

Mr. SYMINGTON. How much did the Secretary have on hand last year at this time?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not recall. It was a little over $400 million. For this fiscal year he had about $460 million. That sum will be supplemented by $250 million in this proposal.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator think, based on the record and past history, the Secretary of Agriculture is prone to utilize funds of that character in order to help the farmer?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I said, it is my hope that he will do so. If the Secretary will not, it is my hope he will be made to do it, or that the President will get somebody who will.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If Congress does not approve of the 90 percent of parity support provision of the bill, and the other component parts of the bill are

passed, how long does the Senator think a farmer who is in bad condition, so far as his bank is concerned, will have to wait before he will receive any tangible relief under the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. It all depends on what shape he is in. If he is in bad shape, he might not be able to wait until next year. Next year he may be a little better off, because the prices of commodities which he produces may go up. By taking acres out of production, a little scarcity will be created. As I said, however, since the program is on a voluntary basis, nobody knows how many farmers will participate in it. It is my hope that, with the power the Secretary of Agriculture has, he will make it so attractive that the goal set by the committee will be reached. If that goal is reached, it is my judgment that some farmers may benefit in the latter part of 1956, but only farmers who have something to plant and sell and cultivate will benefit.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In other words, the primary possibility of assistance for the farmer this year lies in the 90 percent of parity provision of the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. In high price supports; that is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If these supports are not provided, the farmer will probably have to wait until next year to receive appreciable benefits under the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, if he can get enough credit.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If he cannot get any credit, he will go broke. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] desires to follow me in my remarks. I have been kept very busy answering questions; I requested that Senators propound questions as my address proceeded, and I am not complaining.

(At this point Mr. ELLENDER yielded, first to Mr. WILLIAMS, who addressed the Senate on the subject of tax delinquencies, and then to Mr. YOUNG, who addressed the Senate on the subject of the agricultural bill. On request of Mr. ELLENDER, and by unanimous consent, the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. YOUNG were ordered to be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the speech of Mr. ELLENDER.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the soil-bank program is not going to put extra dollars into the farmers' pockets in 1956, then just how does the Secretary of Agriculture propose to get agriculture out of the depressed state in which we now find it? As I have pointed out, the Secretary is not offering the farmers higher price levels in 1956 as compared to 1955. On the contrary, while he talks about increasing the farmer's income on the one hand, we find him hacking away at price-support levels on the other.

Wheat, corn, and rice producers have already felt the pinch in support prices for this year, and no doubt cotton and peanuts will be the next to feel the impact of lower price supports, unless we return to 90 percent price supports as the committee has suggested.

The trouble with the Secretary of Agriculture these days is that he is behaving like a bull with a red flag waved before him. Whenever 90 percent price supports are mentioned around him, he immediately sees red and runs around in circles. He has become so obsessed with the idea that 90 percent price supports have brought about high production, that he has overlooked the rather obvious fact that his own Department of Agriculture, under the splendid research programs which have been carried on over the years, is primarily accountable for the present era of agricultural abundance. You can examine the Agriculture Department's crop-production records, and the one fact stands out that for every major crop there has been a steady upward swing in yields per acre over the years, commencing in the early 1930's but becoming especially accelerated since World War II.

New varieties, better cultivation methods, more efficient fertilizers, insect- and weed-control formula, mechanical harvesters—these and other 20th century innovations have played their part in increasing the quantity of food and fiber that can now be produced from an acre of ground. The record shows that during the past 14 years the same number of acres planted on our farms have produced 42 percent more food and fiber.

The evidence is abundant that, certainly with respect to the basic crops, the major portion of today's agricultural surpluses have come from increased yields per acre and not from increased acres devoted to the crops. It is true that during the Korean war, when our Government was sorely pressed for food and fiber and our war planners thought that huge quantities of these commodities were needed in reserve to cope with the uncertainties of the future, the American farmers were urged by the President of the United States and by the then Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, to plant and produce to the upmost.

I read from the President's emergency proclamation issued on December 16, 1950:

> I summon our farmers, our workers in industry, and our businessmen to make a mighty production effort to meet the defense requirements of the Nation and to this end to eliminate all waste and inefficiency and to subordinate all lesser interests to the common good.

Farmers were urged at this time to take every available acre into cultivation and to devote it to cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and other crops that, in times of all-out war, have become even more necessary than guns and airplanes. It was during this period, when farmers were doing their utmost to comply with the wishes of their Government, and thereby contribute to the security and well-being of the Nation, that our surplus problems began to aggravate the farm economy. It was during this period particularly that yields per acre continued to increase phenomenally. Then when the Korean war ended, the Government took steps to bring agricultural production back in line with demand. The gates of floodtide production had already been opened wide, however, and surpluses were building up.

Our Nation's mighty agricultural plant, which had produced such an abundance of products in wartime, could not be turned off overnight. Nor did the Government try to turn off overnight its mighty industrial plant. It should be remembered that after Korea, our Government has continued to spend billions to keep our defense plants operating, not only to build up our own defenses, but also the defenses of our allies throughout the world. Our agricultural plant was not accorded equal treatment, however. Instead of continuing to produce food and fiber products in this country in order to supply our allies, our Government's policy instead was to encourage our allies to become self-sufficient in food production. We spent millions in that direction over the years.

Mr. President, we have heard considerable debate during the past few years about the evils of 90 percent of parity—how high, fixed-support levels were wartime incentives, designed to spur the production of farm commodities. The inference has been that 90 percent of parity supports were the equivalent of a high price for farm commodities—that they were shining goals, sitting atop some agricultural mountaintop, toward which the farmers of America were to strive.

In view of this, Mr. President, I think it is time we looked back a few years and examined the precise situation which confronted the Congress during World War II and the months immediately preceding Pearl Harbor.

In May of 1941, when the clouds of war hovered over our Nation, the Senate and the House both voted separate legislation raising the support levels for the basic commodities. Now, this was not done to increase production, as the debate on the bills involved so pointedly demonstrate. Rather, agriculture was in the doldrums; farm prices were sluggish, and our export markets were vanishing. Wages and corporate profits were going up, but there was little raising trend shown in the agricultural economy of our Nation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that the Government itself asked that the farmers produce, in order that there might be on hand surplus commodities in case of a third world war?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not also true that during the war certain industries were making war materials, and that the Government paid those industries for making the war materials and also paid for a great many war materials which the Government never even received? The Government paid for them because it had contracts outstanding, and when companies which had been manufacturing war materials converted back to manufacturing domestic goods, the Government paid those

companies billions upon billions of dollars.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to my good friend it was excess of $41 billion.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. More than $41 billion was paid to industries throughout the Nation. What was paid to agriculture? The only cost to the Government resulted from the Commodity Credit Corporation's buying commodities and selling them at a loss. Is that not correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is true. As the record will show and I feel confident it will be brought out during this debate, from 1933 to November of 1955, the loss on all the basic commodities, which are the commodities we are discussing, was less than a half billion dollars.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If my memory serves me correctly, I believe Russia has been sending its citizens to this country to see how we are producing so much. Is that not correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Russia has sent delegations to this country, and I hope she will continue to send them.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. But Russia is not producing surpluses, so far as food is concerned.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. On my visit to Moscow last year I saw lines of people blocks long waiting to buy small pieces of meat. I remember very well standing in line to see what was going on. Pork was selling at the equivalent of $2.40 a pound in our money. One could not buy boiled ham for less than the equivalent of $4 a pound in our money.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If Russia had the surpluses we have today in America, what does the Senator think would be Russia's attitude? Would not she be a little more willing, probably, to start another war, because she had those surpluses?

Mr. ELLENDER. I dislike making such assumptions. I would hate to say such would cause a war, but I am sure Russia would be more willing, probably, to give the free world trouble than would be the case if she did not have the food.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is certainly true that no nation would want to go to war when it does not have any surpluses of the materials she would need during a war.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am referring particularly to food.

Mr. ELLENDER. If I am to judge from what I saw in Russia last year, there is a severe food shortage. When I say food shortage, I mean that, from what I saw, I do not believe Russia has enough food stored up to wage war for very long. I may be in error about that, but that is the judgment I have to offer, after spending only 10 days in that country. I talked to quite a few people. I visited many of their farms. In many places production on some farms had been far below par.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. So it could be that the surpluses in wheat, oats, and corn, as well as cotton, which is one of the materials we have to have in time of war, may be a blessing in disguise.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not doubt that.

Mr. President, the May 1941 amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which increased support levels to 85 percent of parity for the basic crops, was designed not to stimulate production, but to attempt to infuse into the agricultural economy of our Nation just a little of the prosperity which other segments—principally labor and industry—were experiencing.

In this connection, let me read from some of the debate in the House of Representatives on the conference report on this legislation.

Mr. HOPE is a very prominent Member of the House. He is the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives. He is a very able Member of Congress, and has served his people well and for a long time. This is what Mr. HOPE stated back in 1941, when 85 percent of parity price supports on basics were placed on the statute books. As the record will show, this was done first and foremost, to bring farmers up to the point where they could obtain a little more income, income in line with that being received by other segments of our economy.

By the same token, that is what we are doing here in asking the Senate to reinstate 90 percent of parity price-supports. The purpose is merely to give the farmers of the United States immediate income relief.

This is what Representative HOPE had to say:

> I would certainly not want to be understood as urging that loans as high as 85 percent of parity were a permanent solution of the agricultural problem. I think, as far as cotton in particular is concerned, such would be a ruinous policy to follow over a long period; but I believe that for this year, with the emergency that is staring agriculture in the face—

Mind you, Mr. President, that was in May 1941, a few months preceding Pearl Harbor, which occurred in December of that year—

> with our export markets at least temporarily gone for cotton and wheat, this provision offers the best method that we can devise to give the farmer an opportunity to secure a price which will be fairly commensurate with the price of the things he has to buy.
>
> This report, if adopted, will likely make unnecessary the acceptance of the Russell amendment, which increases the amount appropriated for parity payments this year by $150 million and also increases the amount appropriated for parity payments next year from $212 million, as provided in the House bill, to $300 million.

Representative FULMER, one of the House conferees on the bill, said:

> The other amendment increases the 75-percent loan as carried in the House bill to an 85-percent loan. This loan is for 1 year to take care of this year's crop. There is an amendment on the appropriation bill known as the Russell amendment increasing amount for parity payments from $212 million to $450 million, which would be helpful to increase parity payments which would increase purchasing and debt-paying power of farmers. We realized the opposition to this amendment and therefore agreed upon the 85-percent loan so as to give to farmers that which they are clearly entitled to, especially so because of the high prices they have to pay for everything they have to buy at this time. As a matter of fact, farmers are not getting any advantage or help from the defense program in line with other groups, and the assurance of these prices will enable them to pay these advanced prices on what they have to buy.

Thus, Mr. President, 85 percent of parity in the May 1941 amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, represented an attempt then to achieve much the same goals, price-wise, as the ones the bill of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry today attempts to achieve. Its purpose was, not to stimulate production, but to raise farm income and permit the farmer to share in the wartime boom of the early 1940's.

Mr. President, the story does not end here. In July of 1941 the Steagall amendment, which provided price support at 85 percent of parity for the nonbasic commodities, was adopted.

The act of July 1, 1941, which contains the so-called Steagall amendment, increased the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and it also fixed the support level for both basic and nonbasic commodities at 85 percent of parity. Mr. President, the language of the Steagall amendment is this:

> SEC. 4. (a) Whenever during the existing emergency the Secretary of Agriculture finds it necessary to encourage the expansion of production of any nonbasic agricultural commodity, he shall make public announcement thereof and he shall so use the funds made available under section 3 of this act or otherwise made available to him for the disposal of agricultural commodities, through a commodity loan, purchase, or other operation, taking into account the total funds available for such purpose for all commodities, so as to support a price for the producers of any such commodity with respect to which such announcement was made of not less than 85 percent of the parity or comparable price therefor. The comparable price for any such commodity shall be determined and used by the Secretary for the purposes of this section if the production or consumption of such commodity has so changed in extent or character since the base period as to result in a price out of line with parity prices for basic commodities. Any such commodity loan, purchase, or other operation which is undertaken shall be continued until the Secretary has given sufficient public announcement to permit the producers of such commodity to make a readjustment in the production of the commodity. For the purposes of this section, commodities other than cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, and rice shall be deemed to be nonbasic commodities.

Note well, Mr. President, that this language was confined to the nonbasic commodities; and its purpose was to assure producers of nonbasics, who complied with any production encouragement initiated by the Secretary of Agriculture, that they would not wake up some morning and find themselves with no need for their production; it was assurance to the producers of perishables that should wartime demand suddenly terminate, they would not have to sell on a bottomless market. The incentive of

the Steagall amendment was the knowledge that farmers would have assurance that if they did heed the cries of our Government to increase production, they would not find themselves in the same fix the farmers were in at the end of World War I.

If further evidence is required in order for us to discern the true purpose of this legislation, let us turn to the statement of none other than Representative Steagall himself, when he presented his committee's bill to the House of Representatives. Mr. Steagall said:

Congress has enacted labor laws which fix minimum wages for most employees of the Nation. We just recently passed laws which will permit industrial plants handling defense contracts to amortize their investments for new construction over a shorter period and in that way we have almost guaranteed them a profit on defense contracts. We have given industry the tariff, we fix minimum freight rates, and so forth, so that the income of practically every segment of our population is governmentally protected in one way or the other by law. But we are just now getting around to assuring something nearer reasonable minimum prices and minimum income for farmers.

The indexes of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics on April 30 showed that general farm prices stood at 110 in relation to the so-called base period of 1909–14, but the price of things the farmer buys has increased to a ratio of 129. Thus, even with the increase in farm prices and income, farm prices are still 15 percent below a parity with the prices of things the farmer must buy to carry on his business.

The loan provisions which the Congress has included in the agricultural legislation represent an attempt and promise to give the farmer a guaranty of at least a reasonable minimum return for his crop. Even with loans at 85 percent of parity for the major crops, the farmer is still far behind the parade when it comes to equality of income.

Last year the Congress increased the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation by $500 million, and I think those who have studied the matter will agree with this power to lend funds on the 1940 crops literally saved cotton, tobacco, and wheat farmers from disaster in the past year. Last summer crops were going to harvest and the world markets, which normally absorb 40 percent or more of our cotton, 50 percent of our flue-cured and dark-fired tobacco, and from 15 to 20 percent of our wheat crop, were almost completely closed. Farmers could not have sold their crops last fall at any reasonable price save for the fact that the Department of Agriculture, through Commodity Credit Corporation, placed a bottom under the markets by making nonrecourse loans available. The wheat and corn and cotton dammed back by lack of exports flowed into the loan and the income of farmers was maintained. Due to the large accumulation of these products in the loan, however, it took nearly all of the borrowing power to meet the needs of the current year.

Mr. Chairman, this bill will simply enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to continue its functions of stabilizing prices on basic crops and will provide the necessary funds to do the job.

Now, Mr. President, let us turn to the first time in our history when the Congress voted mandatory 90-percent-of-parity price supports for the basic commodities. It is important to note that this legislation is not found in a general farm bill, but in the Stabilization Act of 1942. This legislation was an outgrowth of a special message sent to the Congress by President Roosevelt on September 7, 1942. He cited increased living costs and outlined the dangers of runaway inflation. He reviewed the earlier emergency legislation enacted by the Congress to control prices and wages, but he pointed to two gaps in this anti-inflationary dike. They were: Failure of the Congress to tax heavily in order to keep the costs of living from spiraling upward, and the failure of Congress to stabilize the prices received by growers for the products of their lands.

In the autumn of 1941, the concern of our President with respect to agriculture was directed not at assuring our farmers a fair share of national prosperity, but controlling the contantly increasing prices they were receiving. The President stated that farmers were the beneficiaries of unfair privilege. He pointed out that some farm prices had shot up to 150 percent of parity, and he called for ceilings on farm products, to be placed at or about 100 percent of parity.

At the same time, he called for price floors. This is what he said:

As a part of our general program on farm prices, I recommend that Congress in due time give consideration to the advisability of legislation which would place a floor under prices of farm products, in order to maintain stability in the farm market for a reasonable future time. In other words, we should find a practicable method which will not only enable us to place a reasonable ceiling or maximum price upon farm products but which will enable us also to guarantee to the farmer that he would receive a fair minimum price for his product for 1 year or even 2 years, or whatever period is necessary after the end of the war. Every farmer remembers what happened to his prices after the last war. We can, I am sure, if we act promptly and wisely, stabilize the farmers' economy so that the postwar disaster of 1920 will not overtake him again.

This, Mr. President, the Congress did. It gave the Nation's price stabilizer power to clamp price ceilings on farm prices which exceeded 100 percent of parity to the producer, subject to an "escape clause" with respect to some commodities. At the same time, it voted 90 percent of parity price supports—not as a present price incentive, but as a guaranty that farmers who heeded their Government's cry to produce more food and to produce more fiber, would not find themselves at some future date with an abundance of production and a dearth of markets.

The claim of those who proclaim that 90 percent of parity for the basics was a wartime price stimulus is in error. Ninety percent of parity came into our agricultural picture as the result of two separate and distinct objectives. The first of these was to assure our agriculture a rightful share of increasing national prosperity; the second was to assure the American farmer that should he increase his production, as his Government requested, he would be insured against a repetition of the farm depression of the 1920's.

Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate by reciting all of the mechanisms by which our Government has come to the aid of business, labor, and other segments of our economy. I presented all these facts to the Senate in 1954, when we debated this very same issue of 90 percent price supports on the basic commodities, as opposed to a flexible price support program. At that time the majority of the Senate voted against 90 percent price supports, and I predicted that within a year or two, when the Benson flexible price support program had fully flexed, our farmers would be faced with distressingly lower incomes. During the extensive field hearings our committee conducted throughout the United States last fall we found ample evidence that my prophecy has been fulfilled. Everywhere we went, farmers begged for help. They asked us to do something to relieve their situation immediately. Most of them stated that they could not withstand another year of depressive prices similar to those of 1955. Yet, here we are faced today with an administration farm program that not only calls for a continuation of the disastrous farm prices that existed in 1955, but contemplates even lower prices in 1956.

To be frank, Mr. President, I could not in good conscience support the Secretary of Agriculture's farm program and still look the farmers of America straight in the face.

I repeat, there is nothing in Mr. Benson's program that will give the farmers any immediate relief in 1956. The soil bank is a more or less long-range program, which gives hope of ridding ourselves of burdensome surpluses in 2, 3, or perhaps 4 years, but there is no prospect of relief in 1956. On the other hand, the program which the majority of the Committee has recommended, a program calling for 90-percent price supports on the basic commodities, plus inauguration of the soil bank program, will, I believe, afford relief and a possible solution to the problem. It will give our farm economy the shot in the arm that is so urgently needed, and it will give that shot in the arm today, and not at some time in the distant future. It will breathe new life into agriculture at a time when the economic life blood of the farmer is fast ebbing away. Contrary to Mr. Benson's views, 90-percent price supports on the basic commodities would not bring about increased production of those commodities. It would not stimulate production of the basics because, as Mr. Benson well knows, he has in his hands all the tools he needs with which to control production of the the basics. He has already called for acreage allotments during 1956 on all of the basic crops. Irrespective of whether we have 75-percent price supports or 90-percent price supports for the basics in 1956, practically every acre that it allocated to farmers for planting of these crops in 1956 will actually be planted to them. Therefore, when Mr. Benson says that the 90-percent parity support feature of the committee bill would stimulate production, the Secretary is in ef-

fect stating either that he is incapable of carrying out the wishes of the Congress in administering this farm program, or that he is unwilling to carry out the wishes of the Congress.

In any event, Mr. President, I say with all sincerity that if the Congress will adopt the program which the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has recommended—a program embracing both the soil bank provisions and the 90-percent parity support provision—and if the President will sign the bill and let it become law; and if, in addition, he will place the administration of the law in the hands of one who will earnestly and conscientiously try to make the program work, we can once more lead American agriculture back to a prosperous state.

Mr. President at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the report of the committee on the pending bill, which excerpts explain the various sections of the bill. I had intended to do that, but during the course of the debate, we have covered practically every subject, with the exception perhaps of the two-price plan for rice, and I am sure that will be fully discussed later.

Furthermore, I believe several Senators desire to speak at this time. Therefore I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana to have certain excerpts printed in the RECORD?

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report (No. 1484) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill provides for immediate assistance to farmers in the form of increased support prices; reduced production of surplus commodities and increased soil, water, wildlife, and forest conservation through acreage reserve and conservation reserve programs; increased disposal or removal of surplus commodities; needed changes in marketing quota and allotment legislation; a two-price plan for rice; assistance to States for tree planting and reforestation; and price reporting and research on forest products.

TITLE 1—PRICE SUPPORT

Section 101. Basic commodities except wheat

Section 101 provides for price support for the basic commodities, except wheat, at 90 percent of parity for the 1956 and 1957 crops. This would apply principally to cotton, corn, and peanuts since (1) the provisions contained in title V of the bill, if approved, would supersede this section with respect to rice; and (2) tobacco is required by existing law to be supported at 90 percent of parity whenever marketing quotas are in effect. Cotton, corn, peanuts, and rice are required under existing law to be supported at between 75 and 90 percent of parity. The support prices for rice and corn of the 1956 crop have been announced at $4.04 per hundredweight for rice (75 percent of parity) and $1.40 per bushel for corn (81 percent of parity). Price support levels for the 1956 crops of cotton and peanuts have not yet been announced. The minimum support level provided by this section for cotton, rice, corn, and peanuts (on the basis of January 15 data) is shown in the last column of the following table:

TABLE 1.—*Support prices on basis of various support levels and various parity prices: Cotton, rice, corn, and peanuts as of Jan. 15, 1956*

Commodity	Unit	Effective parity price Jan. 15, 1956	75 percent of effective parity	90 percent of effective parity	Parity price prescribed by sec. 106 of S. 3183	90 percent of parity price prescribed by sec. 106 of S. 3183
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Cotton, upland	Pounds	[1] $0.3484	$0.2631	$0.3136	$0.3522	$0.3170
Rice	Hundredweight	[1] 5.42	4.04	4.88	5.42	4.88
Corn	Bushels	[2] 1.73	1.30	1.56	1.82	1.64
Peanuts	Pounds	[2] .129	.0968	.116	.136	.122

[1] New formula parity price.
[2] Transitional 95 percent of old.

Section 102. Wheat

Section 102 provides price support for milling quality wheat at 90 percent of parity and support for other wheat at such levels as will preserve its competitive relationship with corn on the basis of respective feed values, the average support price for all wheat to be not less than 75 percent of parity. Milling quality wheat would be wheat produced in any area from seed of a variety which in such area normally produces wheat of a quality desired for milling purposes. Wheat of the 1956 crop is deemed to be milling quality unless of a variety designated as undesirable by the Secretary of Agriculture prior to the time such wheat is planted. In determining milling quality wheat, the Secretary would consult with a committee on which there will be 3 representatives from each of the principal wheat-producing areas, of whom 1 would be a wheat farmer, 1 a wheat miller, and 1 a person experienced in research on wheat varieties. This section would be applicable only to the 1956 and 1957 crops.

The announced support price for wheat of the 1956 crop is $1.81 per bushel (76 percent of parity). On the basis of January 15 data and the parity formula provided by section 106, 90 percent of parity would be $2.26 per bushel.

Under this section, a national average support level representing 90 percent of the parity price for wheat, would be established and, after the adjustments for location, grade, quality, and other factors called for by section 403 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, this would be applied to milling quality wheat. The support level for other wheat would be established at a price for each county which represents its feed value relationship to corn. The feeding value of wheat to corn (pound for pound) based on USDA Circular No. 836 is 105.

The Department has had some experience in preparing a program of the type contemplated by this section.

On August 12, 1955, it announced that under the 1956 wheat price-support program 23 designated undesirable varieties would be discounted 20 cents per bushel in addition to any other discounts, and that protein premiums would not be applicable to these varieties. Following is a listing of the designated undesirable varieties, by classes and the States in which they are designated:

HARD RED WINTER

Purkof: Indiana, Michigan.

Red Chief: Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico.

Red Jacket: Illinois, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico.

Kanking: Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Nebraska.

Kanqueen: Missouri, Colorado.

Chiefkan: Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Montana, Colorado, New Mexico.

Stafford: Nebraska, Kansas.

Early Pawnee (Sel. 33): Kansas.

Early Blackhull: Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Montana, Colorado.

New Chief: Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico.

Yogo: Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas.

SOFT RED WINTER

Kawvale: Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska.

HARD RED SPRING

Henry: Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana.

Sturgeon: Wisconsin.

Progress: Wisconsin.

Spinkcota: Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Premier: Montana, North Dakota.

WHITE

Rex: Idaho, Washington, Oregon.

Sonora: California.

Galgalos: Nebraska.

DURUM

Golden Ball: Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana.

Peliss: North Dakota, Montana.

Pentad: North Dakota.

The August 12 announcement contemplated that a producer certification plan would be used. Each producer applying for price support in States with any of the listed undesirable varieties would be required to certify (1) that the wheat he harvested was not of the undesirable varieties listed for his State, or (2) that the wheat he harvested was from one or more of the undesirable varities but none of such wheat was being tendered for price support, or (3) that the wheat on which he requested price support contained wheat of an undesirable variety listed for his State and such wheat was identified by variety, and bin number (if farm stored) or warehouse receipt number.

It was estimated that the total 1954 production of the 23 varieties listed as undesirable by the Department in its announcement of August 12, 1955, amounted to 31 million bushels, as compared with the total 1954 crop of 985 million bushels.

Section 103. Cottonseed and soybeans

Section 103 provides that whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported, the price of the other shall be supported at such level as will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market. The oil and meal produced from cottonseed and soybeans generally compete for the same markets, both in the United States and abroad. The purpose of this provision is to assure that the support levels established for the two commodities will not result in one being withdrawn into Government store, while the other takes over the market.

Support prices for the 1951–56 crops of cottonseed and soybeans were as follows:

TABLE 2

Crop	Cottonseed		Soybeans	
	Support price (per ton) [1]	Percent of parity	Support price (per bushel)	Percent of parity
1951	$63.90	90	$2.45	90
1952	66.70	90	2.56	90
1953	54.20	75	2.56	90
1954	54.00	75	2.22	80
1955	46.00	65	2.04	70
1956	48.00	70	2.15	75

[1] Loan rate basis grade (100).

Section 104. Cotton

Section 104 repeals the special provision of law designating Middling ⅞-inch cotton as the standard grade and staple of parity calculations and price support and would result in the average grade and staple being utilized for such purposes as in the case of other commodities. This change for cotton would aid in establishing more realistic differentials under the support program and would result in slightly lower support prices than would result from using Middling ⅞ as the standard grade and staple, since Middling ⅞ is below the actual average grade and staple. The amount they would be lower would depend on the particular schedule of premiums and discounts used in the calculations. If the 1955 loan schedule were used, support prices would be 1.36 cents per pound lower if based on average grade and staple than they would be if based on Middling ⅞. The average quality of the cotton produced in 1954 was as follows: Grade 95.4 (Middling white equals 100) and staple lengths 33.2 thirty-seconds of an inch. Through January 15, 1956, the 1955 crop was as follows: Grade 93.4 and staple length 32.6 thirty-seconds.

Section 105. Dairy products

Section 105 provides price support for whole milk, butterfat, and the products of such commodities at not less than 80 percent nor more than 90 percent of parity, and provides for using a parity equivalent for manufacturing milk based on the 30-month period July 1946 to December 1948, both inclusive (the period originally used in computing the parity equivalent). On the basis of data now available, this would result in a parity equivalent of 88 percent of the parity price for all milk sold wholesale by farmers, instead of 83.3 percent as now results from using the most recent 10-year period.

The effect of this section on support prices is illustrated by the following tables:

TABLE 3.—*Minimum and maximum support prices of manufacturing milk*

(*a*) Under present method:

Parity for all milk per hundredweight: Jan. 15, 1956	$4.61
Parity equivalent price of manufacturing milk:	
83.3 percent of parity for all milk [1]	3.84
Maximum support 90 percent	3.46
Minimum support 75 percent	2.88

[1] July 1946–December 1955 average relationship between prices of manufacturing milk and all milk wholesale (revised series).

(*b*) Under sec. 105:

Parity for all milk	4.61
Parity equivalent of manufacturing milk:	
88 percent of all milk [2]	4.06
Maximum support 90 percent	3.65
Minimum support 80 percent	3.25

[2] July 1946–December 1948 average relationship between prices of manufacturing milk and all milk wholesale (revised series).

NOTE.—Present support price of $3.15 is 80 percent of the parity equivalent price of manufacturing milk as of Apr. 1, 1955, the beginning of the current marketing year, but is 82 percent of the parity equivalent price as of January 1956.

TABLE 4.—*Minimum and maximum support prices of butterfat*

	Cents per pound
(a) Under present method:	
Parity price, Jan. 15, 1956	71.9
Maximum support 90 percent	64.7
Minimum support 75 percent	53.9
(b) Under sec. 105:	
Parity price, Jan. 15, 1956	71.9
Maximum support 90 percent	64.7
Minimum support 80 percent	57.5

NOTE.—Present support price of 56.2 cents per pound is 76 percent of parity as of Apr. 1, 1955, the beginning of the current marketing year, but is 78 percent of the parity price as of January 1956.

The parity equivalents which have been used heretofore and the periods for which they were applicable are set out in the following table:

TABLE 5.—*Parity equivalent*

Period:	*Percent*
January 1949–March 1954	88.5
April–December 1954	84.1
January–December 1955	83.7
January–December 1956	83.3

The method currently used in computing and applying the parity equivalent is described as follows:

METHOD CURRENTLY USED TO COMPUTE AND APPLY THE PARITY EQUIVALENT FOR MANUFACTURING MILK

Current procedure for computing the parity equivalent for manufacturing milk as approved by the Secretary of Agriculture provides that (1) the parity equivalent for manufacturing milk shall be determined on the basis of the relation of (a) the average price received by farmers for all milk sold at wholesale to plants and dealers for the period July 1946 through the December preceding the date of computation to (b) the average price paid f. o. b. plant by processors for all milk sold by farmers for use in production of American cheese, evaporated milk, and butter and byproducts during the same period; (2) data for each year are to be added annually until 10 full calendar years are included in the comparison; (3) thereafter the parity equivalent during any calendar year will be determined on the basis of the relation between the averages of the respective series for the 10 calendar years immediately preceding.

The factor to be used during a particular calendar year is computed in January of that year using price data available at the date of computation. The factor to be used during 1956 is 83.3 percent, which compares with 83.7 percent, the factor used during 1955. The parity price for all milk wholesale, $4.61 per hundredweight on January 15, 1956, multiplied by 83.3 percent, results in $3.84 per hundredweight, the parity equivalent for milk for manufacture for January 15, 1956. This parity equivalent applies to the national average price for all milk of average butterfat content used for the principal manufacturing purposes calculated on an annual basis. It should be noted that the parity equivalent for milk for manufacturing is not in itself a parity price but is rather an administrative determination of an operating differential which is subject to revision as additional data become available or as experience indicates that the same purpose might better be achieved by calculating and applying revised differentials.

Section 106. Parity formula

Section 106 would require the Secretary in the case of the basic commodities to use the old parity price or the modernized parity, whichever is higher. This section also directs the Secretary to make a thorough study of possible methods of improving the parity formula and report thereon within 6 months after enactment of the act.

A brief description of "old," "new," and "transitional" parity prices, and a table illustrating the effect of this section, is set out below:

1. Old parity prices are calculated by multiplying base-period prices by a parity index. In the case of the basic commodities, except tobacco, the base period is August 1909 to July 1914. Hence, the base-period prices for the individual commodities are the average prices received by farmers for those commodities during that period. The parity index is the unrevised index of prices paid by farmers, including interest and taxes.

2. Transitional parity prices are the old parity prices decreased by 5 percent for each calendar year since 1955 in the case of basic commodities and 5 percent for each calendar year since 1949 in the case of nonbasic commodities. For 1956 transitional parity prices are 95 percent of old parity prices for basic commodities and 65 percent of old parity prices for nonbasic commodities.

3. New parity prices are computed in much the same manner as old parity prices, using the parity index based on 1910–14, but the pattern of price relationships among the various commodities that existed in the immediately preceding 10 calendar years is used to determine the pattern of relationships among the parity prices of the individual commodities.

TABLE 6.—*New, old, or transitional and effective parity prices for selected basic and nonbasic commodities, Jan. 15, 1956*

Commodity	Unit	New parity price	Old parity price	Transitional parity price [1]	Effective parity price [2]	Parity price prescribed by sec. 106 of S. 3183
Basic commodities:						
Corn	Bushel	$1.64	$1.82	$1.73	$1.73	$1.82
Cotton, American upland	Pound	.3484	.3522		.3484	.3522
Wheat	Bushel	2.19	2.51	2.38	2.38	2.51
Rice	Hundredweight	5.42	5.14		5.42	5.42
Tobacco:						
Flue-cured, types 11–14	Pound	.534	.522		.534	.534
Burley, type 31	do	.520	.506		.520	.520
Peanuts	do	.114	.136	.129	.129	.136

[1] Transitional parity is not shown where the new parity price is the effective parity price. Transitional parity price in 1956 was 95 percent of the old parity price.

[2] The effective parity price is the new parity price or the transitional parity price, whichever is higher.

TITLE II—SOIL BANK ACT

Title II of the bill provides for a soil-bank program composed of two parts: (1) An acreage reserve program; and (2) a conservation reserve program.

ACREAGE RESERVE PROGRAM

Sections 203–206 authorize and direct the Secretary to compensate producers for voluntarily reducing their 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959 crops of wheat, cotton, corn, rice, flue-

cured tobacco, burley tobacco, and cigar-binder tobacco, types 51, 52, 54, and 55, below their acreage allotments. Cotton would include American upland cotton and extra-long-staple cotton. To be eligible for such compensation the producer is required to reduce his acreage of the commodity below his farm acreage allotment within such limits as the Secretary may prescribe, to specifically designate such acreage, and not to harvest any crop from or graze the reserve acreage unless the Secretary, after certification by the governor of the State, determines that it is necessary to permit grazing to alleviate hardship caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster. It is anticipated by the committee that, beginning with the 1957 crop, the program would require the producer to underplant his acreage. It is recognized that in 1956, particularly in winter wheat areas, unless producers are permitted to adjust acreage already planted, some producers would not be able to participate in the program during 1956. The Secretary is directed to establish a national reserve acreage goal for each of the crops and to establish the limits within which individual farms may participate in a manner which is reasonably calculated to achieve the national reserve goal, and give producers a fair and equitable opportunity to participate.

Compensation of producers for participating in the acreage reserve program would be made through the issuance of certificates redeemable in cash by Commodity Credit Corporation or in the commodity, at the option of the producer, in the case of certificates issued with respect to grains and cotton. If the certificate is redeemed in the commodity, it is redeemable at not more than 110 percent of the cash value of the certificate, and the grain or cotton delivered in redemption of the certificate is to be valued at 105 percent of the current support price plus reasonable carrying charges or the market price, whichever is higher. If, as of the beginning of any marketing year, the total supply does not exceed the normal supply of the commodity, certificates thereafter issued or certificates then outstanding would no longer be redeemable in the commodity. Certificates redeemed in cash may be redeemed by the producer or by any holder in due course, but certificates redeemed in the commodity may be redeemed only by the producer. Certificates shall not be redeemed in commodities other than the commodity for the reduced production of which the certificate was issued, except that certificates for corn or wheat may be redeemed in any feed grain including wheat for feed on such basis as may be mutually agreed upon between the producer and CCC.

The amount of the compensation to producers for reducing their crops below their acreage allotments would be established by the Secretary at such rates as would provide producers with a fair and reasonable return for the acreage withdrawn from production and with a sufficient incentive to achieve the reserve acreage goal.

The compensation paid any producer for participation in the acreage-reserve program with respect to any crop of tobacco is limited to $100 per acre.

The total compensation which may be paid producers for participating in the acreage-reserve program with respect to any year's crops is limited to $750 million, and it is expected that this amount would be allocated among the various crops so as to provide for a fair reduction of acreage for each.

The Secretary is directed to provide adequate safeguards to protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers, including provision for sharing on a fair and equitable basis the certificates issued for participating in the program, and including such provision as may be necessary to prevent them from being forced off the farm.

Participation in the acreage reserve program by a producer would not reduce his future acreage allotments and quotas.

CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

Sections 207–214 provide for a conservation reserve program. In carrying out the conservation reserve program, the Secretary would be authorized to enter into long-term contracts under which producers would agree to devote to conserving uses a specifically designated acreage of land on the farm regularly used in the production of crops (including crops such as tame hay, alfalfa, and clovers, which do not require annual tillage). The Secretary would, however, have discretion in determining the type of land to be designated in connection with particular contracts, and in making such determination he could consider the needs of the various crop-producing regions of the country.

Section 207 sets forth certain matters that are to be covered in such contracts. Under the contract, the producer would be required to establish and maintain the conservation use on the designated acreage; not to reduce the amount of acreage on the farm normally devoted to conserving uses or allowed to remain idle; not to harvest any crop from the land established in protective cover; not to pasture the acreage prior to January 1, 1959, or such later date as prescribed in the contract except upon a finding by the Secretary, after certification of the governor of the State, of a need for grazing to alleviate hardship caused by flooding, drought, or other natural disaster; not to adopt any practice tending to defeat the purposes of the contract; and to forfeit further payments and refund all payments already received, for violating the contract if the Secretary determines that such violation is of such nature as to warrant termination of the contract, or to accept such adjustments or forfeit price support benefits as the Secretary may deem appropriate if he determines that the producer's violation does not warrant termination of the contract.

The contracts would require the Secretary:

1. To bear such part of the cost (including labor) of establishing and maintaining the protective cover or other authorized use on the designated acreage as he determines to be necessary to effectuate the purposes of the act, not to exceed a maximum for the county or area where the farm was located; and

2. To make an annual payment for the term of the contract to the farmer who fulfills the provisions of the contract. This payment would represent a fair and reasonable return on the land in protective cover or other authorized use, taking into consideration the value of the land for producing commodities customarily grown on such kind of land in the area, the prevailing rates of cash rentals in the area, necessary incentive to obtain contracts, and other appropriate factors.

While the bill contains specific provisions relating to matters to be covered in such contracts, the specific provisions in the bill are not necessarily to be incorporated verbatim in each contract. While it is intended that the contracts contain provisions which give effect to the matters required to be covered, such provisions may be worded so as to give more detailed treatment to such matters or to adapt them to the particular area, type of farming, conserving use, or other matter covered by the contract.

The cost of all direct and significant factors in the establishment of the vegetative cover could be shared. For grasses and legumes these factors would include, but would not be limited to—

1. Land preparation, including summer-fallowing the area and planting a go-down crop in areas where needed;
2. Seed;
3. Inoculation;
4. Seeding;
5. Liming;
6. Fertilizing; and
7. Fencing the seeding area where needed.

For trees these factors would include, but not be limited to—

1. Land preparation (including summer-fallowing), if needed;
2. Tree seedlings, seed, cuttings, and shrubs;
3. Cultivation following planting (where needed); and
4. Fencing the planted area (where needed).

In a similar way, direct and significant factors of cost could be shared in connection with the establishing and maintaining of water storage facilities and other soil, water, wildlife, or forest conserving uses.

Advertising and bid procedures could be used in determining the lands in any area to be covered by the contracts.

The Secretary could not terminate a contract unless he determined that the nature of the violation was such as to defeat or substantially impair the purposes of the contract. Before termination the Secretary would have to give written notice to the producer who, if he requested such an opportunity within 30 days after the mailing, or serving of the notice, would have an opportunity to show cause why the contract should not be terminated. A hearing, formal or informal as provided for under regulations issued by the Secretary, would be held to determine whether to terminate the contract. If termination was determined, the producer would receive written notice thereof and would have 90 days after the mailing or service of the notice to appeal to the appropriate United States district court for a de novo determination of the facts in the case and judicial relief with respect thereto. The Secretary's determination on termination would become final and conclusive if the producer failed to avail himself of the opportunity for a hearing within the 30-day period or for appeal to the court within the 90-day period.

A national conservation reserve goal would be proclaimed each year not later than February 1. Such goal would represent that percentage which the Secretary determines would be practicable to cover by contracts during such year of the number of acres by which (1) the acreage needed for the production of agricultural commodities during the preceding year, plus any acreage then in the acreage or conservation reserve program or retired from production because of acreage allotment or marketing quota programs, exceeds (2) the acreage needed during the year for which the determination was made for the production of commodities for domestic and export use and for adequate carryover allowances. The 1956 national goal would be determined as soon as practicable after the enactment of the bill.

In distributing the national goal among States and major crop production regions, due regard is to be given to the need for flood control, drought control, and other conservation benefits; the desires of producers in particular States or regions to participate; diversion of acreage under acreage allotment and marketing quota programs; and the need to assume adequate production of agricultural commodities and crops not in surplus and to discourage the production to those in surplus. Other relevant factors could of course be taken into consideration by the Secretary in the distribution of the national goal.

The criteria for determining the national conservation reserve goal, and for distributing the goal among the States and major crop production regions, are intended only as general guides to the Secretary and not as a rigid formula.

The Secretary would annually report to Congress the scope of the program for that year and the basis for participation in such program in the various States and major crop production regions.

Contracts would be entered into during the 5 years 1956 through 1960. The minimum contract period would be 3 years. The maximum contract period would be 10 years except that contracts for tree cover could extend for 15 years.

The Secretary could not enter into contracts calling for payments to producers (including the cost of materials and services furnished to producers) in excess of $350 million in any calendar year.

Any contract could be terminated by mutual agreement with the producer if the Secretary determined that such termination would be in the public interest. Provision is also made for the modification of contracts previously entered into. In view of the long-term contracts authorized, the Secretary is given broad authority to agree to such modifications, without obtaining technical consideration therefore, as he determines to be desirable either to carry out the purposes of the act or to facilitate the practical administration of the conservation reserve program.

Authority similar to that in the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for programs under that act would be provided to make conservation materials and services available to producers under the conservation reserve program. The Secretary could produce as well as purchase such materials and services under the conservation reserve program. It is likely that the facilities of Forest Service nurseries would be needed to produce some of the tree seedlings needed in carrying out the program. The Secretary would be authorized to reimburse any Federal, State, or local government agency for materials or services furnished by such agency and to pay expenses necessary in making such materials and services available, including costs incident to the delivery, application, or installation of the materials and services.

Authority similar to that in the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act would be provided to use regular dealers in the furnishing of conservation materials and services and to make payments to such dealers in advance of determination of performance by producers. If the Secretary determined it to be necessary to protect the interests of producers and the Government fair prices for furnishing such materials and services could be established.

The bill would provide that the acreage of cropland on any farm would not be decreased during the term of any contract for the purposes of determining acreage allotments and marketing quotas by reason of the establishment of protective cover or other use of land covered by contract under the conservation reserve program. The acreage of cropland on a farm may directly affect the size of the cotton allotment for the farm and may have a bearing indirectly in the size of the farm acreage allotments for other commodities.

Likewise the acreage determined to have been diverted from the production of any commodity subject to acreage allotments or marketing quotas in order to carry out a contract entered into under the conservation reserve program would be considered to have been devoted to the production of the commodity for the purposes of determining future State, county, and farm acreage allotments.

Many producers would be unwilling to participate in the conservation reserve program without these safeguards to preserve their acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

The Secretary is directed to take adequate safeguards to protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers, including such provision as may be necessary to prevent them from being forced off the farm.

The conservation reserve program would be applicable to the continental United States, and could be extended, if the Secretary determined it to be in the national interest, to Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO ACREAGE RESERVE AND CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAMS

As a condition of eligibility for payment under either the acreage reserve or conservation reserve program the producer must comply with all farm acreage allotments established under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, except that in the case of wheat the wheat acreage must not exceed the larger of the farm wheat acreage allotment or 15 acres. Noncompliance would be determined only when the producer knowingly exceeded the acreage allotment, or, in the case of wheat, 15 acres, if larger than the allotment.

No acreage diverted from the production of any commodity by reason of participation in either the acreage reserve or conservation reserve program may be reapportioned or allotted to any other farm.

Payment of compensation authorized under the acreage reserve or conservation reserve program could be made upon the basis of the claimant's certification that he had complied with all requirements for such payments. It is intended by this provision to authorize the Secretary to provide for payments prior to the end of a program year and without waiting for a check of compliance. The producer would, of course, be expected to agree to refrain from any action which would result in his not being in compliance at the end of the program year.

The Secretary would be directed to use in administering the programs in the continental United States the community, county, and State committees established under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

The Secretary would be required to consult with soil conservation districts, State foresters, land-grant colleges and other appropriate State agencies in formulating at the State and county levels the conservation aspects of the programs. He would be required also to utilize, so far as practicable, the technical resources of the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service, land-grant colleges, State foresters, and other appropriate technical services to assure coordination of conservation activities and a solid technical foundation for the program.

The Secretary would be directed to utilize as fully as practicable land use capability data in carrying out the acreage reserve and conservation reserve programs; and to carry forward to completion as rapidly as possible the basic land inventory of the Nation (now about one-third completed). However, land use capability work would continue to be financed from funds otherwise made available for such work and not from any funds made available for the acreage reserve and conservation reserve programs.

In financing the acreage reserve and conservation reserve programs, including administrative costs, the Secretary would be authorized to utilize the facilities, services, authorities, and funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Necessary sums to pay the CCC its actual costs would be authorized to be appropriated.

The Secretary may transfer funds to agencies of the Federal or State Governments who are requested to cooperate or assist in carrying out the programs and for technical assistance in connection therewith. Such payments may be made in advance of the time that the agency renders such assistance.

Determinations by the Secretary of (1) the facts constituting the basis for any payment, and (2) the person entitled to certain payments, would be conclusive, in the same way that similar determinations are made conclusive for other programs by section 385 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

The Secretary would be authorized to deny any producer all or any part of the benefits under the soil bank programs if the Secretary determines that (1) the producer had displaced any tenant or sharecropper, or reduced the acreage of any commodity farmed by any tenant or sharecropper, on any farm owned or controlled by such producer; (2) such displacement or reduction was made in contemplation of, or on account of participation by such producer in either the acreage reserve or conservation reserve program; and (3) such displacement or consent was not consented to by the tenant or sharecropper.

Cost-sharing under the regular agricultural conservation program could also be made available for establishing and maintaining protective vegetative cover and other practices and facilities authorized on lands in the acreage reserve and conservation reserve programs. However, where payment is earned for carrying out any such practice under the conservation reserve program, a duplicate payment for carrying out the same practice will not be made under the agricultural conservation program.

The Secretary would be given broad discretion in the administration of the acreage and conservation reserve programs as to lands to be retired, incentives to be paid, and other matters. This discretion is necessary to the efficient administration of the programs, and its exercise will require consultation with field agencies and others interested in the programs.

TITLE III—SURPLUS DISPOSAL

Section 301. Authority to add corn to set-aside

Section 301 gives the Secretary discretionary authority to add not to exceed 250 million bushels of corn to the set-aside established pursuant to section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1954.

The Agricultural Act of 1954 provided for the insulation from commercial markets of up to $2,500 million worth of commodities held or thereafter acquired from 1954 and prior year's production. The maximum and minimum quantities specified in the law and the actual quantities set aside as of December 31, 1955, are as follows:

TABLE 7

Commodity	Maximum quantity	Minimum quantity	Quantity in set-aside as of Dec. 31, 1955
Wheat ... bushels	500,000,000	400,000,000	420,286,393
Upland cotton ... bales	4,000,000	3,000,000	2,632,456
Cottonseed oil ... pounds	500,000,000		
Butter ... do	200,000,000		
Nonfat dry milk solids ... do	300,000,000		
Cheese ... do	150,000,000		

The price-support level for corn has been announced for the 1956 crop at 81 percent of parity, or $1.40 per bushel, based on the indicated supply situation and the January 15, 1956, parity. Had 250 million bushels of corn been included in the set-aside at the time these determinations were made, the change in supply data would have resulted in a support price of 84 percent of parity, or $1.45.

Section 302. Program of orderly liquidation

Section 302 requires the Secretary to submit to Congress within 60 days after the enactment of the act a detailed program for the disposition of all stocks of agricultural commodities held by CCC and to report annually thereafter on operations undertaken to dispose of such stocks.

There follows a statement showing the quantity and value of commodities pledged for outstanding CCC loans and commodities in price-support inventory of the CCC as of December 31, 1955, with a comparison in total as of December 31, 1954. (Quantity data shown include the quantities in the set-aside inventory as of the respective dates.)

TABLE 8.—*Quantity and value of commodities pledged for outstanding loans and commodities in price-support inventory as of Dec. 31, 1955 and total investment as of Dec. 31, 1954*

[All figures in thousands]

Commodity	Unit of measure	Investment as of Dec. 31, 1955 [1]						Total investment as of Dec. 31, 1954 [1]	
		Pledged for loans		In inventory		Total			
		Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
Basic commodities:									
Corn	Bushels	180,159	$277,579	757,612	$1,300,323	937,771	$1,577,902	757,756	$1,237,164
Cotton, extra long staple	Bales	13	3,566	93	33,975	106	37,541	84	29,519
Cotton, upland	do	5,422	893,034	7,921	1,437,671	13,343	2,330,105	8,424	1,428,692
Peanuts, farmers' stock	Pounds	290,746	32,856	6,033	668	296,779	33,524	12,968	1,351
Rice	Hundredweight	12,115	64,158	15,387	175,902	27,502	240,060	15,369	84,701
Tobacco	Pounds	1,053,976	597,808	231	92	1,054,207	597,900	725,891	346,279
Wheat	Bushels	221,241	455,343	888,542	2,399,042	1,109,783	2,854,385	1,106,257	2,756,649
Total basic commodities			2,324,344		5,347,073		7,671,417		5,884,355
Designated nonbasic commodities:									
Honey	Pounds	986	105			986	105	1,725	218
Milk and butterfat:									
Butter	do			166,399	100,685	166,399	100,685	451,541	292,678
Butter oil	do			23,980	20,613	23,980	20,613		
Cheese	do			333,002	131,250	333,002	131,250	437,706	175,109
Milk, dried	do			161,714	28,216	161,714	28,216	268,259	43,642
Whey	do			8,180	503	8,180	503	85,122	3,471
Tung oil	do			22,988	5,850	22,988	5,850	38,516	9,459
Wool	do			140,059	94,156	140,059	94,156	145,445	96,657
Total designated nonbasic commodities			105		381,273		381,378		621,234
Other nonbasic commodities:									
Barley	Bushels	69,152	61,147	31,261	43,966	100,413	105,113	94,694	109,142
Beans, dry edible	Hundredweight	2,284	15,005	1,865	14,755	4,149	29,760	3,210	24,870
Cottonseed and products:									
Cotton linters	Pounds			495,830	47,771	495,830	47,771	663,989	64,560
Cottonseed	Tons	(2)	7				7	(2)	2
Cottonseed meal	Pounds			53	2	53	2	4,773	71
Cottonseed oil	do			17,878	2,801	17,878	2,801	604,489	107,551
Flaxseed	Bushels	6,685	18,925	438	1,517	7,123	20,442	6,153	19,649
Grain sorghum	Hundredweight	43,483	75,828	26,452	77,379	69,935	153,207	51,260	126,438
Linseed oil	Pounds			57,256	8,385	57,256	8,385	130,828	22,306
Naval stores:									
Rosin	do			280,234	21,517	280,234	21,517	348,570	26,367
Turpentine	Gallons			1,846	1,059	1,846	1,059	2,873	1,576
Oats	Bushels	56,237	34,493	35,258	29,988	91,495	64,481	84,810	66,305
Olive oil	Gallons							365	934
Rye	Bushels	8,988	9,595	3,306	5,390	12,294	14,985	7,579	10,720
Seeds, hay and pasture	Pounds			26,718	15,198	26,718	15,198	38,181	20,273
Seeds, winter cover crop	do							26,753	3,772
Soybeans	Bushels	22,342	44,680	410	986	22,752	45,666	23,177	50,148
Total other nonbasic commodities			259,680		270,714		530,394		654,684
Exchange commodities: Strategic and critical materials					83,120		83,120		10,952
Total			2,584,129		6,082,180		8,666,309		7,171,225

[1] Book value before deduction of reserve for losses.

[2] Less than a thousand.

Section 303. Reestablishment of historic share of world cotton market

Section 303 directs Commodity Credit Corp. to use its existing powers and authorities to reestablish and maintain the fair historical share of the world market for United States cotton. Under this authority the Secretary would be directed to initiate immediately an export program for cotton so that it will move into export channels at competitive world prices. The program developed could provide either for the sale of CCC cotton for export at competitive world prices or for a cash export subsidy on United States cotton sufficient to make it competitive in world markets. The section also provides that cotton made available by CCC under section 102 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 shall be sold at competitive world prices. Cotton made available is intended to include cotton sold from its stocks by CCC as well as cotton made available for export under the program through CCC financing of exportations from private stocks.

The Department initiated a special cotton export program January 1, 1956, and 723,469 bales were sold during the first 6 weeks of the program. The cotton has been sold at prices averaging about $45 per bale under the minimum price at which it could have been sold for unrestricted use under section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

Section 304. Extra-long-staple cotton

Section 304 directs the Secretary of Agriculture to provide sufficient incentive to domestic users of extra-long-staple cotton to assure domestic utilization of a minimum of 30,000 bales of such cotton annually and authorizes appropriations for such purpose.

Section 305. Section 32 funds supplemented

Section 305 of the bill authorizes an annual appropriation of $250 million, free of the existing 25-percent limitation on the expenditure of funds with respect to any one commodity, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to further carry out the provisions of section 32.

There follows a statement of the section 32 funds available for the fiscal year 1956:

Carried forward from 1955	$300,000,000
Appropriated (30 percent of customs receipts)	166,807,174
Total available under sec. 32	466,807,174
Deduct transfer to Interior Department	—4,322,879
Total available to USDA	462,484,295

Section 32 enacted in August 1935, appropriates for each fiscal year an amount equal to 30 percent of the previous calendar year's customs receipts for the purpose of encouraging the domestic consumption and expor-

tation of agricultural commodities. The Agricultural Act of 1948 provides that up to $300 million of unused prior year balances remain available for use.

Section 32, as amended (7 U. S. C. 612c), provides that the amount that may be devoted during any fiscal year to any one agricultural commodity or the products thereof shall not exceed 25 percent of the funds available under this section for such fiscal year and also that the funds shall be devoted principally to nonbasic perishable agricultural commodities other than those receiving price support under title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

Public Law 393, 76th Congress (53 Stat. 1411 and 1412), as amended by Public Law 466, 83d Congress, provides that section 32 funds in an amount equal to 30 percent of customs receipts collected on fishery products shall be transferred to the Secretary of the Interior. Also, Public Law 311 of August 9, 1955 (84th Cong.) authorizes the use of $15 million to meet commodity program costs in each of the fiscal years 1956 and 1957 for the purchase and donation of wheat flour and cornmeal to needy persons without regard to the requirement relating to the amounts to be devoted to perishables. In addition to these limitations and requirements for section 32 funds, their use is also authorized by section 392 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1392 (b)), for operating expenses and administration of other laws such as the Marketing Agreement Act of 1937.

The use of section 32 funds for program operations varies from year to year, depending upon economic conditions with respect to particular commodities as well as the outlets which may be available for commodities purchased. Based on total funds available under section 32 for fiscal year 1956, the largest amount that can be devoted to commodity program costs for any one commodity or product thereof is $116,701,793. This would include the direct program costs of purchasing, processing, packaging, transporting, etc. Administrative expenses of the Department in connection with section 32 programs are not included in the calculation of the amount devoted to any one commodity. The largest amount previously devoted to any one commodity was in the fiscal year 1954 when $87,129,232, or the equivalent of 18.3 percent of total funds available, was used for commodity program costs for the purchase and donation of dairy products.

Section 306. Transfer of barter materials to supplemental stockpile

Section 306 provides for the transfer to the supplemental stockpile established by section 104 (b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 of materials acquired by CCC under the barter program unless such materials were acquired for the national stockpile or were acquired for other purposes, and authorizes appropriations to reimburse CCC for the value of any materials so transferred. This section also provides that strategic materials acquired by CCC as a result of barter may be imported free of duty as in the case of strategic materials imported for the national stockpile. Although it would appear that materials imported by CCC are already exempt under the provisions of 15 United States Code 713a-5, which exempts CCC from all taxation except real estate taxes, it is understood that the Bureau of Customs has raised a question whether this exemption extends to import duties. The present section will make it clear that materials entered by CCC are exempt from duties.

Section 307. Sales for foreign currency exempted from cargo preference

Section 307 removes sales for foreign currency under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 from the requirement of the cargo preference statute, Public Law 664, 83d Congress, that at least 50 percent of commodities transported on ocean vessels under certain foreign aid programs and other Government programs shall be transported on privately owned United States-flag vessels.

From the inception of the title I program under Public Law 480 through January 31, 1956, agreements have been entered into with 22 countries providing for the sale of approximately $517 million worth of commodities at export market value. The cost to the Commodity Credit Corporation of financing these sales will be about $769 million. Ocean freight costs involved in moving these commodities and financed by the United States will amount to about $53 million. The export market value of the commodities plus the amount of ocean freight financed, except for differentials absorbed by the United States, is paid by the importing countries in their own currencies.

In applying the cargo preference law to the program, at least 50 percent of each commodity to each country is required to be moved on United States-flag vessels, if available. Also, at least 50 percent of shipments in each of the categories, liner, tramp, and tanker are required to move on United States-flag vessels, if available. Compliance with these requirements is assured through prior approval by the Department of all vessel charters and liner bookings.

The Commodity Credit Corporation finances ocean transportation costs on United States vessels when such vessels are required to be used in order to assure compliance with the provisions of the Cargo Preference Act. The amount by which freight costs on such vessels exceed the prevailing rate on foreign flag vessels is absorbed by the United States. Ocean transportation costs on United States vessels over and above that necessary to comply with the provisions of the Cargo Preference Act and on third country vessels is financed only to the extent that the importing country is unable to pay such costs. Transportation costs on vessels of the importing country are not financed under the program.

Approximately 53 percent of the total tonnage was approved for shipment on United States-flag vessels. Tramp tonnage was about 81 percent of the total, liner tonnage about 18 percent, and tanker tonnage about 1 percent. The 18 percent liner tonnage breaks down, 13 percent United States flag and 5 percent foreign flag. Tramp tonnage divided about 40 percent United States and 41 percent foreign, the 1 percent in favor of foreign tramps being the result of the shortage of United States-flag tramps to carry wheat to Yugoslavia during February of 1955. Since that time no appreciable difficulty has been experienced in the chartering of sufficient United States-flag vessels.

Your committee is firmly convinced that the maintenance of our merchant marine fleet is essential to national welfare and security. However, such governmental support as is necessary for maintenance should be directly provided and should not be at the expense of the farm program. The word "expense" is used in this connection to connote not so much monetary expense as the expense of curtailed dispositions of surpluses under the program and hampered efforts to obtain the liberalization of restrictions against the commercial importation of United States agricultural products into maritime nations.

The Department reported favorably on S. 2584, a bill to exempt the title I program from cargo preference, for the following reasons:

First, we have lost opportunities to move commodities to a number of countries. Only one country, Denmark, has definitely rejected the possibility of negotiating a title I program because of cargo preference. Difficulties in securing acceptance of cargo preference by three other maritime nations have delayed negotiations for extended periods. These negotiations have not been terminated, however, and efforts are being continued to overcome this resistance. It is impossible to estimate with any degree of accuracy the value of commodity movement lost because of this problem.

Second, the cargo-preference requirement has resulted in added cost to the farm program. It is necessary to provide dollar financing of ocean freight charges on United States-flag vessels required to be used. Total freight approved for financing during 1955 was about $31 million. About $12 million of this was on United States vessels required to be used in programs with maritime nations which carried all or substantially all of the non-United States-flag tonnage in their own vessels. In the absence of the United States-flag requirement these countires could be expected to participate in the program without any financing of ocean freight by the United States.

In addition to financing the freight charges on United States-flag vessels required to be used, it is necessary for the United States to absorb the differential resulting from use of such vessels where shipment would be cheaper on foreign-flag vessels. On vessels approved during 1955 differentials amounting to about $3 million will have been paid by CCC. This amount will not be covered by foreign-currency payments of the importing countries.

Third, the cargo-preference requirement is hampering efforts to obtain trade liberalization on agricultural commodities. Many importing countries discriminate against imports of United States commodities through quotas, exchange controls, and other restrictions. The Departmnet of Agriculture is making a determined effort to obtain liberalization of such restrictions as part of its overall program to expand exports of United States farm commodities. Obviously, it is difficult for the United States to argue for the lifting of restrictions while imposing restrictions of its own. Maritime nations argue that the freedom of their merchant fleets to compete in the world market is as important to them as the freedom of our farmers to compete in the world market is to us.

Section 308. Surplus Disposal Administrator

Section 308 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to appoint an Agricultural Surplus Disposal Administrator at a salary rate of not exceeding $15,000 per annum. This authority is needed in order to secure the best qualified person available. Under present legislation, Department final authority to determine compensation for this position is limited to GS-15, with a base rate of $11,610. The possibilities of having the position established in GS-18 ($14,800) through Civil Service Commission channels are quite remote under present numerical restrictions of the Classification Act.

Section 309. State contribution in disaster relief

Section 309 of the bill provides that after March 1, 1957, the States must contribute at least 15 percent of the cost of feed or seed made available for disaster relief.

During the fiscal year 1955 there were two programs of this nature in effect. Under the 1955 emergency-feed program, eligible farmers received purchase orders enabling them to buy from established dealers at reduced prices, certain designated surplus feed grains, such as barley, corn, wheat, grain sorghums, and oats, or approved mixed feed containing a high percentage of the surplus feed grains. Dealers received a certificate representing the value of the reduction in the price of the feed and used it to buy replacement stocks which eventually came from CCC inventories. The cost of this program to the Government during the fiscal year 1955, represented by the value of CCC

inventories released in satisfaction of dealer's certificates was approximately $61,200,000. Had the States been required to contribute 15 percent of the cost of this program during the fiscal year 1955 their contribution would have amounted to $9,180,000. The emergency-feed program was operative as of January 31, 1956, in Colorado, Kansas, Nevada, North Carolina, Oregon, Texas, Utah, and Wyoming.

A second program conducted during the fiscal year involved the execution of agreements with States to assist them in furnishing hay to eligible farmers. Under these agreements the Department contributed a definite sum to the State to defray one-half the cost of transportation of the hay (not to exceed $10 per ton). The total of such contributions during the fiscal year 1955 was $4,684,839. Since the States assumed at least half of the transportation costs for hay, as well as the costs incident to the purchase and distribution of such hay, they would not have to make any additional contributions in a program such as this. North Carolina is the only State with which the Department has a hay agreement at the present time.

TITLE IV—MARKETING QUOTAS AND ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Section 401. Extension of surrender and reapportionment

Section 401 extends to the 1956 and 1957 crops of wheat the provisions of section 334 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, whereby wheat producers who do not plant all their wheat allotments can release the unused portion of the allotment. The amount released would be deducted from the allotment for the farm from which released and would be reapportioned by the county committee to other farms in the same county. If not needed in the county, the county committee could surrender the acreage to the State committee for the purposes of establishing new farm allotments. In establishing future allotments, acreages so released and reapportioned are credited to the releasing farms rather than to the farms to which surrendered. Provision for permanent release of allotments is made.

Since release and reapportionment to be effective must be accomplished prior to planting time, extension of the provision to cover the 1956 crop would be applicable only in areas where spring wheat is grown and not in areas where only winter wheat can be grown.

Section 402. Commercial wheat producing area

Section 402 would amend the provision in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 for determining the noncommercial wheat-producing area. Under present law any State may be excluded from the commercial wheat-producing area for any year if its State allotment for such year is determined to be 25,000 acres or less. As amended, the Secretary would be required to exclude any State from the commercial area for any year if the State allotment for the immediately preceding year is determined to be 240,000 acres or less. By basing the determination on the size of the allotment for the preceding year and making the action of the Secretary mandatory, States will be able to know well in advance whether they will be in the commercial area.

The States which would be included in the noncommercial wheat area under the proposal to include all States with 240,000 acres or less in the State wheat allotment, based on 1956 State wheat allotments, are as follows:

(a) 12 States included on the basis of the present "25,000 acres or less" provision:

	Acres
Alabama	14,505
Arizona	17,533
Connecticut	626
Florida	1,329
Louisiana	3,184
Maine	1,347
Massachusetts	687
Mississippi	21,143
Nevada	11,616
New Hampshire	71
Rhode Island	603
Vermont	432
Total	73,076

(b) 11 additional States which would become noncommercial under the proposed "240,000 acres or less" provision:

	Acres
Arkansas	47,433
Delaware	36,370
Georgia	105,624
Iowa	139,443
Kentucky	219,495
Maryland	187,546
New Jersey	55,141
South Carolina	133,488
Tennessee	199,261
West Virginia	42,956
Wisconsin	45,174
Total	1,211,931

The total 1956 allotment acreage involved in the proposed "240,000 acres or less" provision is 1,285,007 or 2.2 percent of the national allotment of 55 million acres. There follows a statement of the acreage allotments for the 36 States included in the commercial area under the "25,000 acres or less" provision:

1956 allotment

	Acres
Arkansas	47,433
California	455,719
Colorado	2,702,237
Delaware	36,370
Georgia	105,624
Idaho	1,159,816
Illinois	1,381,461
Indiana	1,166,484
Iowa	139,443
Kansas	10,587,206
Kentucky	219,495
Maryland	187,546
Michigan	969,478
Minnesota	726,503
Missouri	1,163,686
Montana	4,002,138
Nebraska	3,200,332
New Jersey	55,141
New Mexico	465,924
New York	312,175
North Carolina	283,395
North Dakota	7,321,263
Ohio	1,594,233
Oklahoma	4,860,057
Oregon	819,522
Pennsylvania	620,185
South Carolina	133,488
South Dakota	2,749,275
Tennessee	199,261
Texas	4,227,136
Utah	314,994
Virginia	261,043
Washington	2,009,033
West Virginia	42,956
Wisconsin	45,174
Wyoming	303,725
Total commercial area	54,871,924
Total noncommercial area	73,076
National reserve	55,000
Grand total	55,000,000

Section 403. Small farm allotments for cotton

Section 403 would amend section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for reserving not to exceed 1 percent of the national acreage allotment to assist in establishing minimum farm allotments. The State committee would be required to reserve as much as 3 percent of the State allotment, if needed, to supplement the acreage allocated to the State from the national reserve. Under existing law, the county allotment is used first to establish minimum farm allotments at the smaller of 5 acres of the highest acreage planted on the farm in the preceding 3 years, in all counties where farm allotments are established on the "cropland factor" basis and in other counties where allotments are established on the "historical" basis and the county committee elects to establish such minimum farm allotments. The proposed amendments to section 344 of the act would change the fixed acreage portion of the minimum allotment provision from 5 acres to 4 acres and would require minimum farm allotments to be established in all counties regardless of the allotment basis used. The Secretary would determine, on the basis of data available in connection with past allotment programs and such surveys as he deems necessary to obtain additional data on which to base estimates, the additional acreage which would be required to establish minimum farm allotments (assuming that allotments were first made on a cropland or history basis). The acreage so determined would be used as a basis for allocating the national acreage reserve to States and for allocating such reserve, as well as acreage from the State reserve for minimum allotments, to counties.

The national acreage allotment announced for the 1953 cotton crop is 17,391,304 acres. One percent of this total would be 173,913 acres.

Section 404. Minimum State acreage allotments for 1956 rice crop

Section 404 would amend section 353 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide minimum State rice acreage allotments for 1956 equal to 85 percent of the final allotment established for 1955. Any acreage apportioned to farms in the State from the national reserve acreage would be included in determining the minimum allotment. The final allotment for 1955 would include the State allotment originally determined plus the increased acreages allotted in the State through legislation enacted after State allotments were originally determined.

In States having county allotments the increase in State allotments would be apportioned among counties on the same basis as the State allotment had theretofore been apportioned among counties, but without regard to adjustments for trends in acreage.

The additional acreage apportioned to each State by this section is shown in the last column of the following table:

TABLE 9.—*Rice: Additional allotment acreage that would be apportioned to State under Sec. 404 of S. 3183*

State	Total rice acreage apportioned to State for 1955	85 percent of total rice acreage apportioned to State for 1955	Total rice acreage apportioned to State for 1956	Additional acreage required for 1956 to provide allotment equal to 85 percent of final allotment for 1955
Arkansas	453,850	385,772	399,084	0
California	352,729	299,820	297,174	2,646
Louisiana	558,934	475,094	465,773	9,321
Texas	496,929	422,390	421,360	1,030
Mississippi	54,921	46,683	46,267	416
Arizona	269	229	227	2
Florida	1,126	957	949	8
Illinois	24	20	20	0
Missouri	5,388	4,580	4,557	23
North Carolina	34	29	29	0
Oklahoma	175	149	147	2
South Carolina	3,350	2,847	2,783	64
Tennessee	605	514	517	0
United States total	1,928,334	1,639,084	1,638,887	13,512

Section 405. Preservation of unused acreage allotments

Section 405 would provide that with respect to the 1956 and subsequent crops of any commodity for which acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, were in effect, the entire acreage allotment for the farm would be considered for purposes of future farm acreage allotments as having been planted to the commodity in such year if the owner or operator of the farm notified the county committee prior to the 60th day preceding the beginning of the marketing year of his desire to preserve the farm acreage allotment of the commodity. This provision would not be applicable to any farm on which no acreage of the commodity was planted for 4 successive years or in any case in which the amount of the commodity of any previous crop stored to postpone or avoid payment of penalty had been reduced because the allotment was not fully planted. No other farm would be permitted to use the acreage of which notice was given under the section.

TITLE V—RICE

Section 501. Two-price plan for rice

Section 501 provides that the national acreage allotment of rice for 1957 shall not be less than the national acreage allotment for 1956, including any acreage allotted under section 404 of the bill. The 1957 allotment will be apportioned among the States in the same proportion as in 1956. The effect of this provision on 1957 State acreage allotments is shown in the last two columns of the following table.

TABLE 10.—*Rice: Indicated 1957 State acreage allotments under S. 3183 as compared with indicated 1957 State allotments under the present law and 1956 State allotments now in effect*

State	1956 State acreage allotment	Additional acreage apportioned to State from 1956 national reserve	Total acreage apportioned to State for 1956	Total acreage apportioned to State for 1956, adjusted for increase under sec. 404 of S. 3183	Indicated 1957 State allotment under present law [1]	Indicated 1957 State allotment under S. 3183
Arkansas	399,084	0	399,084	399,084	402,852	399,084
California	297,100	74	297,174	299,820	296,691	299,820
Louisiana	460,704	5,069	465,773	475,094	463,416	475,094
Texas	421,360	0	421,360	422,390	419,479	422,390
Mississippi	41,422	4,845	46,267	46,683	42,555	46,683
Arizona	10	217	227	229		229
Florida	887	62	949	957	888	957
Illinois	11	9	20	20	14	20
Missouri	3,673	884	4,557	4,580	4,005	4,580
North Carolina	27	2	29	29	23	29
Oklahoma	38	109	147	149	63	149
South Carolina	1,958	825	2,783	2,847	2,040	2,847
Tennessee	517	0	517	517	502	517
Total, United States	1,626,791	12,096	1,638,887	1,652,399	1,632,528	1,652,399
National reserve	12,293	(197)	(197)	(197)	[2] 6,556	(197)
National allotment	1,639,084	12,293	1,639,084	1,652,596	1,639,084	1,652,596

[1] Assuming the national acreage allotment to be the same as in effect for 1956 and the 1956 planted and diverted acreage of rice to be the same as determined for 1955.

[2] To be apportioned among the minor rice-producing States receiving inadequate State or county allotments such as Mississippi, Missouri, South Carolina, etc.

Two-price plan

Eection 501 also provides for a 2-price plan for rice of the 1956 and 1957 crops. A primary market quota for rice is to be determined and proclaimed by the Secretary of Agriculture for each marketing year. This primary market quota is to be determined on the basis of the quantity of processed rice (expressed in terms of hundredweights of rough rice) which the Secretary determines will be consumed in the United States (including its Territories and possessions and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) or exported to Cuba during the marketing year, taking into consideration the historical consumption of United States rice in these markets and any expected increase in consumption. In determining the primary quota, rough rice used for feed or seed would be excluded, since it is not intended that the primary quota would include rice which is not milled. For 1956, the primary market quota is to be apportioned among the States on the basis of the 1955 production of rice in each State. For 1957, the primary market quota is to be apportioned among the States on the basis of the average yield per acre of rice in each State during 1955 and 1956, multiplied by the acreage allotment for the State. Each State quota is to be apportioned among farms in the State on the basis of the acreage allotment established for each farm, multiplied by the normal yield per acre for the farm. The estimated 1956 primary market quota and its apportionment among the States is shown in the following tables:

TABLE 11.—*United States milled rice consumed in primary markets (on rough-rice basis)*

[Thousand 100-pound bags]

Marketing year	Food	Industry	Total consumed	Exports to Cuba	Total primary market
1950–51	18,252	4,866	23,118	10,066	33,184
1951–52	16,756	4,750	21,506	7,131	28,637
1952–53	17,750	4,577	22,327	7,039	29,366
1953–54	17,950	4,560	22,510	6,850	29,360
1954–55	18,000	5,700	23,700	4,914	28,614
1955–56 [1]	18,500	5,500	24,000	4,748	28,748
1956–57 [2]	18,500	5,700	24,200	4,750	28,950

[1] Preliminary. [2] Estimated.

TABLE 12.—*Rice: Apportionment of the estimated 1956 primary market quota among the several States*

[100-pound bags]

State	1955 production [1]	1956 State primary quota
Arkansas	12,694,000	6,854,007
California	11,694,000	6,039,777

[1] Production for the 5 major rice-producing States are official estimates of the Department of Agriculture while production for the 7 minor States was determined by multiplying the 1955 measured acreage in each such State by the 1955 State average yield per acre as reported by the Southern Rice Millers Association.

TABLE 12.—*Rice: Apportionment of the estimated 1956 primary market quota among the several States*—Continued

[100-pound bags]

State	1955 production	1956 State primary quota
Louisiana	13,150,000	7,100,220
Texas	14,880,000	8,034,318
Mississippi	1,510,000	815,310
Arizona		
Florida	16,750	9,044
Illinois	550	297
Missouri	120,350	64,982
North Carolina	350	189
Oklahoma	3,900	2,106
South Carolina	43,400	23,433
Tennessee	11,700	6,317
United States total	53,617,000	28,950,000

Price support will be made available by Commodity Credit Corporation to cooperators through loans, purchases, or other operations on the 1956 crop of rice at 55 percent of the parity price of rice as of the beginning of the marketing year. On the 1957 crop, the level of support is to be at such level as the Secretary of Agriculture determines will not discourage or prevent exportation of rice produced in the United States, but such level is not to be less than 50 percent nor more than 90 percent of the parity price.

Certificates will be issued by the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperators each marketing year for farms having primary market quotas. Such certificates will be issued for a quantity of rice equal to the primary market quota for the farm but not more than the normal yield for the acreage planted to rice on the farm. The value of each certificate will be equal to the difference between 90 percent of the parity price of rice as of the beginning of the marketing year and the level of price support for rice for such marketing year (to be calculated to the nearest cent) multiplied by the quantity of rice for which the certificate is issued. The landlord and his tenants or sharecroppers will share in the certificates in the same proportion as they share in the rice produced on the farm or the proceeds therefrom. Commodity Credit Corporation will redeem at its value any certificate not used to cover the processing or importation of rice.

Assuming the parity price of rice on August 1, 1956 (the beginning of the 1956–57 marketing year), to be the same as the January 15, 1956, parity price of $5.42 per hundredweight, the unit value of the certificate for 1956 crop rice would be computed as the difference between $2.98 per hundredweight (55 percent of parity), and $4.88 per hundredweight (90 percent of parity), or $1.90 per hundredweight.

Beginning August 1, 1956, each person processing rough rice in the United States (excluding Puerto Rican or Hawaiian rice processed in Puerto Rico or Hawaii) will be required to acquire certificates in an amount sufficient to cover the quantity of rough rice processed. Each person importing processed rice into the United States on or after August 1, 1956, will also be required to acquire certificates covering the rough rice equivalent of such processed rice. Such certificates may be acquired from producers by the processor or importer, or he may purchase certificates from Commodity Credit Corporation. Upon the exportation to any country other than Cuba of processed rice with respect to which certificates were acquired, Commodity Credit Corporation will pay the exporter an amount equal to the value of the certificates for the rough rice equivalent of the processed rice.

The provisions of this section will not be applicable to nonirrigated rice produced on any farm on which the acreage planted to

nonirrigated rice does not exceed 3 acres or to rice grown in Puerto Rico or Hawaii.

Inventory adjustment payments

In order to facilitate the transition to the two-price plan, inventory adjustment payments will be made to all persons owning rough rice located in the continental United States as of July 31, 1956, except that payments will not be made with respect to 1956-crop rice, imported rice, or rice acquired from Commodity Credit Corporation. Such payments will be in amounts equal to 35 percent (the difference between 90 and 55 percent) of the parity price of rice as of August 1, 1956, multiplied by the quantities of such rough rice. An appropriation to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for such payments is authorized.

Transfer of rice to the set-aside

The Secretary is given discretionary authority to transfer to the commodity set-aside, established pursuant to section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1954, all rough and processed rice in the inventories of Commodity Credit Corporation as of 60 days after the beginning of the 1956 marketing year for rice, not exceeding 20 million hundredweight of rough rice or its equivalent in processed rice.

The proportion of United States rice used for domestic consumption and export is shown by the following table:

TABLE 13.—*Rice: Percentage, domestic consumption and exports (in rough rice equivalent) is of total production during the marketing years 1939–40 through 1955–56*

Marketing year	Production [1]	Domestic consumption		Exports	
		Total	Percent of production	Total	Percent of production
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1939–40	24,328	20,046	82.4	4,484	18.4
1940–41	24,495	21,138	86.3	5,651	23.1
1941–42	23,095	19,571	84.7	6,552	28.4
1942–43	29,082	20,266	69.7	6,961	23.9
1943–44	29,264	21,316	72.8	7,069	24.2
1944–45	30,974	20,001	64.6	10,201	32.9
1945–46	30,668	19,613	64.0	11,469	37.4
1946–47	32,497	20,162	62.0	12,291	37.8
1947–48	35,217	22,037	62.6	13,055	37.1
1948–49	38,275	22,092	57.7	14,378	37.6
1949–50	40,784	23,423	57.4	16,224	39.8
1950–51	38,757	25,693	66.3	13,167	34.0
1951–52	45,853	24,121	52.6	24,058	52.5
1952–53	48,260	25,121	52.1	25,122	52.1
1953–54	52,761	25,764	48.8	22,708	43.0
1954–55	64,414	27,839	43.2	14,385	22.3
1955–56 [2]	53,617	27,917	52.1	23,000	42.9

[1] Production for the marketing years 1949–50 through 1955–56 includes estimated production in the minor rice-producing States.
[2] Preliminary.

TITLE VI—FORESTRY PROVISIONS

Tree planting and reforestation

Section 601 provides for assistance to States for tree planting and reforestation. The objective of this section is to step up nationwide the present rate of reforestation on all land in need of such planting irrespective of ownership. This would be accomplished through a cooperative plan of action between the individual States and the Secretary of Agriculture. The plan would originate in the States through the State foresters or equivalent State officials and after approval by the Secretary would be put into effect by a State agency. The major provisions of this section would:

1. Establish a policy of Congress that the Secretary of Agriculture should assist the States in undertaking needed programs of tree planting.

2. Permit a State to draw up a plan of reforestation that would further this purpose and submit such plan to the Secretary of Agriculture for his consideration and approval.

3. When the Secretary has approved the plan, authorize and direct him to assist the State in carrying out the plan which assistance may include furnishing advice, technical assistance and financial contributions up to an amount equal to the State expenditure for the same purpose during the same fiscal year.

4. Require the Secretary to obtain cooperation and assistance of other Federal agencies and the appropriate State foresters in the approval and carrying out of the plan when it includes forest lands under such other Federal agencies' jurisdiction.

The committee believes that more money should be made available for tree planting and recommends that the Appropriations Committees consider providing $50 million to carry out the provisions of this section.

Forest products

Section 602 provides for price reporting and research with respect to forest products. This section would direct the Secretary to: (1) establish a price reporting service for basic forest products such as standing timber, sawlogs, and pulpwood; (2) conduct and stimulate research aimed at developing the efficiency of marketing forest products; and (3) study price trends and relationships for basic forest products and within 2 years report thereon to the Congress.

TAX DELINQUENCIES

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on June 2, 1955, I incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report furnished by the Treasury Department showing the total tax delinquencies as of December 31, 1954, in the amount of $1,614,494,280.

At the same time I incorporated in the RECORD a statistical breakdown by districts, amount and type of tax, and the number of accounts involved in each instance.

This was the first inventory which had formation, and it had been complied upon my request on the basis that such ever been assembled providing such information should be assembled annually in order that the Treasury Department and the country would know the extent of these outstanding obligations, as well as the progress being made toward their collection. It would also help the Department to spot the trouble areas in their agency by showing which offices and which regions were making progress or losing ground.

I have just received the second annual report, which shows that the total delinquencies as of December 31, 1955, are $1,646,383,974.

This represents an increase of $31.9 million over the same comparable statistics for December 31, 1954.

The Department does claim that this increase is somewhat offset by the fact that it has reduced by nearly $200 million the number of accounts remaining to be assigned to the field; however, it should be noted that in using the same comparable figures for comparison, the total delinquencies as of December 31, 1955, were $31.9 million greater than the number in the preceding year.

I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a copy of the Department's letter of February 20, 1956, followed by the insertion of two charts, exhibits No. 1 and 2.

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

UNITED STATES TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 20, 1956.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In accordance with my letter to you of February 1, 1956, there are enclosed tabulations of all accounts as of December 31, 1955, which were delinquent and which have been formally transferred to our field collection force for collection action. Exhibit No. 1 shows that as of December 31, 1955, we had a total of 1,596,615 delinquent accounts in the amount of $1,646,383,974 in this status. These accounts were divided in the following general categories of tax:

Class of tax	Number	Amount
Income tax	1,139,658	$1,268,101,723
Employment tax	399,269	284,803,237
All other	57,688	93,479,014
Total	1,596,615	1,646,383,974

The tabulations we furnished you as of December 31, 1954, broke the accounts into seven categories of tax. These consisted of the following: Individual income, corporation income, taxes withheld, excise taxes, estate and gift taxes, unemployment taxes, and carriers taxes. During the past year, in order to simplify our reporting load, we consolidated these 7 categories into the 3 listed above. Under income tax, we have included the individual income and corporation income taxes; under employment tax, we have included taxes withheld, unemployment and carriers taxes; and under all other, we have included the excise taxes and estate and gift taxes.

In addition to the delinquent accounts which have been formally transferred to the field collection force for collection action, we had on hand on December 31, 1955, 26,853 accounts in the amount of $12.9 million which were of delinquent age but which had not been transferred to the field collection force.

Exhibit No. 2 shows the number of delinquent accounts that have been transferred to the field collection force that are in an inactive status. These are accounts on which collection activity has been deferred pending the outcome of court decision, audit examination or other contingent action. Of the total delinquent accounts in the hands of the field collection force, 14 percent or 222,845 are such inactive accounts, representing $667,437,626, or 40.5 percent of the total delinquent tax liability. On these accounts collection action is not being pursued pending consummation of the contingent action.

During the year the number of delinquent accounts assigned to our field collection force was reduced by 128,859 (from 1,725,474 to 1,596,615), but the amount outstanding increased approximately $31.9 million (from $1,614.5 million to $1,646.4 million). On the surface, in respect to the amount outstanding, this would indicate an unfavorable trend. However, considerable progress is in-

dicated when consideration is given to the following:

1. While the amount outstanding on accounts assigned to the field collection force increased by $31.9 million, the increase occurred in our inactive category, as illustrated by the following table:

Delinquent accounts assigned to field collection force

[Amounts in millions]

As of—	Active		Inactive		Total	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Dec. 31, 1954	1,448,888	$1,062.3	276,586	$552.2	1,725,474	$1,614.5
Dec. 31, 1955	1,373,770	979.0	222,845	667.4	1,596,615	1,646.4
Difference	−75,118	−83.3	−53,741	+115.2	−128,859	+31.9

2. A substantial reduction was made in the number of accounts which were of delinquent age but which had not been transferred to the field collection force. This number was decreased from 382,510 accounts in the amount of $207.1 million as of December 31, 1954, to 26,853 accounts in the amount of $12.9 million as of December 31, 1955. Simply stated, there has been a net reduction of 484,516 delinquent accounts in the amount of $162.3 million during calendar year 1955, as shown in the table which follows:

Delinquent accounts	Number	Amount
On hand, Dec. 31, 1954:		*Millions*
Assigned to field collection force	1,725,474	$1,614.5
To be assigned to field collection force	382,510	207.1
Total	2,107,984	1,821.6
On hand, Dec. 31, 1955:		
Assigned to field collection force	1,596,615	1,646.4
To be assigned to field collection force	26,853	12.9
Total	1,623,468	1,659.3
Net reduction	484,516	162.3

Very truly yours,

O. GORDON DELK,
Deputy Commissioner.

EXHIBIT 1.—*Taxpayer delinquent accounts by type of tax, quarterly (December 1955) inventory*

[Source: Form 1955 Detail Sheets, December 1955]

Regions	Income tax, taxpayer delinquent accounts on hand		Employment tax, taxpayer delinquent accounts on hand		All other, taxpayer delinquent accounts on hand		Total	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
101 Atlanta:								
102 Atlanta	17,784	$12,936,603.26	5,889	$3,572,771.07	1,306	$2,300,004.85	24,979	$18,809,469.18
103 Birmingham	11,476	13,993,164.32	3,655	1,965,215.06	872	1,678,440.28	16,003	17,636,819.66
104 Columbia	8,700	5,119,028.20	3,318	822,119.84	954	570,281.24	12,972	6,511,429.28
105 Greensboro	10,310	18,145,271.06	4,318	1,998,267.92	1,059	875,141.11	15,687	21,018,680.09
106 Jackson	3,351	1,874,233.74	1,526	596,553.02	354	487,144.53	5,231	2,957,931.29
107 Jacksonville	21,291	40,704,504.77	8,239	4,996,151.87	1,388	3,661,040.47	30,918	49,361,697.11
108 Nashville	9,133	11,096,319.81	3,181	1,601,697.63	657	521,994.88	12,971	13,220,012.32
Total	82,045	103,869,215.16	30,126	15,552,776.41	6,590	10,094,047.36	118,761	129,516,038.93
201 Boston:								
209 Augusta	1,751	1,360,301.41	1,119	489,363.35	148	66,296.52	3,018	1,915,961.28
210 Boston	27,307	26,532,013.87	11,122	10,000,411.94	1,294	1,302,930.45	39,723	37,835,356.26
211 Burlington	713	180,911.18	441	145,096.27	91	83,963.04	1,245	409,970.49
212 Hartford	15,627	11,478,332.91	5,079	3,298,977.26	513	570,825.76	21,219	15,348,135.93
213 Portsmouth	1,432	1,744,258.25	840	310,676.22	75	124,096.57	2,347	2,179,031.04
214 Providence	4,612	5,892,874.38	1,259	894,222.10	114	386,708.77	5,985	7,173,805.25
Total	51,442	47,188,692.00	19,860	15,138,747.14	2,235	2,534,821.11	73,537	64,862,260.25
301 Chicago:								
315 Chicago	93,511	64,654,342.36	22,891	15,915,033.71	3,420	7,274,133.27	119,822	87,843,509.34
316 Detroit	63,011	55,281,810.11	16,325	10,808,182.55	2,233	2,814,232.78	81,569	68,904,225.44
317 Milwaukee	10,145	13,448,227.83	3,781	2,087,500.52	396	743,876.44	14,322	16,279,604.79
318 Springfield	8,859	6,048,445.22	3,381	1,627,535.26	645	1,047,875.59	12,885	8,723,856.07
Total	175,526	139,432,825.52	46,378	30,438,252.04	6,694	11,880,118.08	228,598	181,751,195.64
401 Cincinnati:								
419 Cincinnati	20,348	9,541,182.70	3,630	1,947,441.26	445	1,197,285.25	24,423	12,685,909.21
420 Cleveland	36,632	28,109,544.75	8,720	5,523,283.73	1,194	1,915,010.25	46,546	35,547,838.73
421 Columbus	9,543	5,807,403.95	1,290	657,347.06	177	160,050.14	11,010	6,624,801.15
422 Indianapolis	16,768	16,103,896.72	4,767	2,953,720.13	738	1,702,634.07	22,273	20,760,250.92
423 Louisville	9,258	11,067,358.51	2,934	1,228,281.32	771	877,329.31	12,963	13,172,969.14
424 Parkersburg	8,398	8,979,751.48	2,257	1,376,158.66	439	271,193.30	11,094	10,627,103.44
425 Richmond	23,065	17,529,876.86	5,147	2,663,135.29	1,120	1,688,817.26	29,332	21,881,829.41
426 Toledo	3,976	2,421,443.93	785	393,421.06	94	82,108.95	4,855	2,896,973.94
Total	127,988	99,560,458.90	29,530	16,742,788.51	4,978	7,894,428.53	162,496	124,197,675.94
501 Dallas:								
527 Albuquerque	2,774	1,843,031.53	1,994	853,894.55	310	263,803.54	5,078	2,960,729.62
528 Austin	11,018	9,088,606.03	6,580	2,702,774.57	793	962,625.15	18,391	12,754,005.75
529 Dallas	14,738	11,780,058.08	6,816	3,608,220.71	866	948,788.69	22,420	16,337,067.48
530 Little Rock	2,678	1,674,826.09	1,259	319,961.69	245	113,650.40	4,182	2,108,438.18
531 New Orleans	9,097	9,531,536.77	4,261	2,260,578.68	867	1,821,473.72	14,225	13,613,589.17
532 Oklahoma City	5,803	6,619,900.95	3,123	1,825,878.19	529	975,285.27	9,455	9,421,064.41
Total	46,108	40,537,959.45	24,033	11,571,308.39	3,610	5,085,626.77	73,751	57,194,894.61
601 New York City:								
633 Albany	8,822	7,241,533.66	4,770	3,454,402.53	654	578,994.65	14,246	11,274,930.84
634 Brooklyn	59,960	101,497,850.39	37,482	24,523,884.76	3,490	7,318,051.77	100,932	133,339,786.92
635 Buffalo	12,830	8,525,442.69	4,756	2,916,655.39	617	616,219.15	18,203	12,058,317.23
636 Lower Manhattan	25,056	143,922,610.48	25,952	20,573,162.41	2,333	4,981,076.42	53,341	169,476,849.31
698 Puerto Rico	1,391	306,561.69	1,853	252,580.38	5	63,102.58	3,249	622,244.65
638 Syracuse	6,275	3,391,748.40	2,565	1,664,304.71	468	339,795.74	9,308	5,395,848.85
637 Upper Manhattan	72,545	151,566,563.70	31,922	32,691,187.54	5,100	10,841,024.02	109,567	195,098,775.26
Total	186,879	416,452,311.01	109,300	86,076,177.72	12,667	24,738,264.33	308,846	527,266,753.06
701 Omaha:								
739 Aberdeen	1,765	1,267,833.94	604	248,973.89	119	97,169.23	2,488	1,613,977.06
740 Cheyenne	1,309	674,142.90	727	256,547.69	179	413,539.81	2,215	1,344,230.40
741 Denver	6,245	5,921,413.58	3,056	1,642,399.55	447	396,857.75	9,748	7,960,670.88
742 Des Moines	3,317	7,199,169.93	1,596	749,072.00	294	251,940.91	5,207	8,200,182.84
743 Fargo	895	636,150.12	578	217,937.13	134	157,049.40	1,607	1,011,136.65
744 Kansas City	5,326	7,963,158.06	2,030	1,146,641.36	259	323,677.84	7,615	9,433,477.26
745 Omaha	1,901	2,582,942.88	638	480,083.97	158	301,419.06	2,697	3,364,445.91

EXHIBIT 1.—*Taxpayer delinquent accounts by type of tax, quarterly (December 1955) inventory*—Continued

[Source: Form 1955 Detail Sheets, December 1955]

Regions	Income tax, taxpayer delinquent accounts on hand		Employment tax, taxpayer delinquent accounts on hand		All other, taxpayer delinquent accounts on hand		Total	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Omaha—Continued								
746 St. Louis	6,958	$8,407,369.43	2,686	$1,323,248.26	355	$355,033.21	9,999	$10,085,650.90
747 St. Paul	6,019	6,126,248.49	3,110	2,093,897.27	487	1,050,554.65	9,616	9,270,700.41
748 Wichita	6,986	5,481,358.34	2,912	1,018,508.27	381	257,992.29	10,279	6,757,858.90
Total	40,721	46,259,787.67	17,937	9,177,309.39	2,813	3,605,234.15	61,471	59,042,331.21
801 Philadelphia:								
849 Baltimore	84,492	54,989,772.38	9,577	5,773,385.50	1,792	1,734,066.57	95,861	62,497,224.45
850 Camden	12,727	13,211,643.15	3,684	2,657,984.25	547	1,027,080.35	16,958	16,896,707.75
851 Newark	58,625	51,713,451.67	23,673	22,244,526.78	2,585	5,835,964.16	84,883	79,793,942.61
852 Philadelphia	66,620	53,746,591.42	17,918	17,060,134.24	3,056	3,937,611.07	87,594	74,744,336.73
853 Pittsburgh	26,882	23,957,182.16	6,651	5,079,938.43	1,358	1,107,207.14	34,891	30,144,327.73
854 Scranton	4,739	4,614,994.23	1,743	2,324,223.08	177	294,050.88	6,659	7,233,268.19
855 Wilmington	3,834	3,117,064.18	683	327,924.93	69	194,939.62	4,586	3,639,928.73
Total	257,919	205,350,699.19	63,929	55,468,117.21	9,584	14,130,919.79	331,432	274,949,736.19
901 San Francisco:								
956 Boise	1,682	1,405,988.43	1,099	472,819.51	168	109,486.17	2,949	1,988,294.11
957 Helena	1,930	1,961,348.95	831	333,265.41	151	280,889.25	2,912	2,575,503.61
958 Honolulu	2,399	3,266,212.22	1,196	876,086.14	240	203,320.95	3,835	4,345,619.31
959 Los Angeles	79,839	57,859,349.68	22,429	19,796,004.78	2,771	6,113,982.52	105,039	83,679,336.98
960 Phoenix	4,696	3,502,403.19	2,059	1,327,348.74	268	228,005.77	7,023	5,057,757.70
961 Portland	7,134	9,027,537.39	3,950	2,281,809.97	552	1,119,794.93	11,636	12,429,142.29
962 Reno	2,394	4,836,130.51	1,195	1,470,181.47	193	391,641.58	3,782	6,697,953.56
963 Salt Lake City	2,985	2,584,690.27	1,491	809,124.82	192	167,038.32	4,668	3,560,853.41
964 San Francisco	52,516	73,660,760.70	17,509	11,951,569.42	3,220	3,370,887.18	73,245	88,983,217.30
965 Seattle	15,455	11,345,352.83	6,417	5,409,549.97	762	1,530,507.05	22,634	18,285,409.85
Total	171,030	169,449,774.17	58,176	44,637,760.23	8,517	13,515,553.72	237,723	227,603,088.12
Grand total	1,139,658	1,268,101,723.07	399,269	284,803,237.04	57,688	93,479,013.84	1,596,615	1,646,383,973.95

EXHIBIT 2.—*Analysis of taxpayer delinquent accounts in DARB pending on Dec. 31, 1955*

Regions	Military cases				Foreign cases				Proof of claim cases				Audit adjustment cases			
	Number of cases	Percent	Amount	Percent	Number of cases	Percent	Amount	Percent	Number of cases	Percent	Amount	Percent	Number of cases	Percent	Amount	Percent
101 Atlanta:																
102 Atlanta	1,450	44.4	$146,443	2.1	4	0.1	$1,365	------	847	25.9	$2,806,272	40.5	405	12.4	$895,813	12.9
103 Birmingham	1,320	38.1	123,867	1.2	8	.2	1,583	------	1,278	36.8	972,667	9.2	163	4.7	4,067,815	38.5
104 Columbia	694	43.8	57,408	2.1	4	.3	1,140	------	379	23.9	468,821	16.9	133	8.4	145,290	5.2
105 Greensboro	1,803	41.4	156,870	1.0	11	.3	2,081	------	594	13.6	620,104	3.9	655	15.0	474,386	2.9
106 Jackson	417	53.6	38,667	3.7	3	.4	450	------	171	22.0	253,730	24.5	51	6.6	19,550	1.9
107 Jacksonville	1,253	30.3	144,972	.8	15	.4	6,592	------	1,710	41.3	5,415,021	29.0	532	12.9	540,465	2.9
108 Nashville	1,281	43.4	119,102	2.7	8	.3	2,030	------	636	21.6	1,481,875	33.9	441	14.9	510,334	11.7
Total	8,218	40.0	787,329	1.3	53	.3	15,241	------	5,615	27.3	12,018,490	19.9	2,380	11.6	6,653,653	11.0
201 Boston:																
209 Augusta	211	35.6	17,540	1.5	6	1.0	688	0.1	237	40.0	176,747	15.1	63	10.6	285,602	24.5
210 Boston	1,240	17.5	103,965	.6	8	.1	2,497	------	2,741	38.8	5,956,663	36.7	1,278	18.1	889,993	5.5
211 Burlington	53	29.6	4,557	2.9	2	1.1	319	.2	65	36.3	95,600	61.4	29	16.2	43,302	27.8
212 Hartford	327	12.2	28,084	.4	9	.3	5,598	.1	556	20.8	905,095	11.8	632	23.6	1,838,931	23.9
213 Portsmouth	216	34.2	16,352	1.0	4	.6	3,026	.2	154	24.4	136,438	8.4	101	16.0	46,872	2.9
214 Providence	674	45.8	58,454	1.6	------	------	------	------	492	33.4	1,093,785	29.0	81	5.5	34,354	.9
Total	2,721	21.6	228,952	.7	29	.2	12,128	------	4,245	33.6	8,364,328	27.3	2,184	17.3	3,139,054	10.2
301 Chicago:																
315 Chicago	6,628	27.3	364,181	1.0	------	------	------	------	2,545	10.5	12,867,464	36.8	12,095	49.8	9,789,444	28.0
316 Detroit	2,581	29.1	223,866	.7	50	.6	82,716	.3	2,001	22.5	7,028,103	21.6	2,717	30.6	17,787,296	54.7
317 Milwaukee	680	20.6	58,125	.6	11	.3	1,835	------	1,178	35.7	3,569,273	36.3	1,082	32.8	1,617,035	16.5
318 Springfield	1,757	46.6	140,947	3.4	4	.1	1,169	------	668	17.7	1,122,224	27.0	908	24.1	671,008	16.1
Total	11,646	28.9	787,119	1.0	65	.2	85,720	.1	6,392	15.9	24,587,064	30.2	16,802	41.8	29,864,783	36.6
401 Cincinnati:																
419 Cincinnati	532	30.6	51,652	.9	4	.2	2,792	------	545	31.3	1,078,529	19.0	320	18.4	194,503	3.4
420 Cleveland	1,329	22.0	119,967	.7	47	.8	123,105	.8	1,731	28.6	3,950,882	21.6	2,226	36.8	3,918,354	21.4
421 Columbus	640	46.5	56,250	2.9	1	.1	117	------	416	30.3	734,506	37.6	180	13.1	100,392	5.1
422 Indianapolis	2,941	63.5	264,751	1.9	12	.3	4,721	------	745	16.1	2,421,302	17.6	223	4.8	2,723,950	19.8
423 Louisville	1,174	30.2	145,183	1.7	------	------	------	------	485	12.5	1,950,108	23.3	1,859	47.9	2,790,092	33.4
424 Parkersburg	1,183	56.3	105,372	1.8	11	.5	9,172	.2	520	24.8	1,233,471	21.6	194	9.2	2,853,307	50.0
425 Richmond	1,091	35.3	107,784	1.2	7	.2	3,127	------	775	25.1	3,298,738	37.1	541	17.5	218,396	2.5
426 Toledo	383	46.7	35,592	2.0	1	.1	65	------	199	24.3	452,968	26.0	131	16.0	52,312	2.9
Total	9,273	39.2	886,551	1.4	83	.4	143,099	.2	5,416	22.9	15,120,504	23.5	5,674	24.0	12,851,306	19.9
501 Dallas:																
527 Albuquerque	147	24.7	13,011	1.7	6	1.0	3,022	.4	220	37.0	182,679	23.8	87	14.6	174,880	22.8
528 Austin	920	36.2	83,233	1.9	42	1.7	29,451	.7	413	16.3	816,511	18.4	569	22.4	477,463	10.8
529 Dallas	1,498	49.9	127,482	2.4	15	.5	16,199	.3	331	11.0	2,340,432	43.3	590	19.7	833,295	15.4
530 Little Rock	398	37.6	34,958	3.8	3	.3	464	.1	182	18.6	149,187	16.4	277	28.3	175,361	19.2
531 New Orleans	359	13.6	38,040	.5	10	.4	7,656	.1	672	25.4	1,297,758	16.7	805	30.4	749,597	9.7
532 Oklahoma City	377	25.3	34,689	.8	19	1.3	99,411	2.2	374	25.1	497,431	10.9	200	13.4	442,721	9.7
Total	3,669	32.6	331,413	1.4	95	.8	156,203	.7	2,192	19.5	5,283,998	22.2	2,528	22.5	2,853,317	12.0
601 New York City:																
633 Albany	508	25.8	43,187	1.2	32	1.6	74,716	2.0	639	32.4	995,872	27.3	324	16.4	133,977	3.7
634 Brooklyn	636	11.0	61,999	.2	------	------	------	------	1,174	20.4	8,725,620	32.1	1,637	28.4	2,267,915	8.3
635 Buffalo	137	9.5	12,451	.3	13	.9	2,984	.1	542	37.4	699,250	17.4	315	21.7	127,704	3.2

EXHIBIT 2.—*Analysis of taxpayer delinquent accounts in DARB pending on Dec. 31, 1955*—Continued

	Regions	Military cases				Foreign cases				Proof of claim cases				Audit adjustment cases			
		Number of cases	Percent	Amount	Percent	Number of cases	Percent	Amount	Percent	Number of cases	Percent	Amount	Percent	Number of cases	Percent	Amount	Percent
	New York City—Continued																
636	Lower Manhattan	171	3.0	$23,847	------	19	.3	$132,373	.2	3,084	53.8	$14,787,874	25.1	303	5.3	$7,629,965	12.9
698	Puerto Rico	29	4.0	3,064	1.0	4	.5	1,377	.4	151	20.6	87,910	28.1	506	68.9	89,889	28.7
638	Syracuse	525	35.7	49,057	2.0	9	.6	1,595	.1	395	26.9	1,381,967	56.4	210	14.3	185,882	7.6
637	Upper Manhattan	198	1.3	16,613	------	47	.3	844,379	1.3	4,640	31.4	24,279,268	36.1	5,404	36.6	12,761,782	19.0
	Total	2,204	6.9	210,218	.1	124	.4	1,057,424	.6	10,625	33.3	50,957,761	31.1	8,699	27.3	23,197,114	14.1
701	Omaha:																
739	Aberdeen	317	63.4	26,952	7.2	1	.2	34	------	6	1.2	2,347	.6	75	15.0	67,799	18.0
740	Cheyenne	79	21.5	6,562	1.1	8	2.2	5,339	.9	97	26.4	95,703	16.4	102	27.7	355,355	60.7
741	Denver	249	19.1	25,525	.6	6	.5	1,113	------	256	19.6	383,297	9.6	363	27.8	1,059,779	26.5
742	Des Moines	380	33.5	35,091	.7	6	.5	896	------	295	26.0	579,705	10.8	159	14.0	1,608,086	30.0
743	Fargo	94	37.6	7,001	2.0	------	------	------	------	35	14.0	59,638	16.7	48	19.2	76,598	21.5
744	Kansas City	244	15.7	20,002	.3	1	.1	233	------	498	32.1	428,300	7.4	526	33.9	3,136,603	54.5
745	Omaha	214	28.9	17,948	.7	1	.1	403	------	98	13.2	325,607	12.8	245	33.1	333,405	13.1
746	St. Louis	352	23.4	29,764	.5	2	.1	136	------	394	26.2	1,908,242	33.1	357	23.7	986,942	17.1
747	St. Paul	403	21.0	43,135	1.0	28	1.5	11,292	.3	683	35.7	1,283,703	30.0	369	19.3	531,809	12.4
748	Wichita	525	30.2	53,094	1.3	6	.3	2,764	.1	445	25.6	447,759	10.7	389	22.4	2,357,766	56.3
	Total	2,857	25.9	265,074	.8	59	.5	22,210	.1	2,807	25.5	5,514,301	16.6	2,633	23.9	10,514,142	31.7
801	Philadelphia:																
849	Baltimore	6,682	46.6	862,484	2.6	3,417	23.8	2,496,420	7.5	1,911	13.3	20,592,461	62.2	1,273	58.9	1,921,275	5.8
850	Camden	427	30.0	36,802	.4	11	.8	2,053	------	271	19.0	202,744	2.0	360	25.3	6,366,492	62.3
851	Newark	936	14.1	94,512	.4	24	.4	11,594	------	1,906	28.8	8,875,138	32.9	693	10.5	1,241,357	4.6
852	Philadelphia	2,471	27.6	220,299	.9	23	.3	117,651	.5	2,173	24.2	9,054,038	36.3	3,017	33.6	3,724,791	14.9
853	Pittsburgh	1,013	32.5	82,893	.5	124	4.0	16,166	.1	779	25.0	2,368,721	14.3	464	14.9	1,185,277	7.1
854	Scranton	590	41.1	52,874	1.4	2	.1	2,066	.1	241	16.8	746,107	19.7	310	21.6	395,523	10.5
855	Wilmington	42	12.4	3,195	.2	------	------	------	------	73	21.5	694,172	40.2	144	42.4	53,661	3.1
	Total	12,161	33.5	1,353,059	1.2	3,601	9.9	2,645,950	2.3	7,354	20.3	42,533,381	36.3	6,261	17.3	14,888,376	12.7
901	San Francisco:																
956	Boise	178	43.3	34,509	4.1	5	1.2	955	.1	113	27.5	93,345	11.2	46	11.2	53,166	6.4
957	Helena	107	22.3	10,287	.6	7	1.5	522	------	71	14.8	57,317	3.3	129	26.9	83,559	4.8
958	Honolulu	160	24.4	16,436	1.2	8	1.2	1,679	.1	82	12.5	158,096	11.1	261	39.8	86,420	6.1
959	Los Angeles	3,206	21.0	355,029	1.6	138	.9	851,861	3.9	3,570	23.4	9,181,676	42.0	7,237	47.3	6,498,052	29.7
960	Phoenix	348	36.2	32,744	1.9	7	.7	2,038	.1	222	23.1	219,337	12.7	134	13.9	146,829	8.5
961	Portland	833	38.2	87,196	1.9	10	.5	2,809	.1	631	28.9	1,149,326	25.4	455	20.8	844,862	18.7
962	Reno	51	16.3	5,218	.2	31	9.9	223,485	10.6	127	40.7	579,346	27.5	36	11.5	70,007	3.3
963	Salt Lake City	215	30.4	18,695	1.7	2	.3	803	.1	328	46.4	375,248	33.8	34	4.8	23,813	2.1
964	San Francisco	2,188	23.4	204,322	.4	136	1.5	41,809	.1	3,144	33.7	6,820,504	13.3	2,727	29.2	32,557,393	63.6
965	Seattle	2,582	51.7	210,375	3.8	64	1.3	78,506	1.4	913	18.3	1,422,769	25.7	1,064	26.3	1,630,870	29.5
	Total	9,868	22.9	974,811	1.1	408	1.2	1,204,467	1.3	9,201	26.0	20,056,964	21.8	12,123	34.3	41,994,971	45.6
	Grand total	62,617	28.1	5,824,526	.9	4,517	2.0	5,342,442	.8	53,847	24.2	184,436,791	27.6	59,284	26.6	145,956,716	21.9

NOTE.—Owing to rounding, components shown do not always add to totals.

EXHIBIT 2.—*Analysis of taxpayer delinquent accounts in DARB pending on Dec. 31, 1955*—Continued

	Regions	Postponement bond and escrow agreements				Tax Court cases pending				Offers in compromise				Total inventory in DARB pending	
		Number of cases	Percent	Amount	Percent	Number of cases	Percent	Amount	Percent	Number of cases	Percent	Amount	Percent	Number of cases	Amount
101	Atlanta:														
102	Atlanta	1	------	$30,173	0.4	55	1.7	$286,255	4.1	505	15.5	$2,758,765	39.9	3,267	$6,925,087
103	Birmingham	28	.8	228,478	2.2	247	7.1	2,753,527	26.0	425	12.3	2,430,762	23.0	3,469	10,578,697
104	Columbia	22	1.4	31,399	1.1	29	1.8	710,340	25.6	324	20.4	1,365,714	49.1	1,585	2,780,110
105	Greensboro	20	.5	18,877	.1	377	8.7	6,487,440	40.3	894	20.5	8,338,958	51.8	4,354	16,098,716
106	Jackson	2	.3	37,417	3.6	11	1.4	244,049	23.5	123	15.8	442,996	42.7	778	1,036,860
107	Jacksonville	42	1.0	872,226	4.7	135	3.3	9,319,338	49.9	453	10.9	2,385,759	12.8	4,140	18,684,372
108	Nashville	8	.3	89,447	2.0	22	.7	318,825	7.3	554	18.8	1,846,689	42.3	2,950	4,368,302
	Total	123	.6	1,308,017	2.2	876	4.3	20,119,774	33.3	3,278	16.0	19,569,643	32.4	20,543	60,472,144
201	Boston:														
209	Augusta	29	4.9	529,062	45.3	------	------	------	------	47	7.9	157,540	13.5	593	1,167,179
210	Boston	9	.1	38,684	.2	77	1.1	2,313,599	14.3	1,715	24.3	6,928,788	42.7	7,068	16,234,189
211	Burlington	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	30	16.8	11,910	7.6	179	155,688
212	Hartford	------	------	------	------	18	.7	246,830	3.2	1,135	42.4	4,660,763	60.6	2,677	7,685,302
213	Portsmouth	1	.2	107,045	6.6	------	------	------	------	156	24.7	1,318,074	81.0	632	1,627,807
214	Providence	18	1.2	351,433	9.3	------	------	------	------	208	14.1	2,227,932	59.2	1,473	3,765,958
	Total	57	.5	1,026,224	3.3	95	.8	2,560,429	8.4	3,291	26.1	15,305,007	50.0	12,622	30,636,123
301	Chicago:														
315	Chicago	------	------	------	------	93	.4	4,304,829	12.3	2,928	12.1	7,668,275	21.9	24,289	34,994,193
316	Detroit	3	------	30,297	.1	153	1.7	1,262,660	3.9	1,378	15.5	6,097,318	18.8	8,883	32,512,256
317	Milwaukee	------	------	------	------	38	1.2	1,590,365	16.2	310	9.4	2,984,310	30.4	3,299	9,820,942
318	Springfield	14	.4	57,118	1.4	40	1.1	692,427	16.6	378	10.0	1,475,270	35.5	3,769	4,160,162
	Total	17	------	87,415	.1	324	.8	7,850,281	9.6	4,994	12.4	18,225,173	22.4	40,240	81,487,553
401	Cincinnati:														
419	Cincinnati	------	------	------	------	124	7.1	3,769,585	66.4	214	12.3	579,644	10.2	1,739	5,676,705
420	Cleveland	1	------	259	------	191	3.2	7,895,132	43.2	524	8.7	2,268,344	12.4	6,049	18,276,041
421	Columbus	3	.2	4,834	.2	114	8.3	944,049	48.4	21	1.5	111,639	5.7	1,375	1,951,786
422	Indianapolis	26	.6	1,545,936	11.2	193	4.2	2,893,861	21.0	488	10.5	3,923,601	28.5	4,628	13,778,122
423	Louisville	23	.6	201,646	2.4	138	3.6	2,037,036	24.4	203	5.2	1,235,559	14.8	3,882	8,359,624
424	Parkersburg	5	.2	249,485	4.4	------	------	------	------	187	8.9	1,254,342	22.0	2,100	5,705,148
425	Richmond	------	------	------	------	141	4.6	2,285,299	25.7	536	17.3	2,977,263	33.5	3,091	8,890,606
426	Toledo	------	------	------	------	42	5.1	1,145,467	63.3	64	7.8	124,164	6.9	820	1,810,567
	Total	58	.2	2,002,160	3.1	943	4.0	20,970,429	32.5	2,237	9.4	12,474,556	19.4	23,684	64,448,599

EXHIBIT 2.—*Analysis of taxpayer delinquent accounts in DARB pending on Dec. 31, 1955*—Continued

Regions	Postponement bond and escrow agreements				Tax Court cases pending				Offers in compromise				Total inventory in DARB pending	
	Number of cases	Percent	Amount	Percent	Number of cases	Percent	Amount	Percent	Number of cases	Percent	Amount	Percent	Number of cases	Amount
501 Dallas:														
527 Albuquerque	1	.2	$8,044	1.0	2	.3	$98	------	132	22.2	$386,298	50.3	595	$768,033
528 Austin	65	2.6	374,639	8.4	19	.7	558,164	12.6	513	20.2	2,100,584	47.3	2,541	4,440,044
529 Dallas	1	------	119,083	2.2	34	1.1	428,685	7.9	533	17.8	1,535,563	28.4	3,002	5,400,740
530 Little Rock	2	.2	2,524	.3	4	.4	26,537	2.9	143	14.6	523,188	57.4	979	912,220
531 New Orleans	6	.2	1,763	------	101	3.8	3,581,934	46.2	693	26.2	2,074,386	26.8	2,646	7,751,134
532 Oklahoma City	5	.3	150,489	3.3	47	3.1	1,738,178	38.2	471	31.5	1,584,624	34.8	1,493	4,547,544
Total	80	.7	656,542	2.8	207	1.8	6,333,596	26.6	2,485	22.1	8,204,643	34.4	11,256	23,819,715
601 New York City:														
633 Albany	16	.8	58,192	1.6	43	2.2	895,885	24.6	410	20.8	1,446,896	39.7	1,972	3,648,725
634 Brooklyn	1	------	17,722	.1	102	1.8	7,131,789	26.2	2,214	38.4	9,012,225	33.1	5,764	27,217,271
635 Buffalo	1	.1	128,847	3.2	58	4.0	1,665,971	46.4	383	26.4	1,388,482	34.5	1,449	4,025,689
636 Lower Manhattan	------	------	------	------	246	4.3	23,227,717	39.4	1,907	33.3	13,211,795	22.4	5,730	59,013,572
698 Puerto Rico	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	44	6.0	130,730	41.8	734	312,970
638 Syracuse	23	1.6	384,766	15.7	13	.9	14,404	.6	295	20.1	434,609	17.7	1,470	2,452,280
637 Upper Manhattan	------	------	------	------	112	.8	1,272,018	1.9	4,384	29.7	28,150,465	41.8	14,785	67,324,525
Total	41	.1	589,527	.4	574	1.8	34,207,784	20.9	9,637	30.2	53,775,202	32.8	31,904	163,995,032
701 Omaha:														
739 Aberdeen	------	------	------	------	7	1.4	156,890	41.6	94	18.8	122,789	32.6	500	376,810
740 Cheyenne	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	82	22.3	122,068	20.9	368	585,027
741 Denver	13	1.0	24,556	.6	59	4.5	911,123	22.8	360	27.6	1,598,678	39.9	1,306	4,004,071
742 Des Moines	17	1.5	362,758	6.8	32	2.8	336,454	6.3	247	21.7	2,432,441	45.4	1,136	5,355,431
743 Fargo	------	------	------	------	26	10.4	158,931	44.5	47	18.8	54,601	15.3	250	356,770
744 Kansas City	------	------	------	------	32	2.1	242,813	4.2	252	16.2	1,929,486	33.5	1,553	5,757,436
745 Omaha	11	1.5	130,832	5.2	30	4.0	1,301,916	51.3	142	19.2	425,957	16.8	741	2,536,068
746 St. Louis	------	------	------	------	27	1.8	357,311	6.2	373	24.8	2,487,286	43.1	1,505	5,769,681
747 St. Paul	11	.6	374,558	8.8	61	3.2	837,923	19.6	359	18.8	1,198,020	28.0	1,914	4,280,440
748 Wichita	53	3.1	226,272	5.4	23	1.3	247,613	5.9	296	17.0	854,609	20.4	1,737	4,189,876
Total	105	1.0	1,118,976	3.4	297	2.7	4,550,974	13.7	2,252	20.5	11,225,935	33.8	11,010	33,211,610
801 Philadelphia:														
849 Baltimore	4	------	262,543	.8	------	------	------	------	1,059	7.4	6,957,206	21.0	14,346	33,092,388
850 Camden	28	2.0	607,636	5.9	14	1.0	669,193	6.5	314	22.0	2,333,922	22.8	1,425	10,218,842
851 Newark	3	------	110,486	.4	203	3.1	5,010,973	18.6	2,864	43.2	11,606,550	43.1	6,629	26,950,610
852 Philadelphia	8	.1	192,624	.8	33	.4	1,323,596	5.3	1,242	13.9	10,291,648	41.3	8,967	24,924,646
853 Pittsburgh	------	------	------	------	99	3.2	7,347,080	44.3	638	20.5	5,596,350	33.7	3,117	16,596,487
854 Scranton	------	------	------	------	52	3.6	155,091	4.1	240	16.7	2,428,330	64.2	1,435	3,779,990
855 Wilmington	------	------	------	------	31	9.1	908,561	52.7	50	14.7	65,680	3.8	340	1,725,269
Total	43	.1	1,173,289	1.0	432	1.2	15,415,494	13.1	6,407	17.7	39,279,686	33.5	36,259	117,288,232
901 San Francisco:														
956 Boise	3	.7	4,263	.5	35	8.5	338,013	40.4	31	7.5	312,487	37.3	411	836,738
957 Helena	9	1.9	978,619	56.1	------	------	------	------	157	32.7	612,688	35.2	480	1,742,992
958 Honolulu	9	1.4	135,437	9.5	17	2.6	538,348	37.8	119	18.1	487,504	34.2	656	1,423,919
959 Los Angeles	4	------	51,553	.2	86	.6	630,421	2.9	1,048	6.9	4,280,013	19.6	15,289	21,848,605
960 Phoenix	2	.2	3,600	.2	41	4.3	355,399	24.5	207	21.5	973,566	56.2	961	1,733,514
961 Portland	------	------	------	------	84	3.8	1,459,344	32.3	170	7.8	981,024	21.7	2,183	4,524,561
962 Reno	------	------	------	------	29	9.3	1,132,487	53.7	38	12.2	96,527	4.6	312	2,107,070
963 Salt Lake City	21	3.0	96,818	8.7	23	3.3	402,950	36.3	84	11.9	191,684	17.3	707	1,110,011
964 San Francisco	2	------	18,337	------	149	1.6	4,857,389	9.5	987	10.6	6,714,019	13.1	9,333	51,213,773
965 Seattle	1	------	154	------	68	1.4	1,467,071	26.5	303	6.1	727,690	13.1	4,995	5,537,435
Total	51	.1	1,288,781	1.4	532	1.5	11,181,422	12.1	3,144	8.9	15,377,202	16.7	35,327	92,078,618
Grand total	575	.3	9,250,931	1.4	4,280	1.9	123,189,183	18.5	37,725	16.9	193,437,047	29.0	222,845	667,437,626

NOTE.—Owing to rounding, components shown do not always add to totals.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, chart No. 1 gives a statistical breakdown of the outstanding delinquencies in each of the collection districts by showing the number of accounts and the amounts involved.

Chart No. 2 shows the number of delinquent accounts that have been transferred to the field collection force that are in an inactive status. This is a further breakdown of a portion of the items appearing in exhibit No. 1.

I now ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a third chart, which is a summary showing the amount of both 1954 and 1955 delinquent taxes charged to each of the collection districts, along with a percentage computation showing the increase or decrease as compared to 1954.

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

Region	1954 delinquent taxes	1955 delinquent taxes	Percent of increase, 1955 over 1954	Percent of decrease, 1955 over 1954
Atlanta region:				
Atlanta	$20,972,739	$18,809,469.18	----------	10
Birmingham	19,488,687	17,636,819.66	----------	9
Columbia	7,201,701	6,511,429.28	----------	9
Greensboro	26,395,319	21,018,680.09	----------	20
Jackson	4,717,712	2,957,931.29	----------	37
Jacksonville	47,883,435	49,361,697.11	3	----------
Nashville	12,463,047	13,220,012.32	6	----------
Boston region:				
Augusta	2,582,660	1,915,961.28	----------	25⅙
Boston	41,306,294	37,835,356.26	----------	8⅔
Burlington	644,129	409,970.49	----------	36½
Hartford	15,271,158	15,348,135.93	½	----------
Portsmouth	3,252,731	2,179,031.04	----------	33
Providence	7,389,895	7,173,805.25	----------	3
Chicago region:				
Chicago	$81,659,860	$87,843,509.34	7½	----------
Detroit	44,787,225	68,904,225.44	53¾	----------
Milwaukee	16,592,839	16,279,604.79	----------	1⅔
Springfield	9,101,127	8,723,856.07	----------	4
Cincinnati region:				
Cincinnati	15,128,835	12,685,909.21	----------	16
Cleveland	42,963,755	35,547,838.73	----------	17
Columbus	6,652,735	6,624,801.15	----------	½
Indianapolis	19,133,272	20,760,250.92	7	----------
Louisville	11,834,161	13,172,969.14	11	----------
Parkersburg	12,931,609	10,627,103.44	----------	18
Richmond	20,986,659	21,881,829.41	4	----------
Toledo	3,317,067	2,896,973.94	----------	12

Region	1954 delinquent taxes	1955 delinquent taxes	Percent of increase, 1955 over 1954	Percent of decrease, 1955 over 1954
Dallas region:				
Albuquerque	$2,824,810	$2,960,729.62	4	
Austin	20,202,903	12,754,005.75		36
Dallas	23,748,778	16,337,067.48		31
Little Rock	2,315,863	2,108,438.18		8
New Orleans	17,472,965	13,613,589.17		22
Oklahoma City	9,043,216	9,421,064.41	4	
New York City:				
Albany	15,061,055	11,274,930.84		25
Brooklyn	106,522,490	133,339,786.92	25	
Buffalo	12,368,574	12,058,317.23		2
Lower Manhattan	171,309,518	169,476,849.31		1
Puerto Rico	273,843	622,244.65	127⅓	
Syracuse	5,650,017	5,395,848.85		4
Upper Manhattan	158,538,468	195,098,775.26	23	
Omaha region:				
Aberdeen	1,255,504	1,613,977.06	28½	
Cheyenne	1,629,689	1,344,230.40		17½
Denver	7,552,576	7,960,670.88	5⅔	
Des Moines	9,737,729	8,200,182.84		15⅞
Fargo	1,353,482	1,011,136.65		25
Kansas City	9,021,864	9,433,477.26	4⅝	
Omaha	4,180,447	3,364,445.91		19½
Omaha region—Con.				
St. Louis	$12,267,505	$10,085,650.90		17¾
St. Paul	9,725,868	9,270,700.41		4⅔
Wichita	7,316,879	6,757,858.90		7⅛
Philadelphia region:				
Baltimore	68,663,284	62,497,224.45		9
Camden	10,638,780	16,896,707.75	58⅚	
Newark	92,962,952	79,793,942.61		14⅙
Philadelphia	63,450,420	74,744,336.73	17⅝	
Pittsburgh	28,955,774	30,144,327.73	4	
Scranton	7,948,754	7,233,268.19		9
Wilmington	22,009,168	3,639,928.73		83½
San Francisco region:				
Boise	2,083,834	1,988,294.11		4½
Helena	2,863,290	2,575,503.61		10
Honolulu	4,620,939	4,345,619.31		5
Los Angeles	88,047,147	83,679,336.98		5
Phoenix	5,510,061	5,057,757.70		8⅛
Portland	15,351,352	12,429,142.29		19
Reno	6,043,359	6,697,953.56	10⅔	
Salt Lake City	4,649,780	3,560,853.41		23¼
San Francisco	66,858,096	88,983,217.30	33	
Seattle	19,804,603	18,285,409.85		7⅔

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I call particular attention to the fact that the Philadelphia-Camden area, which has been under criticism recently, show delinquent tax increases of 17 percent and 58 percent, respectively. This further confirms my contention that a long overdue examination of these two offices is in order.

There has been a 53-percent increase in delinquencies in Detroit, 127-percent increase in Puerto Rico, 33-percent increase in San Francisco, and increases of somewhat lesser extent in other areas.

Many other districts have shown progress in reducing the amount of delinquent accounts, and it is a pleasure to call special attention to the fact that the Wilmington, Del., district has made the outstanding record for the country by reducing its tax delinquencies by 83 percent during the calendar year 1955.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the pending farm legislation.

It is not necessary to restate here the adverse financial situation in which almost every farmer finds himself today. Most people realize that if present farm prices were permitted to continue, they would break the average farmer.

A very high percentage of our farmers are in bad shape financially. This is particularly true of the small farmers and the young World War II and Korean war veterans who, during the past 10 years, have just gotten started in the farming business.

The Eisenhower administration recognizes that farmers are in dire financial straits. Otherwise the administration would not be requesting authority of Congress to spend more than $1.3 billion a year in payments to farmers for a soil-bank program in addition to the costs of the flexible price support program.

The farm bill now before the Senate has three major provisions—the soil-bank program; the restoration of 90-percent supports for basic farm commodities, an increase in dairy supports from 75 to 80 percent of parity; and a provision to reinstate the dual parity formula.

The soil-bank proposal embodies two separate and important programs—the conservation reserve program and the acreage reserve program.

The conservation reserve program applies to all cultivated acres. Cooperation by farmers in both the conservation reserve and acreage reserve programs would be strictly on a voluntary basis.

Farmers would be paid approximately $19 an acre on a national average to reimburse them for the expense of placing their land under the conservation reserve program. The rate in North Dakota would be slightly less.

All the figures I will use in connection with the soil-bank program are those given to the Senate Agriculture Committee by the Secretary of Agriculture and are subject to some revision.

The land placed under this program would be on a 3- to 10-year lease basis and in North Dakota farmers would be given an annual payment of approximately $5.70 per acre.

The acreage reserve program affects only allotted acres of wheat, corn, cotton, and other basic commodities. Farmers may voluntarily take up to 30 percent of their allotted wheat and corn acres out of production and place it under this program.

All they must do to comply is keep the land idle for 1 year. The payment per acre in North Dakota would average about $13.50. This is a tentative figure.

The following is an example of how the acreage reserve program would be applied to a farm in Ward County, N. Dak., for wheat:

County normal yield bushels per acre	13.2
Size of farm acres	480
Acreage allotment do	120
Acreage put into reserve do	30
Payment rate per acre	$13.50
Payment to farmer	$405.00

If this farmer also participates in the conservation reserve program, he could earn additional money as follows: If he places 70 acres of any of the rest of his cultivated acres under the conservation reserve program, he would be paid approximately $17 per acre for the expense involved in placing the land under conservation practices.

Seventy acres times $17 per acre would be $1,190. In addition, he would earn approximately $5.70 per acre, or 70 times $5.70, $399.

Thus, for the first year he would earn $1,589 on the conservation reserve program plus the $405 on the 30 acres he placed in the acreage reserve program, or a total of $1,994.

The committee has written strong language in the legislation to assure equitable sharing of the payments under this program as between landlords and tenants.

The second and most important provision in the bill, in my opinion, has to do with price supports. It would restore 90 percent supports for basic farm commodities and raise price supports for dairy commodities from 75 to 80 percent of parity.

On both cotton and wheat the bill provides that there shall be mandatory price differentials to reflect the quality of the commodity. The Secretary of Agriculture now has discretionary authority to establish price differentials, and for years a very limited program of this nature has been in effect.

With respect to wheat, this bill provides that all varieties which normally produce a good quality wheat would be supported at 90 percent of parity. This means that every farmer who seeds a variety of wheat which normally could be expected to produce a good quality wheat would receive 90 percent price supports.

Less than 2 percent of all the wheat seeded in North Dakota in 1955 consisted of varieties which would not qualify for 90 percent supports.

There has been considerable misrepresentation and misunderstanding of the provisions of this section of the farm bill which pertain to price supports for wheat on a quality basis.

One of the worst misrepresentations appeared in the National Farmers Union's Washington newsletter dated

February 10, 1956. A part of this newsletter reads as follows:

Wheat price levels are left in great—and serious—doubt by the committee bill's provisions. An enormous power of discretion is granted to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The mandatory limits that would be established are only that some wheat must be supported at 90 percent; the lowest level of wheat support must be at its feed equivalent value to corn, and the support price of all wheat must average 75 percent of parity.

This means price-support floors for wheat ranging, at today's price levels, from $1.72 per bushel—90 percent of the corn parity equivalent for wheat—if the bill passes.

If the wheat provision is adopted without winning the rest of the bill, it would set price support floors for wheat down as low as $1.36 per bushel.

It is left up to the Secretary of Agriculture, with the advice of a committee comprised of one-third processors, one-third farmers, and one-third professors, all appointed by the Secretary to determine which wheat is to be supported as "milling quality" wheat at 90 percent, and which is to be supported only at feed value.

This bill virtually insures that high-quality wheat producers would lose the premiums which they usually get above the support level.

It also opens up the danger that millers will buy "feed wheat" to dilute their flour mixes, putting further downward pressure on high-quality wheat premiums.

Obviously, the writer of this newsletter did not read the pending bill, or else he does not understand farm legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all of section 102 of the agriculture bill be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

SEC. 102. Section 101 (d) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(8) if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas for the crop, (A) the support price to cooperators for milling quality wheat shall be established upon the basis of a support level for the crop of 90 percent of the parity price for wheat, and (B) the support price to cooperators in any area for any other wheat shall be established, without regard to paragraph (7) of this subsection, at such level as the Secretary determines will preserve the competitive relationship between such wheat and corn on the basis of their respective feed values; but in no event shall the average support price to cooperators for all wheat (based upon anticipated production) be less than 75 percent of its parity price. For the purposes of this paragraph milling quality wheat shall be wheat produced in any area from seed of a variety which in such area normally produces wheat of a quality desired for milling purposes. In determining milling quality wheat, the Secretary shall consult with a committee appointed by him and composed of three representatives from each of the principal wheat-producing areas. Of the 3 representatives from each area, 1 shall be a wheat farmer, 1 shall be a wheat miller, and 1 shall be a person experienced in research on wheat varieties. At least one of the millers on the committee shall have had experience in producing semolina flour. Wheat of the 1956 crop planted in any area shall be milling quality wheat for the purposes of this paragraph, unless such wheat is of a variety which was designated as undesirable in such area by the Department of Agriculture prior to the time such wheat was planted. This paragraph shall be applicable only to the 1956 and 1957 crops."

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks the explanation in the report accompanying the bill as to how Members of the Senate Agriculture Committee feel this quality wheat provision would be applied.

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

SECTION 102. WHEAT

Section 102 provides price support for milling quality wheat at 90 percent of parity and support for other wheat at such levels as will preserve its competitive relationship with corn on the basis of respective feed values, the average support price for all wheat to be not less than 75 percent of parity. Milling quality wheat would be wheat produced in any area from seed of a variety which in such area normally produces wheat of a quality desired for milling purposes. Wheat of the 1956 crops is deemed to be milling quality unless of a variety designated as undesirable by the Secretary of Agriculture prior to the time such wheat is planted. In determining milling quality wheat, the Secretary would consult with a committee on which there will be 3 representatives from each of the principal wheat-producing areas, of whom 1 would be a wheat farmer, 1 a wheat miller, and 1 a person experienced in research on wheat varieties. This section would be applicable only to the 1956 and 1957 crops.

The announced support price for wheat of the 1956 crop is $1.81 per bushel (76 percent of parity). On the basis of January 15 data and the parity formula provided by section 106, 90 percent of parity would be $2.26 per bushel.

Under this section, a national average support level representing 90 percent of the parity price for wheat would be established and, after the adjustments for location, grade, quality, and other factors called for by section 403 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, this would be applied to milling quality wheat. The support level for other wheat would be established at a price for each county which represents its feed value relationship to corn. The feeding value of wheat to corn (pound for pound) based on USDA Circular No. 836 is 105.

The Department has had some experience in preparing a program of the type contemplated by this section.

On August 12, 1955, it announced that under the 1956 wheat price support program 23 designated undesirable varieties would be discounted 20 cents per bushel in addition to any other discounts, and that protein premiums would not be applicable to these varieties. Following is a listing of the designated undesirable varieties, by classes and the States in which they are designated:

Hard Red Winter:

Purkof: Indiana, Michigan.

Red Chief: Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico.

Red Jacket: Illinois, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico.

Kanking: Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Nebraska.

Kanqueen: Missouri, Colorado.

Chiefkan: Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Montana, Colorado, New Mexico.

Stafford: Nebraska, Kansas.

Early Pawnee (Sel. 33): Kansas.

Early Blackhull: Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Montana, Colorado.

New Chief: Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico.

Yogo: Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas.

Soft Red Winter:

Kawvale: Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska.

Hard Red Spring:

Henry: Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana.

Sturgeon: Wisconsin.

Progress: Wisconsin.

Spinkcota: Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Premier: Montana, North Dakota.

White:

Rex: Idaho, Washington, Oregon.

Sonora: California.

Galgalos: Nebraska.

Durum:

Golden Ball: Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana.

Peliss: North Dakota, Montana.

Pentad: North Dakota.

The August 12 announcement contemplated that a producer certification plan would be used. Each producer applying for price support in States with any of the listed undesirable varieties would be required to certify (1) that the wheat he harvested was not of the undesirable varieties listed for his State, or (2) that the wheat he harvested was from one or more of the undesirable varieties but none of such wheat was being tendered for price support, or (3) that the wheat on which he requested price support contained wheat of an undesirable variety listed for his State and such wheat was identified by variety, and bin number (if farm stored) or warehouse receipt number.

It was estimated that the total 1954 production of the 23 varieties listed as undesirable by the Department in its announcement of August 12, 1955, amounted to 31 million bushels, as compared with the total 1954 crop of 985 million bushels.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I think the bill is very plain as to how this provision would be applied. I wish to read just a few lines of section 102 of the bill starting on line 20:

For the purposes of this paragraph milling quality wheat shall be wheat produced in any area from seed of a variety which in such area normally produces wheat of a quality desired for milling purposes.

Exactly the same language is carried forward in the committee report. It should be obvious to anyone that these provisions specifically provide that any farmer seeding wheat which normally produces a good quality wheat would be given 90 percent supports. How can any other interpretation be placed upon it?

In North Dakota more than 98 percent of all the wheat seeded is of varieties which normally produce good quality. There is no reason in the world why wheat producers in any section of the United States should not plant wheat which normally produces good quality if they expect to get 90 percent supports.

It does not make sense to provide top level supports to producers who intentionally plant varieties of low quality wheat just because they are highly resistant to rust and other diseases and produce heavy yields per acre. Continuance of this practice would break any price support program, whether it is based upon 90 percent supports or 70 percent supports.

Why should any farmer in North Dakota be given top level supports for producing such wheat as Premier when it is recognized to be a poor quality. Or why would he be given top level supports for producing Golden Ball, Peliss,

or Pentad durum—varieties which are recognized to be of very poor quality?

As late as last year these varieties of wheat received the same support level as the best wheat produced in our area.

Every variety of wheat released by the North Dakota experiment station has been of very good quality and is so recognized by the millers and bakers. Unfortunately, we cannot say as much for some of the experiment stations in other parts of the United States. Unfortunately, from time to time some have released varieties of wheat which are big yielders, but of very poor quality.

We have many many varieties of both spring wheat and durum wheat which over the years have been recognized for their top qualities.

They include Rival, Mida, Thatcher, Lee, Selkirk, Mindum, Sentry, and numerous others.

The Farmers Union Washington newsletter states:

> The lowest level of wheat support must be at its feed equivalent value to corn, and the support price of all wheat must average 75 percent of parity.

Now this is not in accord with the facts. The bill reads—and I quote again from section 102 line 17 on page 2:

> But in no event shall the average support price to cooperators for all wheat (based upon anticipated production) be less than 75 percent of its parity price.

That is a far cry from what is claimed in the newsletter as to the provisions of the bill. This provision means exactly what it says—that the average support price could not be less than 75 percent of parity. It does not mean it must be 75 percent of parity.

Section 102 does provide that the support level for feed wheats shall be established at a price in each county which represents its feed value in relationship to corn. Certainly varieties of wheat which can only produce wheat of feed value should not have a price support higher than its value as a feed grain equivalent.

For years there have been varying degrees of price support differentials based on the quality of wheat. The quality determination, however, was left entirely to the Secretary of Agriculture working with agriculture research people, millers, and bakers.

The new legislation provides that the quality determination will be made by the Secretary of Agriculture in cooperation with an advisory committee which will include farmers from every principal wheat-producing area of the United States. This is the first time farmers will be given a voice in determining the quality of various varieties of wheat to receive price supports. This, too, is a step in the right direction.

Mr. President, if all the wheat farmers of the United States could be encouraged through such legislation as we are considering today to plant only varieties which would normally produce a good quality milling wheat, it would result in a reduction in production of at least 50 million to 100 million bushels per year.

There is another claim in the newsletter which is absolutely untrue. It states that premiums for the most part would no longer be available to farmers. That is not so. This argument is the one usually used by the proponents of flexible or lower supports.

Mr. THYE. To what newsletter does the Senator refer?

Mr. YOUNG. It is the National Farmers Union Newsletter of February 10, 1956.

As I have stated previously, good quality wheats invariably produce less per acre. There would be many additional benefits. It would be much easier, for example, to find new markets for good quality wheat both at home and abroad. We have lost many foreign markets because all too often we have shipped inferior quality wheat.

Statements by the Secretary of Agriculture and other opponents of the reinstatement of 90-percent supports that this would greatly increase production are just not in accord with the facts.

All of the basic commodities, for which this bill would reinstate 90-percent supports, are now under the strictest kind of acreage allotments or quotas. This has meant a more than one-third cut in their acreage.

The reinstatement of 90-percent supports, as provided in this bill, does nothing to increase acreage or production. Actually, placing price supports on a quality basis, as this bill does, will tend to decrease production.

The present flexible price-support program, if continued, will break most wheat farmers.

I have already said that the wheat farmer has had to cut his acreage by more than one-third. In addition to this, he is required to take a drastic reduction in price supports.

When the Farm Act of 1954 is in full effect, the cut in price supports will be more than one-third. Anyone conversant with the world wheat-supply situation, and more particularly that of Canada and the United States, knows full well that cash prices for most grades of wheat have little chance of rising above support levels in at least the next 2 or 3 years.

Mr. President, permit me to give you an example of how this flexible price-support program, together with the modernized parity formula, affects wheat farmers.

The support price for wheat in 1954 was $2.26 a bushel on the national average. The support price in 1955 was $2.08. The support price for this year, 1956, unless Congress approves the present legislation, will drop to $1.81 a bushel.

The following year, 1957, because of the application of the modernized parity formula, there will be a still further drop in the price support to approximately $1.70 a bushel. In 1958, because of the modernized parity formula, the price support would drop to $1.60 a bushel or lower.

In addition to this, any farmer who does not store his grain on the farm takes a further reduction of an average of 10 cents a bushel as his payment for advance storage costs. That is, if he hauls his grain to town and gets his loan through his regular marketing channels. Thus, by 1958, if the Agricultural Act of 1954 is permitted to go into effect, the actual support price paid to farmers would be $1.50 a bushel or less.

Mr. President, this approximately one-third cut in acreage and the one-third cut in price is more than the wheat farmer can take. Certainly, few business firms could survive such a cut in income.

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

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Perhaps it might be well, if the Senator does not object, to refer to the method of figuring parity under the new basis. Do I understand that the committee is recommending a study of the parity formula?

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct. The committee bill provides for a reinstatement of the dual parity formula, but with the request to the Department of Agriculture to make a study of the parity formulas, in the hope that they can come up with one that is more fair and equitable to all producers.

Mr. CARLSON. May I ask this question? Do I understand from a reading of the report that we have three types of parity formulas, namely, the old, the new, and the transitional? Or am I confused about it?

Mr. YOUNG. There are actually only two, the old parity formula and the modernized parity formula. Under the provision of the law at the present time, parity cannot drop more than 5 percent a year. That is called the transitional parity formula. In the transitional period when we are moving from the old parity formula to the modernized parity formula, it is provided that the parity price cannot drop more than 5 percent a year. That is the transitional period.

Mr. CARLSON. Am I to understand that if we do not adopt the 90 percent formula so far as wheat is concerned, the supported price of wheat in 1956 will drop from $2.04 or $2.06 a bushel to $1.81 a bushel?

Mr. YOUNG. In 1956; yes.

Mr. CARLSON. As I understand the Senator's statement, on the basis of the modernized parity formula, we can expect further reductions in the next 2 or 3 years. Is that correct?

Mr. YOUNG. The reductions will be at least 20 cents a bushel, and perhaps 22 cents a bushel more.

Mr. CARLSON. I believe that is a very important point, and I sincerely hope that we will take some time and look into it.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Senator.

Reinstating price supports for basic farm commodities will automatically raise the cash market price of practically all other grains. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a news story with a Chicago dateline of February 10, 1956, which gives ample proof of what I am saying. Let me read a part of it:

> Two bearish items greeted grain traders at the opening. First, a letter by President Eisenhower to Senator AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, in which the President said he was gravely concerned over the prospect new farm legislation would set price supports at 90 percent of parity for basic crops. Sec-

ond, an Agriculture Department announcement of a steep cut—from 87 percent to 81 percent of parity—in the price support level for 1956 crop corn. Fairly heavy selling hit the market in the first half hour on these developments. But it dried up before that first hour was over. After that, prices climbed. Traders noted President Eisenhower did not definitely say he would veto a farm bill containing the 90 percent of parity support provision.

I think that is the best proof that if 90-percent parity were restored, prices would immediately climb.

Throughout the testimony of farmers during the month-long hearings last fall held in practically every part of the United States, most cattle and hog feeders stated frankly that lower feed grain prices had encouraged too much feeding of cattle and hogs, thus creating burdensome surpluses and depressed prices.

The pending legislation will go a long way toward stabilizing grain prices at a higher level which would be of benefit not only to the producers of grain but to almost every other segment of our agriculture economy.

Farmers produce the most important things necessary to the health and happiness of everyone—food and fiber. The prices farmers receive now, according to Government statistics, are approximately only 80 percent of parity or a fair price. Certainly reinstatement of 90 percent supports would be the least we could do to relieve the desperate farm price situation—and at a time when the Nation as a whole is enjoying unprecedented prosperity.

The third major provision in this bill has to do with reinstating the dual parity formula for basic farm commodities. The modernized parity formula uses as its major provision in determining parity the average price farmers received for the previous 10-year period.

Thus, if farm price supports are lowered—as is being done under the flexible price-support program—and if cash prices are at a depressed level—which they are—the future parity for basic farm commodities will be reduced accordingly. Just because we may have a 5- or 10-year period of depressed prices, it should not follow that this 10-year average of low prices should represent a fair price for parity in future years.

That is exactly what the modernized parity formula does. The lowering of price supports through the modernized parity formula is particularly hard on farmers at this time when the prices of everything they have to buy are increasing sharply. I believe the dual parity formula should be continued until the Department of Agriculture can work out a more fair and equitable parity formula.

Mr. President, I am not unaware of the threat of reprisals by some proponents of the administration-farm program to those of us who will vote to keep 90-percent supports as a part of our present farm program and thus, as they say, invite a possible Presidential veto.

They say they propose to advise the people of this country who then would be responsible for the loss of the soil-bank program. Such threats will not deter me in voting for what I think is a fair and reasonable agricultural bill.

In my opinion, the provision of this bill to reinstate 90-percent supports is of far greater importance than the soil-bank provision. It will immediately raise farm prices and it will immediately raise the value of most of the farm commodities that the Federal Government now holds in its CCC stocks.

The 90-percent provision will do far more to raise farm prices at less cost to the Federal Government than will the soil-bank program.

I think the soil-bank program has considerable merit and should be approved by Congress. Unless very carefully and wisely administered, however, this program has some potentially dangerous aspects. Under this program, we will spend $1.3 billion a year—most of which will be for purposes to enrich the soil. Certainly, this more fertile soil will have the potential of greatly increasing production rather than decreasing it in future years.

There are some highly questionable practices being proposed under this soil-bank program. The provision to pay farmers to destroy a good wheat crop seeded last fall does not meet with my approval. It is repulsive to the thinking of a great many people in this Nation. We tried this kind of program back in the thirties.

We tried a flexible price-support program back in the thirties and it, too, failed to establish a good price for farm commodities and almost doubled the carryover of wheat and corn during the years it was in operation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in my remarks a table which contains figures obtained from the United States Department of Agriculture to substantiate my point.

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

Table indicates price-support level, average price farmers received, carryover as of July 1 of year indicated, and amounts of direct payments made to farmers

[Information from U. S. Department of Agriculture]

	1938	1939	1940
Price support of wheat (percent)	52	56	57
Average farm price farmers received (per bushel)	$0.56	$0.68	$0.67
Carryover in bushels (millions of bushels)	153	259	280
Price support of corn (percent)	70	69	75
Average farm price received	$0.47	$0.54	$0.60
Carryover in bushels (millions of bushels)	361	584	688
A. C. P. class I payments made to farmers in partial compensation for their proportionate acreage adjustment for soil-depleting crops	*Millions* $217.4	*Millions* $350.7	*Millions* $380.2
Parity payments to producers, principally of corn, wheat, and cotton	--------	--------	211.7
A. C. P. class II payments for soil-conservation practices	88.8	119.8	202.0
Total	306.2	470.5	793.9

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, we had flexible price supports ranging from 52 to 75 percent of parity from 1938 until the start of World War II. During the crop years of 1938, 1939, and 1940, the price support for corn, as noted in this table, ranged from 69 to 75 percent of parity.

During this same 3-year period the carryover of corn increased from 361 million bushels in 1938 to 688 million bushels in 1940, or approximately double. It will be noted that the national average farm price for corn in these 3 years were as follows: In 1938, 47 cents a bushel; in 1939, 54 cents a bushel; in 1940, 60 cents a bushel.

Certainly these low price supports and low cash prices did nothing to decrease production—in fact, the carryover during this 3-year period was practically doubled.

The price support for wheat from 1938 to 1940, as noted in this table, ranged from 52 to 57 percent of parity. During this 3-year period we increased our wheat carryover from 153 million bushels to 280 million bushels, or nearly double. The average cash prices received by wheat farmers for these years were as follows: In 1938, 56 cents a bushel; in 1939, 68 cents a bushel; in 1940, 67 cents a bushel.

I may add, Mr. President, that those who claimed they got the farmers out of the financial wilderness in the 1930's should take a look at the average cash prices received by farmers in the 1930's.

These were bankrupt prices, yet, as is always the case, farmers at that time tried to offset losses in income from low prices by increasing their production.

During this 3-year period from 1938 to 1940 we had in connection with this flexible price-support program another program not too unlike that of the President's soil-bank provision in the pending bill. In 1938 the Federal Government made payments to farmers for soil-conservation practices and other closely associated programs totaling $306,200,000.

In 1939 the total payments were $470,500,000 and by 1940 these direct payments to farmers—mostly for soil-conserving practices—had reached a total of $793,900,000.

This $793 million, in terms of prewar purchasing power, would bring far more soil conservation than is proposed under the present bill for $1.3 billion.

Mr. President, we have had another and more recent experience in flexible or lower prices which the proponents claim will control surpluses.

From February of 1951 to the present time the average overall farm prices have dropped approximately 28 percent. We have had flexible price supports in operation the past year. In spite of these lower price supports, and in spite of a drastic drop in cash prices, we witnessed in 1955 the greatest overall farm production in the history of the United States.

I do not see how any student of the production of field crops could escape the conclusion that flexible price supports will do nothing to curtail surpluses.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope the Senate will approve the price support provision of the bill substantially as it was reported by the Senate Agriculture Committee. We should maintain the 90 percent price support program until a better way is found to maintain fair farm prices.

I do not now and never have claimed that 90 percent supports is the complete answer to all farm-price problems. All I am saying is that it will do far more to help farmers than any flexible price-support program yet devised.

Farmers need help immediately. They cannot wait any longer.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to commend the Senator for the very fine statement which he has so ably presented to the Senate, in regard to some of the problems in the great wheat-producing sections of the Nation. He has painted a very accurate picture of the situation, and I was especially interested in that part of it which indicated that the further we reduce the price of a commodity grown by a farmer, the more of it he tries to produce in order to get his cash income up to the point where he can take care of farm machinery costs, labor costs, and utility costs.

Mr. YOUNG. First, I should like to thank my friend from Kansas for his kind remarks. I know the Senator from Kansas has had a great interest in agriculture as long as I have known him.

To answer the Senator's question, I think farmers try their best to offset any loss of income by increasing production.

Mr. CARLSON. May I inquire further if that is not basic in the farmer's problem, namely, to produce enough to carry on an economic operating unit and live as he should live?

Mr. YOUNG. Especially now, when he has a tremendous investment. He must do the only thing he knows how to do best, that is to produce more, and hope that prices will be better.

Mr. CARLSON. We have heard many complaints on the Senate floor as to the gross production. Some 23 million acres of wheat land have been withdrawn from wheat cultivation, and on it farmers have produced forage crops and grains which have upset the livestock market. That is the result of being forced to go into such production in order to make a profitable economic unit of the farms.

Mr. YOUNG. That is true. The more price-supports are lowered for one commodity the farmer can raise, the more he tries to offset his loss by raising something else.

Mr. CARLSON. I will say to the Senator that I do not see how we can work out any other program at the present time than that which has been presented in the Senator's statement to the Senate this afternoon. I think that is the formula which we must follow in the wheat belt of the Nation.

Mr. YOUNG. I have just finished conducting a poll of the people of North Dakota. I received almost 5,000 returns from 20,000 questionnaires which I sent out. The returns from nonfarmers are about 2 to 1 in favor of 90-percent price supports. The farmers favor price supports by about 10 to 1.

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

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I commend the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota for having made a very able presentation of the farmer's plight and the farmer's problem caused by decreasing farm income on the one hand, and, on the other hand, constantly rising expenses, including taxes, insurance on buildings, the cost of replacing machinery, and all the other costs incidental to farm operations. The Senator has very clearly outlined the problems of the farmers.

I was intrigued by the Senator's remarks when he stated that the farmer would not necessarily reduce his production simply because prices were becoming lower. Commonsense should teach anyone that that would be true. It would be applicable even to the members of the press in the gallery. If the cost of their writing per line were reduced, and if they could increase their income by increasing the number of lines they wrote, I would venture a guess that they would increase their writing in order to increase their earnings.

That is true of the farmer. He will increase his units of production if he can realize another dollar by such an increase. He will not decrease his production simply because a bushel of grain is 10 cents less in value or in the price he receives. He will not decrease the number of tons of hay he puts up merely because the price of hay has dropped $10 or $5 a ton. He will first put up the hay which is on the ground. That is the first act of a good farmer. Second, he will till the land and try to produce the maximum. He must do that.

This is most evident so far as the producer of milk is concerned. The support price of milk was dropped in 1954 from 90 percent to 75 percent of parity. But that did not discourage either the flow of milk from the cow or the efforts of the producer. Today there is an increase of almost 4 billion pounds of fluid milk in the United States, even though the price is less.

It stands to reason that the farmer must have income with which to pay his obligations. It is almost second nature for the farmer to produce the maximum amount that his acreage will grow.

So we return to the very simple proposition that the soil bank is the only real answer to a reduction of farm production in the United States. The soil-bank program proposes an orderly lay-aside of tillable acres into a soil-building project.

The soil bank is the real approach to reducing surpluses. The price factor has never accomplished this purpose in the past, and it will not do so in the future, because production will be obtained from the land so long as man is able to scratch or till the land.

I commend the Senator from North Dakota for having presented the Senate with his views on the problem, which he so well understands. Not only is he a farm operator in his own State, together with the aid of his sons as share operators, but he also is a man who has had many years of practical farm-operation experience. He knows the problems of farmers better, probably, than does any other Senator. I shall not even refer to myself.

But, Mr. President, it is simply human nature for a man to try to produce and to try to earn. It makes no difference whether he does it with a pen or pencil, or in the production of crops in farm operations.

The junior Senator from North Dakota is to be commended for an able address on a very complex problem, one which is of grave concern to agriculture at this time.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his kind statement.

Mr. President, when there is a surplus of labor it is not suggested that labor work fewer hours for less money. Labor proposes that it work fewer hours and receive a little more pay. Some persons propose to do just the opposite for the farmers.

EAST-WEST TRADE

Mr. McCLELLAN obtained the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I know the pending business, the farm bill, is important and the Senate wishes to get along with its consideration. Therefore, I am a bit reluctant to interrupt the debate on that measure, but I feel that I should bring to the attention of the Senate at this time a matter of information that is, in my opinion, vital to the deliberations of this body, and to the welfare and security of our country.

I wish to discuss briefly what we term East-West trade—that is, trade between the Communist-bloc countries and our allies, principally NATO countries.

As Senators may know, during the past several weeks the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee has been exploring in both executive and public hearings the relaxation of that trade that occurred in August 1954, as a result of the COCOM, the Coordinating Committee, meeting in Paris, in which our Government participated. Prior to that time, there were some 450 items that were completely embargoed or otherwise controlled by us and our Western allies. At that meeting, however, action was taken which resulted in the disembargoing and downgrading of approximately 200 of the 450 items, leaving only about 250 items under embargo or otherwise controlled.

Immediately following that meeting and the disembargoing and downgrading of these some 200 items, our Government, through its representative at COCOM, Mr. Harold Stassen, issued a statement in which, among other things, he said:

I am convinced that this revision, which has been made with the concurrence of the

Departments of State, Treasury, Defense, and Commerce, and approved by the President, will result in a net advantage to the free world of expanded peaceful trade and more effective control of the war potential items. It is a move in the best interests of the United States.

Mr. President, the facts which the subcommittee has uncovered in the course of these hearings completely refute the validity of that statement. They reveal that most astounding secret concessions were made by our Government in that conference to our allies, whose governments and merchants want to do business as usual with the Communist-bloc countries.

Mr. President, I used the term "most astounding secret," and I mean just that, for this information, as to what occurred at the COCOM conference and the truth about the relaxation of trade controls with the Communist countries, was not told to the Congress, or to the American people. I believe the facts should be made known to every American citizen, and certainly the Members of this body should know. It is for that reason, Mr. President, that I now undertake briefly to give to the Congress, to the press, and, I trust through them, to the public, some of the facts and information thus far developed in public hearing by the subcommittee. I believe Senators will agree that this is a matter about which the people of the United States have a right to know.

I intend to give only a few examples of the character, nature, and description of some of the goods, materials, and equipment which were disembargoed or otherwise downgraded with the concurrence of our Government, and in which our allies are now free to trade in and sell to the Communist countries.

First, I shall discuss the category of machine tools—tools which are absolutely essential in the manufacture of the munitions and armaments necessary in modern warfare. I shall refer only to a few of them.

No. 1: Horizontal boring mills, costing between $200,000 and $500,000 each, and which the Defense Department expert testified are essential in the manufacture of armaments such as tanks, artillery weapons, aircraft, heavy ordnance, ship transmission parts, heavy dies for aircraft, forging presses, catapult parts on aircraft carriers, and even for the manufacture of the atom reactors such as those on the submarine *Nautilus*.

No. 2: Vertical boring mills, which the Defense Department expert testified are essential in the manufacture of jet engines.

No. 3: Dynamic balance machines, which the Defense Department expert testified are used for balancing shafts on engines for jet airplanes and guided missiles. Without this machine guided missles which would remain on a true course could not be produced.

No. 4: External cylindrical grinding machines, which the Defense Department expert testified are esssential in the manufacturing of engine parts, guided missiles, and radar.

Mr. President, we had before us some machine tool experts. One of them, who, as I recall, had been in that business all his life, testified before the subcommittee, after he had reviewed the list of machine tools still under embargo, that the list was not worth the paper on which it was written. He further stated that many of the machine tools removed from the embargoed list had greater strategic importance than those remaining under embargo. He further pointed out that the precision boring machine which does work on a multiple scale can be sent to the Soviet bloc while the jig borer, which does the same work on a single scale was left under embargo. He also found that the description of machine tools presently under embargo is often so ambiguous and misleading that the individual or individuals who drew up the list apparently had no technical knowledge in this field and did not understand the nature of machine tools and their respective uses.

In these conclusions the witness was supported by the Defense Department's expert on machine tools. Both pointed out that by permitting the newest machine tools to be sent to the Soviet bloc we allowed them to save from 3 to 5 years in engineering research and development that would have been required of the Soviets to design and produce many of them.

In other words, Mr. President, it simply means that we allow them to get the latest methods in this country, and they do not have to go through the engineering, designing, testing, and revision periods which are required to get a machine to the point where it will operate efficiently.

It was emphatically stated that it would be better for the United States to permit shells, guns or guided missiles to be disembargoed and sent to the Soviet Union, for they could be used against us only once while these machine tools could and will be used to make armaments of war which could be used against us many times.

Now, let us take a look at metals.

The testimony showed that certain metals and minerals which we are stockpiling in the United States, because they are critical and essential in times of war, were removed from the embargo list and can now be sent to the Soviet bloc.

Let me give you some examples in this category.

Copper is deemed to be one of the most important single strategic metals aside from fissionable materials. Congress was officially informed in the Fifth Battle Act Report, December 23, 1954, that copper remained under embargo. This was a gross misstatement of a material fact. It served to mislead Congress and the public. Testimony has been received by the subcommittee that copper wire was in fact removed from the embargo list. Furthermore, we find that since August, 1954, our Allies in Europe have sent over 250 million pounds of copper to the Soviet Union and its European satellites. I point out that during this same period of time, because of shortages of copper within this country, the United States was forced to divert 143 million pounds of copper to industry from our war reserve stockpile.

We have learned that certain types of aluminum, easily convertible to the manufacture of shells, ammunition, and airplanes, are exportable to the Communist nations. The metal expert from the Defense Department stated, as we all know, that aluminum is essential to build a war machine. He stated that if the decision had been his, aluminum still would be under embargo.

Other minerals stockpiled by the United States and which were either disembargoed or downgraded with the concurrence of the United States, are: asbestos, used in the insulation of cables; talc, used as a spacer in electronic tubes; corrundum, essential as an abrasive in the manufacture of all types of military hardware; beryllium alloys and cobalt alloys, both essential in the atomic energy program, and even certain nickel alloys.

Other items removed from embargo were induction furnaces. With the use of certain crucibles and refractories not under embargo, high heat-resistant metal alloys for sonic and supersonic planes and guided missiles, where high speed friction heat becomes a problem, can be made. The chief metallurgist of the Bureau of Mines testified that he could think of no explanation for removing such an important and strategic item from the embargo list.

The committee heard testimony that railroad tank cars used for the transportation of petroleum, flatcars used for carrying tanks or heavy trucks, railroad well cars used for carrying heavy and bulky equipment, rails, and even steam and diesel locomotives were also removed from the embargo list and can be sold to the Soviet Union by our allies abroad.

These are merely examples of some 200 items which were removed or downgraded, with the United States Government concurrence, from the international embargo lists in August 1954. Furthermore, immediately following the international meetings in Paris, the Battle Act Administrator tailored the Battle Act lists, which are solely a United States responsibility, to conform to the international lists, and thus has permitted our allies to ship strategic materials with impunity. The Battle Act has become a mockery; the intent of Congress has been circumvented.

Mr. President, the subcommittee became concerned about the actions taken at the COCOM Conference shortly after its completion. During 1954 and through 1955, it made inquiries in an effort to ascertain the nature of the approximately 200 items which were either completely disembargoed or downgraded, with a view of determining whether they were strategic or critical, and whether they were either indispensable or essential to the Communist buildup of a war machine.

The Government agencies acting in concert are doing everything to hinder and hamper the subcommittee's efforts to ascertain the facts concerning the relaxation of these controls. In addition to many oral requests, 13 letters have been written to various Government agencies requesting documents and pertinent information. Except for some cooperation from the Department of Defense, the information has not been forthcoming.

The facts the subcommittee has developed thus far, and which I report to the Senate today, have not been made available or furnished to the subcommittee by the executive agencies of our Government.

The information we have has been secured from documents and publications of foreign governments, where the information is being freely given out by our allies. That same information in the United States is being withheld by the executive branch of the Government from both the Congress and the American people. Let me give the Senate an example. The executive branch of our Government has declared even the Battle Act list to be classified, and therefore not available to the people of the United States. But classified and suppressed from whom? Not from the Communist or the Communist bloc countries. They know what they can buy; they know what they do buy and have bought.

Furthermore, the British Government, in an official publication by the Board of Trade, has published substantially the same list of items which the executive department heads have refused to give to the American people.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand samples of the photostatic documents. It has been only through such unnecessary labor that the committee has been able to get the information so as to make it available to Congress and the people of the country. This is information which Congress is entitled to have, and information which the American people are entitled to know about.

We had the incongruous situation of Government witnesses appearing before the subcommittee and, upon instructions from their superiors, refusing to answer questions as to whether certain items—critically strategic items of machine tools and materials, some of which I have named—have been removed from the embargo list, even though the subcommittee had shown to the witnesses the British Government's publication giving this very information.

Mr. President, it is becoming quite clear that this material and the documents which the subcommittee has requested from the executive branch of the Government in the course of the investigation is being withheld from the United States Congress and the American public to prevent them from knowing what has happened, what has been done; to prevent them from knowing to what extent trade with the Communists in strategic things has been relaxed with the concurrence of the United States Government. Can it be, Mr. President, this classification, this policy of secrecy, this suppression or withholding of the truth, is a process or an action designed for the hiding of errors, inefficiency, and bad judgment of Government officials? I am convinced it is. If not, then why not give the Congress the information and let the American people know the truth.

Mr. President, the United States Export Control Act expires June 30 this year. I am sure we will be asked to extend it. We will also be asked, Mr. President, to appropriate $4.9 billion for foreign aid for fiscal 1957. Mr. President, I cannot vote for such appropriations so long as this vital information is suppressed by the executive branch of the Government.

I will tell the Senate why. If we are providing these funds to our allies for the purpose of enabling them to develop their military power and strength as a defense against communism, then how inconsistent is it for the same allies, for the sake of trade and profit, to place in the hands of the Communist bloc the machines, materials, and other essentials of the war potential in a war effort? Is not the advantage we are trying to gain and for which we are trying to provide being offset by the making of such machines, tools, and materials available to a potential enemy?

Mr. President, this is a serious matter. Our Government is now, I am advised, in the course of discussions with our allies regarding the embargo on exports to Red China. The China embargo is presently far more stringent than are the controls of trade with Russia and the European Soviet bloc.

In view of this, I insist, Mr. President, that until Congress gets the information we have requested and to which we are entitled from the executive branch of the Government on trade with the Soviet bloc, it should withhold action on the appropriation for foreign assistance for our allies.

Are we not entitled to have that information as we deliberate and as we consider appropriating billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money which will be expended on the pretext and for the purpose of aiding and assisting our allies to develop superior strength, or strength which will enable them to resist Communist aggression? Are we not entitled to know what kind of cooperation we are getting from those allies, or the lack of cooperation we are getting? I think we are entitled to know. I think we are entitled to know what effect the Battle Act is having today. In my opinion it is very effective.

Mr. President, the work of the subcommittee in this inquiry is not finished. We shall soon hear testimony regarding the decontrol or downgrading of items in the electronic and electrical equipment categories. We will not be deterred in this investigation. We shall do everything in our power to obtain the information and to get the truth to the American people.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I gladly yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, to me the statement which has just been made by the Senator from Arkansas reveals a most startling state of affairs. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that the Government of the United States, through its duly accredited representatives, has agreed to the shipment of tools, which he rightly says are more important than merely guns or ammunition, to the Soviet bloc by our allies, while still placing restrictions on such shipments from American citizens?

Mr. McCLELLAN. We do not sell any such material to the Soviet bloc. We have an embargo on shipments to the Soviet bloc of all the equipment and materials to which I have referred. We do not sell, and we do not permit our people to sell them, and I think rightly so. But obviously we agreed to or concurred in such shipments by our allies. I do not know whether we did it reluctantly; I certainly think we did it reluctantly; but, reluctantly or otherwise, the results are the same. Our allies obviously insist upon this sort of trade. As I pointed out, according to the evidence before the committee, some of the tools and machines referred to, which were to be downgraded, are modern. As I pointed out, in one particular instance, one tool and boring machine was the kind that would make several patterns at one time, whereas a jig-boring machine which makes only one boring at a time remained under embargo.

Mr. RUSSELL. We are going to make sure the Communists do not get any obsolete tools, and make sure that the ones they get are the most modern and effective.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I cannot quote the exact language, but one of the witnesses, an expert in tool equipment and tool machinery, who operates a mill, and whose father operated one before him, said that with what the Soviet bloc can now obtain, they can build a whole machine shop.

Another thing I should like to point out is that whenever a Soviet bloc country gets one of these modern tools, all it has to do is duplicate it. It can be duplicated over and over again. They do not have to spend 2 to 5 years time doing the engineering, the designing, and the testing and experimenting to get the machinery to operate efficiently.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will indulge me for a moment, I should like to say that it may be that we have no power to control the trade relations of our allies, but if the Congress has made one thing clear in passing foreign aid bills, it is that representatives of this Government should exert every effort at their command to see to it that tools which are so vital to our war machine, and that which the Soviet bloc conspiracy is now forging, would not, with our approval, get into the hands of the Communists.

I do not understand exactly why the executive branch of our Government should undertake to classify the tools that come under the Battle Act. I do not see why we should keep it as secret as possible, but agree that such tools may go to the Communist nations.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I might say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that I asked Mr. Hollister, who administers the Battle Act program, why the list was classified. He has been in charge of the program for more than 6 months. His answer to me was—and I think the chairman of the committee was present—that he did not know why. He was in charge of administering the program He had a classified list, but he could not give us a single reason why the list was classified. Is that correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is what Mr. Hollister stated. He had been there only 6 months; therefore he did not know.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Hollister apparently was not our representative when we agreed to this provision.

The man who made the classification was probably the one who agreed that all these tools should go to the Communist government. Naturally, he would want to keep the American people in the dark as much as possible, when he was flying in the face of what I am sure is the will of the overwhelming majority of the American people.

We will never learn anything from experience. We had scrap iron, which was sold to Japan, fired back at us by the Japanese in the form of munitions. Now we are consenting to the sale to the Communists of the most delicate and modern tools necessary for the forging of engines of war.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What we are sending is not scrap.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not want to monopolize all the time, but I commend the Senator from Arkansas for his persistence in pursuing the matter. I do not know that I can commend his apparent calm and patience. I think, from the state of facts he has presented, we have a very shocking picture of the failure of cooperation with the Congress in a field in which we have as direct a responsibility or a greater responsibility than the executive department in attempting to maintain a superiority in arms, in order that we may defend our country. It shows a great abuse of the power of classifying documents, but I cannot blame the individuals who are responsible for this matter for attempting to keep it from the American people. I hope the Senator from Arkansas and the Senate will pursue it until the whole picture is brought into the open.

Mr. McCLELLAN. While perhaps I may appear to be calm, I am not quite so calm in my emotions and in my feelings about this matter, but I have reached the conclusion that this is something which is the responsibility of all of us. With the help of my fine colleagues on the committee, we have been trying to obtain this information. No one can substantiate the statement which was made at the time, namely, that this would help control the shipment of vital war materials. Its effect has been just the opposite; it has made it possible for such materials to flow, and that is not in the interest of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Instead of making any such statement as that, we might as well ship directly to Moscow the 44,000 pounds of uranium which are to be sent overseas, and then say that thereby we are contributing to the superiority of American arms.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I certainly wish to commend my distinguished friend, the able Senator from Arkansas, for this disclosure, once again made on the floor of the Senate, to those of us whose duty it is to represent the American people.

Let me say that we have heard this matter discussed by Senators on both sides of the aisle; and I know that Senators on both sides have assisted the distinguished chairman and the other members of his committee in the work which now has resulted in bringing this matter to light.

Let me ask a question of the chairman of the committee: Is it fair to assume that certain of the foreign aid we are giving annually to foreign countries is, by an indirect route, to be used to purchase tools and machinery which are being shipped to the Communist countries?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course, I cannot say that; but we do know that as we provide this aid to countries which wish to trade, they are trading in some of the strategic materials the Russians are short of; and thus we provide them with an opportunity to sell something else.

Mr. WELKER. They can sell these materials and this equipment anywhere they wish to sell it; is that correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

I wish to say—as perhaps the Senator knows—that the committee, as I have pointed out, began to look into this matter under the preceding administration. The inquiry has been nonpartisan; both sides have tried to pursue the matter, and we are pursuing it now harder than ever before. If there is anything wrong in this case, we should know it. If it is proper for our allies to sell such materials or equipment to Communist countries, it is not wrong for Americans to sell such things to those countries. We should put the matter on that basis.

Mr. WELKER. Let me say that five or six members of the Senate Armed Services Committee are now on the floor of the Senate, and they are vitally interested in the work the able Senator from Arkansas has done. In the last number of months it has been the obligation of those of us who serve on the committee to listen to some rather shocking testimony which has been adduced.

The United States must be prepared. It is the duty of the Armed Services Committee to see that our Nation is prepared. Now that this information has been brought out by the Senator from Arkansas, I hope and pray that America will awaken to the dangers of false security. Mr. President, again I desire to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to my colleague on the committee.

Mr. JACKSON. I should like to say that now that Mr. Dulles has returned, I think it would be appropriate for him to come before our committee and explain—if he has a reason—why this information is being withheld.

I shall be called upon, as will all other Members of the Senate, to vote on a large foreign-aid bill. I wish to know the facts. As one who has consistently voted for foreign aid, I believe we have a right to know the facts.

Mr. Dulles is now back from his vacation; and I think it is high time that he appeared before our committee and gave us the facts, without further delay. Otherwise, he is inviting complete jeopardy of the foreign-aid program. We have no other course but to oppose requests for further foreign aid, if we are not going to get from the executive branch of the Government any more information than we have been getting.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The point is that if there is any information which needs to be classified or needs to be kept secret, and if it actually serves the security of our country to keep it classified or secret, then I do not wish to have such information supplied. But if it is a matter of knowing whether our allies are selling to our potential enemy, I cannot understand the kind of reasoning which holds it is vital that such information be kept secret, and that the publishing of such information would affect the security of our Nation—other than affect it adversely.

Mr. President, why should not the American people know it, and why should not the Congress have complete information about it, so Congress can use the information intelligently, both as regards appropriations and in connection with strengthening the Export Control Act and also the Battle Act. In my judgment, Mr. President, as the Battle Act is operating now, it is almost a farce.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say, Mr. President, that I believe the great Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and the other members of his committee are to be congratulated by all other Members of the Senate on the great, patriotic service they are rendering on this issue, as well as on other issues.

I wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made today by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] and also by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I desire to commend them for the nonpartisan position they are taking on this issue. Certainly it is proper that a nonpartisan position be taken, because when we are dealing with a matter of patriotism, there can be no partisanship.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course there cannot be.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas will yield further to me, I wish to refer to several points which I think need to be reemphasized; I think some of them have already been emphasized by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER]. I wish to point out that what our allies do in regard to supplying strategic materials to Russia happens to have a great effect on every man, woman, and child in the United States, and creates a great danger for all the American people. We cannot ignore that, and we cannot consider it separately from foreign aid.

When the Congress comes to consider the foreign-aid program this year, we shall have to take a long, hard look at its ramifications, because if we are giving

foreign aid, let us say, to England, in order to build up her economic and productive power, we must determine the use to which that productive power is being put. If that productive power is to be used to manufacture machine tools which will be sent to Russia—as the Senator from Arkansas has pointed out today—then that foreign aid threatens the security of American boys, in case of another war.

Mr. President, I serve notice now that I do not intend to vote for a foreign-aid program when there is concealed from me what is happening in regard to the use to which that foreign aid is being put by alleged allies.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I agree with the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. We have a right to know what goods foreign-aid countries ship to Russia. We are not asking for the disclosure of secrets which involve the war plans of our country, which should be kept secret—although on that point let me say that I think that in the United States we have gone a long way in keeping from the chairmen of the appropriate committees defense information which should be known to those leaders of the Senate and the House of Representatives. I believe it is silly to think that the security of our Nation is violated in some way if, for example, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the ranking Republican on that committee are taken into confidence; and the same is true of the Foreign Relations Committee—and I speak as a member of that committee. The same is true of the committee headed by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. Regardless of what administration may be in power—whether Republican or Democratic—we must see to it that we really put into effect the system of checks under our Constitution.

If the list of goods being sold to Russia by our allies referred to is being kept from the Senator from Arkansas on the claim that it is classified, I say that such concealment is not in keeping with the spirit of the checks provided by our Constitution on the executive branch of our Government. I am concerned with what is being done in regard to keeping from the Congress these so-called secret matters.

My second point is that I believe the American people must get their eyes open quickly—but they cannot get them open if they do not have the facts—about what Russia is doing in terms of heavy industry.

I cannot say here everything that I should like to say, and at the same time keep faith with the trust that is reposed in my keeping confidences. But I can say that at a recent briefing I was very much concerned about the Russian steel output. There was information presented that last year the Russian steel output was approximately 53 million tons. If some persons think we should take a great deal of comfort from the fact that in the same year the steel production in the United States was approximately twice that amount they are sadly mistaken.

The question is, What did Russia do with her 53 million tons, and what did we do with our 100 million tons, more or less? That makes all the difference in the world. If we could get a correct analysis, I fear—and I tremble with fear about this—that it would show that the 53 million tons of steel produced in Soviet Russia last year went into war equipment to a greater extent than did the total of 100 million tons of steel produced in the United States. I fear that the 53 million tons of steel produced in Russia did more to hurry Russia forward in the construction of a war machine than the steel produced in the United States did to assist our defense program.

I believe that our two great committees, the Armed Services Committee, of which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and other Senators present are members, and the Foreign Relations Committee, of which the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is chairman, and which includes other Senators who are present, besides myself, must work together on the matter of foreign aid this year. We must find out the facts about what is being done indirectly through foreign aid to increase the war potential of Russia. It is going along at such a rapid pace that, nonpartisanly and nonpolitically, all we patriots had better call the attention of the Government and the people of our country to the great danger of Russia's warmaking power. I do not think the Senator from Arkansas should let go his hold on this subject. I think he must make it clear to this administration that we have the right to know what our allies are doing with foreign aid.

I commend the Senator from Arkansas for his calmness and objectivity, but I think we must be tenacious. I think the time has come to ask the officials of the Government to give us the facts, and not hide behind secret classification, secret classification, secret classification.

In the presence of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], I make this last point: I think a prima facie case has been made on the floor of the Senate to show that we are falling far behind Russia in our air defense and air power. We cannot afford to continue in that direction. The same is true of the missile program. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to say to Mr. Dulles this afternoon from this floor that I do not intend to let him separate foreign aid from the defense program of my country. The Senator from Arkansas is dealing with the defense of my country when he is dealing with this problem; and I assure him of my complete support in the great patriotic fight he is making on this issue.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I will say to him that I do not retreat from a stand I have taken quickly or easily. I have tried to make it very clear to the executive officials—I have done it courteously and politely, but I trust I have also done it firmly—that we are going to get this information if it is within the power of the committee or the United States Senate to get it. I cannot do more than that.

I thought I should report to this body this afternoon on what had been developed and the hindrances which we are encountering. If the officials of the executive department are right, they can sustain their position. If they are wrong, they must take the responsibility for their action.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. May I have the attention of the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER]? He made a pertinent observation on the question of whether or not we were giving aid to countries which were, in effect, shipping materials made with that aid to the Communists. It is true that is what we have been doing. For example, we have given foreign aid to countries in order that they might develop copper mines. Those countries are shipping copper to the Communists, despite the fact we have not yet completed our own stockpile of copper to the point considered essential for our own security, and also despite the fact that, not too long ago, we were paying a premium price for copper on the world market as against domestic price.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. If I may interrupt the Senator from Missouri, of course I do not intend to shed any crocodile tears over Members of the United States Senate who have been voting for foreign aid as long as I have been in the Senate. I have always voted against it. However, I certainly appreciate the kind tribute to me from the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I voted for some foreign aid, and shall continue to vote for some foreign aid, provided we get into the record the fact we do not intend to have that aid used, directly or indirectly, to increase the war machine of the Communists.

Does the distinguished chairman of the committee remember that at one point a Government consultant on machine tools was asked the following question: "In other words, we can say, can we not, that we continue to embargo practically everything they do not want, and have lifted the embargo on just about everything they do want?"

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think that is almost verbatim what took place in the committee.

I can tell this body—and I know my colleagues will verify the statement—that the people upon whom the Defense Department depends for advice and counsel with respect to strategic materials know the seriousness of the situation. We can read their distress in their faces. They are greatly distressed by reason of the fact that these things are happening. They do not hesitate to tell us so privately. When they are before the committee and on the witness stand, and their bosses are sitting there, under such restrictions they are a little reluctant. However, we can read the message in their countenances. They

tell us that what has happened is almost tragic.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is it true that under the present regulations the most modern machine tools can be shipped for 6 months before any question arises as to whether these new machine tools should or should not be embargoed?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think it takes about that long to get them on the list.

Mr. SYMINGTON. So, if one of our allies desired to take an order on the side, it could build the equipment, not say anything about it, then ship the item for 6 months after it was built.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is true.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is it not true that among the products put up in payment for these war materials by the Communists were butter, cotton, and corn?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The testimony before the committee was that many of these strategic materials were paid for in the very things of which we have great surpluses. Cotton is one.

Mr. SYMINGTON. They include as I remember eggs, butter, cotton, corn, and, incidentally, gold.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Gold is one item.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Let me ask the distinguished chairman this question: If an American corporation desired to ship any of these products to the Communists, would it not be refused the right to do so on the ground our national security would be impaired?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is my understanding. I do not see how it could be refused on any other ground. That would be the only justification for it, so far as I know.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is it not true that rubber is being shipped in quantity to Russia, despite the fact rubber cannot be shipped to the Chinese Communists?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understand that is true. I do not think that has developed as yet in the public hearings. I tried to confine my remarks this afternoon to those things which we have developed in public hearings. Certain other facts have been developed in executive sessions, which I hope and expect the committee to bring out in public hearings, possibly next week.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I close my comments on this subject by reading a brief quotation from one of the highest military officials of this Government.

> In airplane after airplane, the Soviets are approaching us in quality and surpassing us in quantity. * * * The fact is they have been and are outproducing us in all categories, but medium jet bombers. * * * One of the reasons that we are dropping behind is that the Communists are making scientific and technological advances at a faster rate than we.

Many people question that type and character of statement, on the ground the Communists have not the materials with which to produce those airplanes, or the technology with which to develop such items as jet engines.

It is a fact, is it not, that the testimony brought out by the Senator from Arkansas, and the able counsel of the committee, and the committee's staff, has developed evidence that we are shipping war materials to the Communists, plus technological knowledge through the shipment of latest machine tools, to a point where they should not have too much difficulty in making these airplanes. Is that not correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is certainly providing aid to them of that character. When the Senator says we are shipping the material, I should like to point out that it is not the United States, but our allies. They are shipping those things with our Government's concurrence.

Mr. SYMINGTON. When I say "We" I mean we, because it is my understanding—and I am asking whether or not it is also the distinguished Senator's understanding—that the free world is operating in a partnership understanding against communism.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is the purpose of the aid. If we were not parties to it we would not be granting aid, certainly not aid of a military character. We might give some humanitarian assistance and perhaps some economic aid, but certainly we would not be granting military aid.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to ask the able Senator from Arkansas if the excuse given is that disclosure of such information might reveal some transactions with a foreign nation which might be of a confidential nature. Is that correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes. I may say to the Senator that perhaps sometimes the request of the committee was so broad that it might have included documents pertaining to other countries which were of a confidential nature, but we have tried to make clear in conversations and in letters that we were not trying to get any confidential documents which related to some other country. What we have been trying to get is a list, the Battle Act list, declassified, so that we can make it public. We have been trying to get the list of items together with the recommendations made by the so-called JOC committee, so that we might make some comparisons as to how far our representatives went beyond perhaps the very liberal action which was taken when we were trying at that level to hold the line on these things.

Mr. ERVIN. That is the matter I wanted to draw attention to in my second question. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Arkansas if evidence taken before the subcommittee has not disclosed the fact that approximately 100 different items were recommended to be de-embargoed by the JOC committee, and if the JOC committee is not entirely a committee composed of Americans operating within the departments of the Government, and if the committee has not been refused documentary evidence concerning actions of the JOC committee in making these recommendations.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; our committee has been refused all those documents, and even the recommendations. I should think there would be a list of items. We have been told that there is not even a list of items that JOC considered. Of course there may not be an actual list, but certainly there is a record, because recommendations were made, and those recommendations related to some specific items.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the Senator from Arkansas, from the standpoint of believing that our country should take every reasonable and every proper precaution to prevent shipments behind the Iron Curtain of any materials useful to their war machine.

So that my position may be made very clear on the record, I may say that I made the motion in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which was approved by the committee, to strike out of the farm bill a section which would have relaxed the arrangements whereby additional foodstuffs could be sent behind the Iron Curtain.

I did that even though I come from a farm State and despite the magnitude of the problem of surpluses, because I recognize the fact that anything that feeds an enemy is a disservice to the Republic.

Having said that, I must also say that, while I associate myself with what the chairman has said, and although I commend him, because I know he is approaching the matter on a nonpartisan basis, I am a little disturbed by some statements made during the colloquy to which I have listened, and which certainly would remind anyone of the fact that 1956 is a political year.

There is one statement which seems to need comment by me. I refer to the chairman's statement:

> Can it be, Mr. President, this classification, this policy of secrecy, this suppression or withholding of the truth, is a process or an action designed for the hiding of errors, inefficiency, and bad judgment of Government officials? I am convinced it is.

I certainly wish to dissociate myself from that conclusion. I think at the moment it is purely a political deduction.

I believe we will find out whether there is inefficiency and I think we should—and I believe we will find out whether there were errors—and I think we should—and I believe we should find out whether there was bad judgment—and I think we will find that out, too.

However, at this stage of uncompleted hearings, before we have even asked Governor Stassen to testify before us—and he should testify before our committee—I do not believe we can conclude now that there was error, inefficiency, or bad judgment. That should be something that should come at the conclusion of the hearings, not before they have actually started.

In that connection, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter written to the committee through our distinguished chairman, on February 20, by the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Herbert Hoover, Jr., in which he sets forth the position of

the State Department and lists those items which in his opinion our committee should have in public session, those items which in his opinion the committee should have as a classified list, and those items which in his opinion might do jeopardy to our international relationships if they were made public in any way.

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

FEBRUARY 20, 1956.

The Honorable JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: During the course of the current inquiry by the subcommittee into East-West trade controls, the subcommittee has made a number of requests for information and documents from the executive branch, some to the International Cooperation Administration, and others to the Departments of Defense and Commerce. The specific requests as to documents relate to the international lists, the Battle Act lists, and the working papers and minutes of the Joint Operating Committee which was set up as an advisory group in the executive branch with relation to the negotiations with our allies in 1954 concerning the international lists. In addition, the International Cooperation Administration has been specifically requested to supply information as to the certain recommendations of the Joint Operating Committee.

This letter relates to all such requests.

In relation to these requests, it should be stated what the agencies involved have supplied and have offered to supply to the subcommittee. The International Cooperation Administration has furnished to you the various Battle Act lists from 1952 to 1955 with a notation as to the items decontrolled or downgraded on or about August 25, 1954. As recognized by the subcommittee in its request, these documents and related information were supplied necessarily on a classified basis.

On February 14, I discussed with the subcommittee the overall policy considerations involved in the whole subject of the control of trade in strategic materials, and for the Departments of State, Defense, and Commerce and the International Cooperation Administration requested, in view of considerations given to the subcommittee, first, that hearings on the subject of strategic controls be held in executive session and, second, that the appropriate officials at the policymaking levels be permitted to come before the subcommittee to fully explain our policy and actions in the negotiations with our allies in 1954.

I further referred to the matter of the documents involved; most of these documents are classified and highly sensitive; many of them involve our relations with other governments; and almost all of them are working-level papers of the executive branch showing internal advice and recommendations.

In that connection, I stated that if the subcommittee decided to pursue its investigation along the lines suggested, the agencies involved were prepared to review the question of what documents could appropriately be turned over to the subcommittee in the light of the developing testimony, with proper consideration for the safeguarding of those that are confidential and sensitive.

It is my understanding that the subcommittee has denied these requests, at least insofar as holding the hearings in executive session is concerned, and has renewed its request for the documents involved. However, the executive branch has certain responsibilities and duties under the Constitution and our laws which it is bound to fulfill. These relate to the conduct of our foreign relations and to the effective and efficient administration of the executive branch.

As to East-West trade controls the present international system has existed on a voluntary basis between the United States and the nations friendly to it since 1948. The group of nations participating in this system of controls does not have a formal agreement which subordinates their actions to rule by majority. The system of controls depends for its very existence on the good faith of the participating nations. Any of these nations is free to take unilateral action at any time if for any reason it does not wish to abide by the suggested control list. Cooperation, therefore, is the only way in which the objectives of effective international control of strategic materials can be accomplished. In many instances participation of a particular nation in this program has been obtained only on the specific commitment that the details of such participation would be kept secret.

Thus any revelation on our part of the details of this program would constitute a breach of trust on the part of the United States, and by jeopardizing the voluntary basis upon which the program rests, would endanger our national security.

Because of this, the international lists cannot be revealed by the executive branch. We are, however, prepared through responsible officials to (1) furnish the subcommittee in open session information as to items deleted from the 1952 list in the 1954 revision, and (2) furnish the subcommittee in executive session on a classified basis information as to items downgraded, upgraded, or added to the list in the 1954 revision.

Apart from the Battle Act list, which already has been supplied to the subcommittee on a classified basis, and the international lists referred to above, the remaining documents in the executive branch relating to East-West trade controls consist of discussions and communications of an advisory nature among the officials and employees of the executive branch, highly sensitive intelligence information, and communications with our delegation and other representatives abroad containing recommendations, information regarding the position of other governments, and comments thereon. It is contrary to the public interest that their conversations or communications or any documents or reproductions concerning such advice be disclosed. May we refer you to the position of the President on the subject in his letter of May 17, 1954, to the Secretary of Defense. We are, therefore, required to deny to this subcommittee any documents that would violate this principle.

We recognize the right of the Congress to investigate the operations of the Government and we continue to stand ready to cooperate with this committee by having the officials who were charged with the responsibility for the negotiations with the cooperating nations to appear before you to explain the considerations which guided their actions during these negotiations. We can advise you that Governor Stassen, who was charged with the chief responsibility involving these negotiations, will appear before the committee on a date mutually satisfactory to the committee and him.

We feel sure that your subcommittee in this manner can obtain an accurate picture of Government policy and actions in the area of international strategic controls.

I am authorized to state that this letter has the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Director of the International Cooperation Administration.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT HOOVER, Jr.,
Acting Secretary of State.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to say just one more thing.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Dakota wishes to speak in his own right, he may do so. I have concluded my remarks.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator, but I believe the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] desires to speak and I can conclude in 2 or 3 more minutes. I have made this suggestion before, and since the matter has been tossed into the arena of public debate, I shall make the suggestion publicly now.

I believe the method by which our committee might most properly proceed to get down to the facts in this matter—and I want to get down to the facts, because I believe Congress may decide to tighten foreign-aid legislation, so as to make certain that our allies, who receive assistance from us, do not in turn transmit war materials to the enemy—would be to ask Governor Stassen to appear before our committee, because he was in charge of the decontrols and in charge of the international conferences at the time the decisions were reached. Until that is done, I submit any deductions are premature, to say the least.

I believe that next we should bring before our committee jointly, in executive session, Mr. John Hollister, the Administrator of ICA, and Mr. Weeks, the Secretary of Commerce, who has had much to do with the decontrol of items on the Battle list. At the same time we should also bring in Mr. Herbert Hoover, Jr., to state the view of the State Department.

In that way we can find out for ourselves, first, which branch of this coordinate activity and information our committee wants and, second, what will serve the public interest to make available in public print. I know that no member of our committee wants to do jeopardy to our international policy. We are not seeking to get information which will be of comfort and aid to the enemy. I believe all of us are seeking, and rightly so, information which clearly does not do anything to help the enemy's cause. By bringing those three officials before the committee we will at least have information before us to show who has the information we want and what their reasons are, if any, for believing that some portion of that information should not be made available.

After hearing them, I think our committee will be able to act rationally, dispassionately, and without political motive, and try to render the service to the country which I know is the ultimate desire of every member of the committee.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, after watching the State Department encourage the Department of Commerce not to give us any information, and the Department of Commerce insisting that the State Department should not give us any information, I am inclined to the conclusion that they were actuated by the motives which actuated a teen-age couple in my section of the country. On one occasion John was at a party and was compelled by force of circumstances to see Mary home. It was the first time he had ever seen a girl home, and, when he reached her home, he said, "Mary, do

not tell any of the boys that I saw you home tonight, because they might tease me about it."

She said, "You need not worry. I am just as much ashamed of it as you are."

So, Mr. President, when I see the Department of Commerce insisting that the Department of State withhold information from the Congress of the United States and the American people, and the Department of State insists that the Department of Commerce do the same, I begin to suspect that they are both ashamed of what has been going on in this field.

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, apropos the remarks made earlier today by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD, a letter which was addressed to him by Mr. Herbert Hoover, Jr., Acting Secretary of State.

Without objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 20, 1956.

The Honorable JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
Chairman, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR McCLELLAN: During the course of the current inquiry by the subcommittee into East-West trade controls, the subcommittee has made a number of requests for information and documents from the executive branch, some to the International Cooperation Administration, and others to the Departments of Defense and Commerce. The specific requests as to documents relate to the international lists, the Battle Act lists, and the working papers and minutes of the Joint Operating Committee, which was set up as an advisory group in the executive branch with relation to the negotiations with our allies in 1954 concerning the international lists. In addition, the International Cooperation Administration has been specifically requested to supply information as to the certain recommendations of the Joint Operating Committee.

This letter relates to all such requests.

In relation to these requests, it should be stated what the agencies involved have supplied and have offered to supply to the subcommittee. The International Cooperation Administration has furnished to you the various Battle Act lists from 1952 to 1955, with a notation as to the items decontrolled or downgraded on or about August 25, 1954. As recognized by the subcommittee in its request, these documents and related information were supplied necessarily on a classified basis.

On February 14, I discussed with the subcommittee the overall policy considerations involved in the whole subject of the control of trade in strategic materials, and for the Departments of State, Defense, and Commerce and the International Cooperation Administration requested, in view of considerations given to the subcommittee, first, that hearings on the subject of strategic controls be held in executive session and, second, that the appropriate officials at the policymaking levels be permitted to come before the subcommittee to fully explain our policy and actions in the negotiations with our allies in 1954.

I further referred to the matter of the documents involved: most of these documents are classified and highly sensitive; many of them involve our relations with other governments; and almost all of them are working level papers of the executive branch showing internal advice and recommendations.

In that connection, I stated that if the subcommittee decided to pursue its investigation along the lines suggested, the agencies involved were prepared to review the question of what documents could appropriately be turned over to the subcommittee in the light of the developing testimony, with proper consideration for the safeguarding of those that are confidential and sensitive.

It is my understanding that the subcommittee has denied these requests, at least insofar as holding the hearings in executive session is concerned, and has renewed its request for the documents involved. However, the executive branch has certain responsibilities and duties under the Constitution and our laws which it is bound to fulfill. These relate to the conduct of our foreign relations and to the effective and efficient administration of the executive branch.

As to East-West trade controls the present international system has existed on a voluntary basis between the United States and the nations friendly to it since 1948. The group of nations participating in this system of controls does not have a formal agreement which subordinates their actions to rule by majority. The system of controls depends for its very existence on the good faith of the participating nations. Any of these nations is free to take unilateral action at any time if for any reason it does not wish to abide by the suggested control list. Cooperation, therefore, is the only way in which the objectives of effective international control of strategic materials can be accomplished. In many instances participation of a particular nation in this program has been obtained only on the specific commitment that the details of such participation would be kept secret.

Thus any revelation on our part of the details of this program would constitute a breach of trust on the part of the United States, and by jeopardizing the voluntary basis upon which the program rests, would endanger our national security.

Because of this the international lists cannot be revealed by the executive branch. We are, however, prepared through responsible officials to (1) furnish the subcommittee in open session information as to items deleted from the 1952 list in the 1954 revision, and (2) furnish the subcommittee in executive session on a classified basis information as to items downgraded, upgraded, or added to the list in the 1954 revision.

Apart from the Battle Act list, which already has been supplied to the subcommittee on a classified basis, and the international lists referred to above, the remaining documents in the executive branch relating to East-West trade controls consist of discussions and communications of an advisory nature among the officials and employees of the executive branch, highly sensitive intelligence information, and communications with our delegation and other representatives abroad containing recommendations, information regarding the position of other governments, and comments thereon. It is contrary to the public interest that their conversations or communications or any documents or reproductions concerning such advice be disclosed. May we refer you to the position of the President on the subject in his letter of May 17, 1954, to the Secretary of Defense. We are, therefore, required to deny to this subcommittee any documents that would violate this principle.

We recognize the right of the Congress to investigate the operations of the Government and we continue to stand ready to cooperate with this committee by having the officials who were charged with the responsibility for the negotiations with the cooperating nations to appear before you to explain the considerations which guided their actions during these negotiations. We can advise you that Governor Stassen, who was charged with the chief responsibility involving these negotiations, will appear before the committee on a date mutually satisfactory to the committee and him.

We feel sure that your subcommittee in this manner can obtain an accurate picture of Government policy and actions in the area of international strategic controls.

I am authorized to state that this letter has the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Director of International Cooperation Administration.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT HOOVER, Jr.,
Acting Secretary of State.

Mr. MAGNUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield in order that I may place several items in the RECORD?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

CABINET COMMITTEE'S REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, much has been said and will be said about the so-called Cabinet Committee's Report on Transportation, the recommendations of which are embodied in S. 1920, a bill which is now pending before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Until now most emphasis has been placed upon how the railroads and the common carrier truck will fare under the proposed legislation.

On February 10 of this year the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, delivered a speech before the Private Truck Council of America, Inc., at the group's Cleveland, Ohio, convention, wherein he touched upon another phase of the matter that also deserves attention.

The Senator from Washington spoke of the importance of maintaining a strong private trucking industry in America and how that picture could be easily changed unless every safeguard is taken to insure continuance of the industry.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent that his Cleveland speech entitled "Trends in Transportation in Congress" be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

The Cabinet Committee report has created more interest and more controversy than any other matter before my committee. I know of your interest.

The Cabinet Committee report states that common carriers are unfairly treated by the present regulatory laws because laws were first passed to regulate railroads as monopolies. Today, these laws are out of date because new forms of transportation offer stiff competition but the restrictive legislation remains, so the report claims.

The Committee claims that putting its recommendations into the law would give a better break to all common carriers.

I should point out that originally regulation was placed on transportation not only because of monopoly conditions but also to correct the evils of too much competition. The Cabinet Committee does not make this entirely clear.

The report was based on the idea that because there is now a great deal of competition between carriers, the Interstate Commerce Act should be changed to recognize such competition. Further, the laws should be changed to serve the public interest by preventing common carriers from having too much unregulated competition. The recommendations of the Committee have been put in a bill, S. 1920, which would make the changes in the Interstate Commerce Act that the Cabinet Committee considers necessary to strengthen common carriers.

You are aware that the national transportation policy now provides that all the parts of the act be administered in such a way as to encourage reasonable charges for transportation services without unfair or destructive competition. The Cabinet Committee would strike this from the law and replace that policy by one calling for full competition between different forms of transportation.

To bring about more competition, several changes in the Interstate Commerce Act concerning rate regulation are proposed by the Cabinet Committee. These changes would give the regulated carriers greater freedom in making rates by cutting down the power of the Interstate Commerce Commission over rates. Supposedly each carrier could then begin to perform the transportation for which it is best suited. The present power of the Commission to instruct the carriers to charge precise rates would be taken away. The Commission would be left the limited authority to determine only just and reasonable minimum or maximum rates. Much confusion, however, exists concerning changes that would actually result if this new suggestion were put into the law.

The Interstate Commerce Commission can now prevent rates of doubtful legality from going into effect for as long as 7 months. During this time the Commission can investigate to determine whether the proposed rates are lawful. The Cabinet Committee would have this power whittled down so that suspension and investigation of proposed rates would be allowed only in very special cases. The suspension period would be made 3 months instead of 7 months.

S. 1920 would change the long-and-short-haul portion of the Interstate Commerce Act. This clause of the law will not allow a carrier to charge less for a long haul as compared with a shorter haul over the same line and in the same direction unless the Interstate Commerce Commission gives permission. The proposal is that rail and water carriers not be required to get approval in advance by the Commission to depart from this section of the law. The carrier could justify a departure by showing that such action was necessary to meet competition and that the lower rates for the longer haul than for the shorter haul are compensatory, that is, cover out-of-pocket costs. Further, large volumes of traffic could be given lower rates than smaller volumes under the terms of S. 1920. Again it must be shown by the carrier that such rates are based on lower costs and are necessary to meet competition.

The bill would do other things in the name of a better deal for common carriers. The present definition of private carriers would be changed. The same would be done for motor and water contract carriers. Water carriers that are now allowed to carry three or less commodities in bulk without regulation would be regulated. The purpose of all these, of course, is to give increased regulation to private and contract carriers in order to help common carriers.

Along the same line, the Interstate Commerce Commission would be empowered to veto service requirements placed on common carriers by States. Under this proposal the ICC could order a passenger train discontinued even though the State commission thought it rendered a necessary service. This power would apply where such requirements unduly burden interstate and foreign commerce; other reasonably adequate service must be available.

The report recommends that the exemption from regulation now given the hauling of farm products be looked over by the Congress for the purpose of deciding exactly what exemptions should be continued. Finally, the Cabinet Committee suggests that the authority to give Federal, State, and municipal governments special rates without regulation under the Interstate Commerce Act be taken away from the carriers. Instead, these rates would be subjected to nearly all of the provisions of the law.

I cannot predict which of the more controversial recommendations of the Cabinet report will reach the Senate floor during the 84th session of Congress.

But—I would like to make it clear that every group affected by the Cabinet report will be given an opportunity to make their objections or voice their approval before hearings on this subject have ended.

I will talk briefly about the recommendation of the Cabinet Committee to change the definition of a private carrier by motor vehicle. As members of the Private Truck Council of America, this is of special significance to you. The law now defines a private carrier as one not included in the term common or contract carrier, who transports in interstate or foreign commerce freight of which the person is the owner, lessee, or bailee, when such transportation is for the purpose of carrying on a commercial enterprise. The purpose of this definition of private carriers is to indicate those, other than common or contract carriers, that are subject to safety regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

According to the ICC's comment on S. 1920, those excluded from the private carrier definition proposed by this bill would be merely relieved from the Commission's safety regulations. This is true, says the Commission, because the bill does not bring within the definition of either common or contract carriers those excluded as private carriers.

S. 1920 would change the definition of private carriage by dropping the requirement that the transportation must be for "furtherance of any commercial enterprise." Without the requirement that the transportation must be for commercial purposes anyone who transports in interstate commerce goods which he owns or leases would be a private carrier subject to ICC safety regulation. This would be true even though the transportation is carrying one's own camping equipment or taking one's clothing to the cleaners in a private automobile. Thus, enormous numbers of additional people would be brought under safety regulation by the ICC by the change in definition. The Cabinet Committee, as I read the report, wanted additional economic regulation of private and contract carriers that now compete with common carriers. I doubt that the Committee has accomplished what it intended by vastly increasing safety regulation. This seems to be unnecessary legislation in any event.

The Committee further would add a proviso that would limit the new definition of private carriers to those whose "ownership, lease, or bailment was not undertaken for the purpose of such transportation."

The proviso would have the effect of taking out from the definition of private carriers and thus relieving from safety regulations those whose ownership, lease, or bailment was undertaken for the purpose of such transportation, whatever the term may mean. I doubt that the Cabinet Committee intended such a result, but there it is. You, I understand, are firmly set against this or other changes in the definition of private carriage. This is another of the many areas of disagreement stirred up by the report, one on which your organization will undoubtedly be heard when hearings are held on S. 1920.

As I understand the law, the rule that is now applied to distinguish private carriage from common or contract carriage was set forth when the courts considered in one proceeding the Lenoir Chair and Schenley cases. The courts upheld the Commission and laid down a simple, commonsense rule known as the primary business test, which I would state as follows:

"You're a regulated, for-hire carrier if you're really engaging in the transportation business as such, but not if you're operating trucks only as a bona fide incident to your own nontransportation enterprise. Which of these you are doing is to be determined from the total facts in each case."

I understand this rule applies even though a charge for transportation is included in the selling price or is billed to the customer as a separate item. Thus, the Cabinet Committee recommendation that a new definition be made for private carriers would probably start action in the courts all over again to determine what the new law means.

I further understand the primary business test would be changed by some, including some of the common carriers. The new rule proposed would be this: when compensation, direct or indirect, has been received for hauling freight, the one receiving the compensation for hauling his own goods would be either a contract or a common carrier. To avoid receiving compensation that would make one a contract or common carrier, apparently one would have to at least deliver his own goods at a loss.

I can understand that most of you will wish to continue the primary business test. You will oppose any proposed change.

I should like to assure you that I believe that the right to carry your own goods in your own vehicle free from economic regulation is a basic fundamental right. I do not want to see it changed because of S. 1920 or in any other way.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if I had known what I was yielding to my friend from Florida for, I would have yielded with much more alacrity.

I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I am glad I have earned that good grace on the part of the Senator from Washington.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY HON. JOSÉ LUIS CRUZ-SALAZAR, AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES FROM GUATEMALA

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an excellent and enlightening address delivered at Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla., on January 21 by the Honorable José Luis Cruz-Salazar, Ambassador to the United States from Guatemala. The speech deals with the case of the recent Communist threat to Guatemala, its impact on the Americas and suggested ideas to keep before us in the continuing fight against the imperialistic tactics of the Communist conspiracy in this hemisphere. I strongly recommend to the Members of the Congress its careful reading.

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

ADDRESS BY LT. COL. JOSÉ LUIS CRUZ SALAZAR, GUATEMALAN AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES, AT ROLLINS COLLEGE

Ladies and gentlemen, I appreciate most deeply the honor you have paid my country,

by inviting its Ambassador to address such a select audience.

I cannot say, however, that I take any pleasure in discussing the topic that is before us. No sane man can derive the slightest pleasure in reviewing the subversion of his country by a ruthless, imperialistic foreign power, in collaboration with local dupes and traitors. To we Guatemalans the subject before us is a painful one.

Nevertheless, the case of Guatemala, when presented in its true perspective, contains some valuable lessons; lessons which, if they are studied well by the peoples of the Americas, will surely contribute to the safety of our hemisphere.

Therefore, ladies and gentlemen, even though the task is an unpleasant one, I must welcome the opportunity to discuss with you briefly, and attempt to analyze, the Guatemalan case.

Let me first try to put the topic in perspective. In recent years many thoughtful Latin Americans have become increasingly concerned at three factors prevalent throughout the hemisphere, which, we feel, threatens the welfare of all of us. This concern is particularly felt by those of us in Guatemala, who participated in the liberation movement.

1. In many of the Amercan nations there is a serious lack of understanding by the great majority of the people, as to the benefits and the responsibilities incurred by the individual in a democratic society. To most of us, I am sad to say, democracy is a subject that evokes much emotion, but too little thought.

2. It is equally true that in many of our countries there is among all classes of people, a lack of knowledge as to the true nature of the Communist conspiracy, of its peculiar techniques and tactics devised for this hemisphere, and especially, of its imperialistic aims.

3. Many of us are too little aware of the very real threat that communism poses to the freedom and security of our hemisphere, and of the truly alarming progress it has made. Ironically, we are better informed on developments in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East, than we are of those right here in the Americas.

Ladies and gentlemen, I believe any objective analysis of the case of Guatemala, must lead to the conclusion that the existence of those three factors enabled a small handful of ruthlessly efficient Communist agitators to gain control of my country, and to exercise that control, almost unnoticed by the rest of the American nations, for nearly a decade.

Guatemalans, in our country located in the very heart of the Americas, have enjoyed political freedom in only a few brief periods of our history. We have had little experience with democracy—except as a catch-phrase by demagogic politicians. Most of our experience has been with the old-fashioned type of personal dictatorship.

As the Second World War drew toward a close, Guatemala was caught in a tide of political, social and economic unrest which swept most of Latin America, and which still prevails in many countries. Jorge Ubico, the last of the old school dictators, who had ruled for 14 years, was forced out of office by public pressure in 1944. A few months later, his successor, Gen. Federico Ponce Vaides, was unseated after a brief, but bloody revolution, when it appeared that he, too, was following the policy of dictatorship.

General Ponce followed his predecessor, Ubico into exile, on October 20, 1944. And that date opened the gates for new hope by the people of Guatemala. But unfortunately, it also opened a new opportunity for international communism to secure a foothold in the Western Hemisphere, after years of patient preparation, and careful testing and revising of its subversive tactics.

Please note, ladies and gentlemen, that at that time, our people had no real knowledge of democracy—we merely had the desire to possess it. Even our intellectuals lacked any real concept of the responsibilities that democracy invokes on all classes of individuals—private citizens as well as public officials. It is equally true that we were utterly lacking in knowledge of the Communist conspiracy, and of the real threat it presented to the achievement of our democratic aspirations. All three of the factors that I listed a few moments ago, were prevalent. And the Communists immediately seized the advantage. They knew precisely what they wanted, and had careful plans as to how they would achieve it. In Europe the Communists used as the tool for expansion, the presence or the threat of the powerful Red Army. In Asia they armed local masses, and organized them into trained armies under Red instructors and advisers. But in Latin America, in Guatemala, they were forced to rely on guile, conspiracy, demagogery and subversion.

So, in accordance with what was obviously a careful plan to exploit any similar opportunity, presenting itself anywhere in the hemisphere, the Communist leader concentrated on Guatemala.

With almost unbelievable speed, they swung into action. Guatemalan Communists who had been living in exile, returned to their homes, and engaged in tireless, carefully coordinated political activity. They were joined by comrades from all over Latin America, and even from Spain.

I believe it is important that only a few of these, in the beginning, acknowledged their Communist beliefs. Most of them sailed under the false colors of liberals, or Marxian Socialists, or even the new spiritual socialism invented by President Arévalo.

Their early tactics have since become standard Communist practices throughout the hemisphere. They allied themselves with all of the revolutionary parties, and immediately set about winning the confidence of the more radical elements in our intellectual and working classes. And they succeeded so well, that they were able to secure the nomination of Juan José Arévalo for the presidency, by all of the revolutionary parties. And Arévalo, if he was not an actual card-carrying Communist at that time, was certainly a true Communist sympathizer.

Needless to say, Arévalo was elected by an overwhelming majority. Then came the second phase of the Communist program, a phase that was already well underway before the elections—the organization of the workers under Communist leaders. At the invitation of Arévalo, Vincente Lombardo Toledano came to Guatemala to supervise the organization of the unions. Toledano maneuvered into leadership of the labor movement a young Communist intellectual, Victor Manuel Gutiérrez. Later Gutiérrez selected as his lieutenant a man whom many observers believes was the No. 2 Communist of Guatemala, Carlos Manuel Pellecer. The direct tie-in between the Guatemalan labor leaders and Moscow, was clearly revealed in 1951, when Louis Saillant, of France, head of the notorious World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) came to Guatemala to personally supervise the organization of a central labor body, the Confederación General de Trabajadores (CGTG), which, of course, became affiliated with the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) and Lombardo Toledano's Communist-controlled Latin American labor organization, Confederación de Trabajadores de América Latina (CTAL).

Meanwhile the peons and the small farmers were also being organized into the Rural Confederation of Guatemala, under Leonardo Castillo Flores, an ardent advocate of communism, who made his pilgrimage to Moscow and to various so-called peace conferences. It was Castillo Flores who attempted to combat the Liberation movement directed by Colonel Carlos Castillo Armas, by organizing the rural workers into armed militia, and at one time even dared to give orders to the army's chief of staff.

Meanwhile the Communists were moving at top speed along three other highly important fronts. They were maneuvering controlling positions in the important government agencies, the educational system, and the political parties.

In the government they obtained control of the propaganda agencies, including the government-owned and subsidized newspapers, and the National Broadcasting System; the Social Security Institute; the Electoral Tribunal; the Labor Courts; the President's General Secretariat; and finally even the Congress. They put through a Communist-designed agrarian reform program, and staffed its administrative agency with Communists. They took over the Foreign Office, and perverted the Guatemalan diplomatic corps into a Communist courier service. And finally, when a decision of the Supreme Court displeased the party leaders, at the request of a single Communist deputy the entire court was impeached by a fellow traveling Congress, and sympathetic judges were appointed to replace them.

In the educational field, Mario Silva Jonama, a fanatic Communist teacher, became virtually a dictator of the men teachers' school; María de Sellarés, another Communist became director of the School for Women Teachers; Virginia Bravo Letelier, a Chilean Communist, headed the rural educational system; Rafael Tischler, a notorious Communist, became director of the Labor Union for Workers in Education. A Communist front was organized to penetrate San Carlos University, and with typical Communist irony, it was called the Democratic University Front. Thus, in our educational system, we soon found that the Communists were in control not only of the hiring and firing of teachers, but also of the selection of curricula.

And in the political field, using their control over the important labor and agrarian vote as a weapon, the Communists soon gained controlling positions in all of our major political parties.

I believe it is highly significant that through this period of securing control of the important fields of our political, social, and economic life, the Communists either remained in the background or maintained the disguise of liberals. From the very beginning, however, a few of us knew, they were actively recruiting the young intellectuals and workers, organizing them into cells, and indoctrinating them in Marxist principles and tactics.

Then, shortly before the election of Jacobo Arbenz Guzmán, the party came out into the open. In 1950 the Communist Party of Guatemala made its public appearance under the leadership of José Manuel Fortuny. About the same time another branch of the party came into being, apparently for the purpose of evading article 32 of the constitution, which, in effect, outlaws the Communist Party. This branch was called the Labor Revolutionary Party and was headed by Gutiérrez. After a trip to Moscow by Gutiérrez, however, the two parties were united into the Guatemalan Workers Party, under the leadership of Fortuny. An interesting aspect is that the Guatemalan Government directly subsidized the party's official newspaper, Octubre, which carried as its motto, "For a strong, large Communist Party," by placing complimentary ads in its issues.

I think that another highly significant aspect of the political tactics of the Communists in Guatemala, is that even after they came out in the open, with their own official party and candidates, the Communists continued their dominant positions in the other political parties. On more than

one occasion, they supported their hand-picked candidates from the other parties, over their own official party candidates.

After the election of Arbenz, the Communist tactics became increasingly bolder, and more apparent to the public. In Arbenz the Communists had a disciple who declared, shortly before his inauguration, and I quote: "The world is divided into two groups; on the one side the United States and the nations of the capitalistic system, with their great economic power; and on the other side the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics controlling a group of nations with the almost mystic ideology opposed to a decadant imperialistic system". And he added, "Perhaps we, the men of the present generation will not see it, but in this fight the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is going to win". This, of course, is the typical Leninist formula of reducing the political problems of the world into the over-simplification of the "inevitable" fight between communism and capitalism. Arbenz, on assuming office, named as his principal adviser, the Communist leader, Fortny. It is small wonder that the Communist conspirators, in order to secure the election of Arbenz went even to the lengths of contriving the assasination of his popular opponent, Coronel Francisco Javier Arana, and an outspoken anti-Communist.

I regret deeply, that I do not have the time to go into detail on the second aspect of the Guatemalan case, one in which I as all loyal Guatemalans can view with real pride—our liberation from the Communist tyranny. And ladies and gentlemen, it was a tyranny—of the most ruthless sort. From the very beginning of the Arévalo regime, the secret police resorted to search without warrant, and arrests without formal charges or trials. Hundreds of opponents to the Communists were forced into exile. After the murder of Arana and the election of Arbenz the oppressive tactics became increasingly harsh, and finally culminated in the reign of terror that preceded the liberation, a reign of terror during which hundreds of anti-Communists were seized, brutally tortured, mutilated and finally murdered.

It is not only lack of time, but my main purpose here is to analyze the tactics the Communists followed in Guatemala, and the factors that made them successful. In the discussion of these factors, I believe there is one aspect of the Liberation Movement which must be considered. For it was by attacking these factors that Colonel Castillo overthrew the Communist regime. It was ideas that won in Guatemala—not guns and tanks and planes. For months preceding the revolution, Colonel Castillo and his followers bombarded the people of Guatemala with a systematic barrage of pamphlets and newspapers published by groups in exile, and with broadcasts over the clandestine radio. All of these were aimed at exposing to the people of Guatemala the true nature of the Communist controlled government and its ties with the Kremlin, and at convincing them of the superior advantages of democracy. So when the final test came, Arbenz and his Communist mentors found that not only were they unable to command the army and air force, but even the workers and the Campesinos deserted them. The people had become convinced, and in Castillo Armas they had found a leader. Permit me, for the sake of emphasis, repeat those factors briefly; first, the lack of real understanding of the political and philosophical meaning of democracy; second, the lack of understanding of the tactics and imperialistic aims of communism; and third, the unawareness of the danger that communism presents, and the headway it has already made. To these I could add a fourth factor, although it is of a slightly different nature, the spirit of political, social and economic unrest. I did not list this in the beginning, because it is to a considerable degree, Communist inspired. The principal tactic being used by the Communists throughout the hemisphere today, is the fomenting of discontent and unrest, in an obvious plan to create a chaotic situation they will be able to exploit.

Those are the factors that made the Communist control of my country possible. And, also let me repeat, for emphasis, those factors are prevalent today in many nations in this hemisphere.

We in Guatemala do not believe that our fight against communism is won, by any means. That is why we are so determined to prove to our people that democracy, once properly understood and applied, offers to all individuals willing to accept its responsibilities, the better way of life. However, even then, we shall not feel secure. We know that we are part of this hemisphere. And as long as a single nation remains vulnerable, we in Guatemala, too, are vulnerable.

Therefore, speaking entirely unofficially, I should like to propose for your discussion and consideration, an idea that is provoking considerable thought in my country. Not a detailed solution—but at least an idea.

I am convinced that we must find a way to mobilize the anti-Communist thought in this hemisphere, into an effective force to cope with these prevailing ignorances that endanger our freedom. I suggest a movement on a hemispheric basis, which would:

A. Educate all clases of people, in all of our countries, in the full political and philosophical meaning of democracy; not only in the benefits that it offers the individual, but also in the duties, the responsibilities that it imposes on him if those benefits are to be enjoyed.

B. Educate all classes of our people in the true nature of communism, and particularly its tactics and its imperialistic aims.

C. Acquaint our peoples with the day-to-day, week-to-week, and year-to-year activities of the Communist conspiracy, so that we can better evaluate its gains, and so that our governments can devise methods to counterbalance them.

I present this idea not as a cure-all. But simply as one step to be taken in the continuing fight, which I fear will outlast our lives, between the two great ideological forces, democracy and communism. Surely the knowledge—not only of what we are fighting against, but also of what we are fighting for, is an indispensable weapon in this historic struggle. And since all of us in the hemisphere are the objects of Communist attack, and all are to a greater or lesser degree, vulnerable, I propose a defense on a hemispheric scale. I limit this particular program to this hemisphere, because, as I already pointed out, the imperialistic tactics of the Communist conspiracy here, differ from those followed in other critical areas of the world.

If this were possible, if we should team our resources in a common effort and bring the whole truth to the peoples of our hemisphere, we would have taken a long and sure step toward the goal of true freedom that only democracy can bring.

I once again thank Rollins College for the opportunity given me to address you here today and thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for your attention.

A NATIONAL POLICY WITH RESPECT TO MANAGEMENT, CONSERVATION, AND WELFARE OF FISHERIES RESOURCES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the hour is late, but I have a matter of great importance which I wish to discuss briefly today, and I also desire to introduce a bill which now lies on the desk. It seems to me quite appropriate that I take the matter up at this time, because the Senate is in the throes of discussing the so-called agricultural bill. My bill, Mr. President, deals with another problem which relates to the farmers of the sea.

It is with regard to a sad state of affairs that I come before the Members of the Senate today to offer a form of relief and security for an important segment of our national economy.

It is in the interests of our domestic commercial and sport fisheries of the United States, of Alaska, of our other Territories and possessions, and of the fisheries on the high seas, that I wish to inform the Senate of the serious plight of the fisheries industry and to explain the purpose of a bill which I am introducing, on behalf of myself and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] to give our domestic fisheries the rightful recognition they deserve.

During the interim between the last session of Congress and the present time, I have conducted hearings of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, along with my esteemed colleague, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], in Alaska and in the principal fishing centers of the Pacific coast.

At the hearings held in various cities, our committee members were joined by other Members of Congress from both the Senate and the House of Representatives, including the Honorable Delegate E. L. BARTLETT of Alaska, and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

I might say that all the Members of Congress present at the hearings showed a profound interest in hearing what the various witnesses had to say about conditions prevailing in our domestic fisheries industry.

I would like now briefly to summarize the testimony and ideas of more than 200 witnesses engaged in or closely associated with commercial fisheries, who testified at the hearings. Among those witnesses were the Honorable B. Frank Heintzleman, Governor of Alaska, members of State and Territorial legislatures, mayors of cities, members of local chambers of commerce, fishermen, fish packers, shipbuilders, and representatives of marine supply houses, and other allied industries.

First of all we were informed that our Alaska salmon industry is in bad financial condition and practically out of business. There are no longer great runs of salmon returning to the 2,000 rivers and streams of the territory.

The total annual salmon pack for Alaska during the past 10 years has dwindled to less than one half the average yield maintained for the previous 20 years—with the 1955 season's catch the lowest in 48 years.

This means an annual loss to our fisheries industry of over $45 million and the possibility of a complete curtailment of all salmon fishing in many areas in order to bring the runs back.

The declining stocks of salmon in Alaska have shown a decided downward trend since 1950, when a sudden drop of 25 percent in production occurred. The decline since then indicates fewer salmon are returning to the streams.

From the thoughts expressed by the many interested persons contacted dur-

ing our Senate investigation, there is but one answer as to how the present crisis in the Alaskan salmon industry came about. We have failed in our management of this valuable resource.

We have harvested too many and allowed too few salmon to ascend unmolested to the spawning streams required by nature to reproduce the runs.

In addition to our robbing the streams of the seed to reproduce the runs, we have done nothing to protect and assist the salmon and their spawn against the natural predators and environmental conditions. This accounts for a 99 percent mortality in the species from the egg status to the seaward migrating stage.

I believe that in addition to the millions of pounds of food lost annually through our careless management in allowing these valuable fisheries to decline we have created a far more grievous error. We have failed to give to the many problems affecting our domestic food fisheries resources the rightful attention they should have on a national level in Government.

In contrast, land farmers of the Nation over the past 20 years have made wonderful progress in increasing the production and quality of food on their farms; and in this connection they have had the assistance of an independent and respected agency of our national Government.

I am now placing before Congress a bill that will provide for a more practical manner of managing our domestic fisheries in cooperation with the States, Territories, and international agencies in which we participate.

In addition to the salmon crisis in Alaska I find, through our lack of sound fisheries management, that the Government has inflicted severe handicaps upon our own fishermen and fish handlers up and down the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, and also along the gulf coast, while helping fishermen and producers in other countries. This is somewhat similar to what was brought out by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] in our discussion today.

Through our national policy in permitting duty-free fish imports to flood domestic markets in competition with our own fishermen and packers, we have practically forced a major portion of our food fisheries enterprises out of business.

This does not mean that anyone is speaking against the reciprocal trade agreements; but in this case, these products come into our country absolutely duty-free.

During the period between 1935 and 1954 edible fish imports alone have increased from an annual rate of 325 million pounds to 803 million pounds, with dollar values increasing from $27,500,000 to $203,600,000. Most of this increase has been in direct competition with domestically produced fish; and in 1953 foreign fish imports comprised 35.2 percent of all fish food available on the domestic market.

Tunafish imports, including processed and unprocessed fish, from 1949 to 1954, increased from an annual rate of 14,500,000 pounds to 170 million pounds, with imports totaling 40.1 percent of all available tuna sold on our domestic market during 1954.

The result of this impact of excessive tuna and other fish imports upon our domestic fisheries has been to deprive United States citizens of their market and the opportunity of fulfilling the fisheries needs of the Nation with supplies which they might readily obtain on the high seas and in coastal areas.

They have been forced to curtail their efforts and to sell their catches at prices comparable to those quoted by foreign producers, whose fishermen receive a standard wage of one-fifth to one-tenth the earnings of an average American laborer. During 1954, trawler-caught bottom fish imports amounted to over 52 percent of domestic consumption.

With this open-door policy permitting low tariff and duty-free fish imports to enter our country, every fish-producing nation in the world has its eyes on United States markets to sell its fish. Almost daily we read accounts of trade organizations being formed in foreign countries to promote the sale of their fish. They have been encouraged to do so by our own State Department officials—while our Government fisheries people sit by and, so far as I can ascertain, say nothing.

I have been concerned for some time over the attitude of our State Department and the administration in surrendering our domestic market to foreign fish producers.

In the May 1951 issue of United States Fish and Wildlife Commercial Fisheries Review, Mr. William C. Herrington, fisheries adviser for the State Department, made a statement in which he related in detail how necessary it is to have American support in advancing and building up Japanese fisheries operations even though our own fishermen would have to restrict their operations.

In summarizing his comments Mr. Herrington made, the following statement regarding the United States fisheries industry's position in relation to fish imports:

> In face of this situation, what course should the United States fishery industry adopt? With no protection there is very little doubt that the United States tuna fishery would greatly decline if not practically disappear. On the other hand, to ask for complete protection would be attempting to fly directly into the face of basic United States policy—and remember—that there is plenty of evidence that most people believe this policy is in the overall national interest. To find a course which will fit in with United States policy and win public support, it appears that the tuna industry must work out a position intermediate between complete protection and no protection.

Of course, there is now no protection at all.

There is much evidence today in the tuna industry, 5 years after Mr. Herrington's statement, that he was correct that "With no protection the American tuna industry would disappear," for today they are on the very edge of complete bankruptcy. Every tuna ship is now tied up. This represents millions of dollars of investment and thousands of persons unemployed.

During the past 4 years the tuna industry has struggled in vain for a program such as that suggested by Mr. Herrington, namely, some middle ground between complete protection and no protection of their market. But the administration and the State Department have failed to act—in fact, they have refused to act.

During my 20 years in Congress I have always been sympathetic to and interested in helping to provide funds to carry out the studies and programs advocated by our Wildlife Service people to aid our fisheries.

I have felt that any program or proposal offered to aid the fisheries was in the best interest of the people in the industry.

I am of the opinion now that not only have we poorly managed our fisheries, but we are far behind time in applying modern methods of water farming to foster the growth of marine foods. The evidence produced at the hearings was unanimous on this point. I believe it is time to act, not to study.

At our Seattle hearings last fall we heard from one of our Nation's most successful fish farmers, the head of the applied laboratory at the University of Washington School of Fisheries.

Dr. Lauren R. Donaldson gave a very convincing account of how it is possible to increase our Alaskan salmon fisheries to about any productive level we wish through proper regulatory measures, predator control, and stream and lake fertilization. He also stated—and he is an expert in this field—that the concrete results of any fisheries program can be evaluated only in numbers of fish in the water or landed by the fishermen.

Following Dr. Donaldson, Mr. Clarence Pautzke, Chief of the Fisheries Division of the Washington State Game Department, told how under his direction more than 260 lakes in Washington State had been poisoned out to eliminate all forms of undesirable marine life, and then restocked with trout from their hatcheries. The net results of this program have been a 1,000-percent increase in available fish for Washington sportsmen over a period of 7 years.

These men are not just fussing around making studies, they are producing fish. I think it is time something was done about the problem on a national scale.

One other factor regarding our Alaska salmon industry is that many fishermen and packers believe the tremendous increase in the Japanese catch of salmon on the high seas has a direct bearing upon the sharp decrease of salmon on our side of the Pacific.

Many fishermen claim that net-marked salmon have appeared in their catches in Bristol Bay, even though no fishing is conducted in front of that bay. They say that this is a sure sign that the Japanese are catching our fish. If that be true, it would be in violation of the treaty concluded between the United States and Japan after the war.

Our scientists assigned to the job of finding out about the possibility of Asian and North American stocks of salmon intermingling on the high seas appear to doubt the idea that Japanese fishermen

are taking salmon headed for Alaskan streams.

We do know, however, that taking salmon on the high seas a considerable distance offshore is a wasteful, destructive practice. There is no way under such operations to secure adequate escapement to replenish the runs.

We know that fisheries studies all take time and a considerable amount of funds. The Government Wildlife Service has given considerable attention to this problem, but apparently they have not found the answers.

If the Japanese fishermen are taking North American fish, as the fishermen indicate, and if our Alaska salmon runs continue to decline as they have in the past 3 years, our Alaska salmon fisheries may be wiped out before our services have determined the true cause.

In addition to Alaska salmon, tuna, and other fish problems on the Pacific coast, from Maine to Florida our Atlantic coastal fisheries are becoming less productive each year, especially on the New England Banks.

The once proud trawler fishing fleets of New York and Boston are becoming outmoded with the times.

During the past 20 years the annual trawler bottom fish landings at Boston alone have dropped from 300 million pounds to approximately one-half that amount. No new ocean trawlers have been built to continue these operations.

Other nations are expanding this type of fishing operation for the reason that they have a market for their fish, a good share of it right here in our United States. This is possible because we are sacrificing our own fishermen's markets by turning them over to foreigners.

Established marine- and fishing-gear suppliers throughout the country are also faced with serious handicaps in their trade through the competition of low-priced imports. Some items arriving from factories abroad are financed by American capital to take advantage of low-cost labor in the manufacture of their products, which they sell at high United States prices.

There is a peril point in these enterprises as a result of which our industries can be forced out of business. No one seems to be applying the brakes.

The seriousness of the problems of our domestic fisheries that I have outlined today can hardly be emphasized in this brief message.

The astonishing fact brought out at our hearings with the industry is that not one employee in our Government has raised his voice at a national or international level to protect and defend the position of United States fishermen in the security of their markets and in their inherent rights to accustomed fishing areas.

I hope that all the Members of Congress will join with me in supporting this bill and other necessary legislation to follow in providing relief and averting the crisis that now faces our domestic fisheries.

The United States, with our increasing population, cannot afford to allow our fisheries resources and enterprises to deteriorate and become an unimportant segment of our national economy.

We must no longer be content with pretentious stories about the need for continued studies about the life and habits of fish. We must direct our efforts toward farming our streams and water areas to create a healthy condition in all fisheries.

It is in the Nation's best interests that we direct our attention toward giving the fisheries of the country the recognition they should have, and that we hereafter employ experienced, competent personnel to manage, defend, and promote the welfare of our fisheries.

Mr. President, I might take just a moment or two to say briefly, that the bill provides for the abolition of the Fish and Wildlife Service in the Department of the Interior and creates an independent commission of five members, which will be the Fisheries Commission of the United States, and establishes a fishing policy for the whole United States. That is long overdue. The bill puts fisheries in the right perspective in our Nation's economy. It puts our fisheries problem, both international and domestic, in the right perspective in regard to our dealings with other countries in this matter. This country has been making fisheries treaties, many of which have gone through the committee headed by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is now occupying the Chair. In the negotiation of those treaties United States fishing interests have been at a disadvantage. We have been dealing with men at Cabinet level from other maritime and fisheries countries, while subheads of subdepartments have represented this country.

The bill would create an independent commission, free it from the politics and necessity of making yearly regulations, and offer a hope that we may rehabilitate an industry which is fast declining. I have sat on the Appropriations Committee and have seen millions of dollars voted for conservation of our fisheries resources, but apparently that has been of no avail, because the whole industry has been dropping and dropping and dropping. As one fisherman put it to me, "We have no place to go but up."

Surely it is high time that we took hold of the problem and put our fisheries on such a level in the national Government that immediate steps could be taken to rehabilitate our depleted runs and the almost economic bankruptcy facing the fishermen of the Nation.

Mr. President, I introduce the bill and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3275) to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the development, conservation for preservation, management and use of fisheries resources, to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Fisheries Act of 1956."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that fish and shellfish resources make a material contribution to the health and well-being of our citizens and constitute an important part of the food-producing segment of the national economy, and that a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the development, conservation for preservation, management, and maximum use of such resources, the prevention of excessive exploitation thereof, and the promotion and maintenance of prosperous and productive conditions in both the commercial and the sport and recreational fisheries industries is essential in the public interest. The Congress further declares that the provisions of this act are necessary in order to accomplish such objectives, and that this act shall be administered with due regard to the inherent right of every citizen and resident of the United States to engage in fishing for his own pleasure and enjoyment.

UNITED STATES FISHERIES COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created an independent agency of the Government to be known as the United States Fisheries Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") which shall be composed of five members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice of the Senate. One of such members shall be designated by the President as Chairman of the Commission at the time of nomination. Each such member shall hold office for a term of 6 years; except that the terms of office of the members first appointed shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of nomination, as follows: 1 on January 1, 1958, 1 on January 1, 1959, 1 on January 1, 1960, 1 on January 1, 1961, and 1 on January 1, 1962. A vacancy in the membership of the Commission shall not affect the power of the remaining members to exercise the functions of the Commission, and shall be filled in the same manner as is the case of the original appointment. Not more than 3 members of the Commission shall be members of the same political party. The Chairman of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum, and each of the other members of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of $18,000 per annum.

(b) Not less than three members of the Commission shall have general knowledge of commercial and sport fishing conditions and of the problems confronting the domestic and international fisheries.

(c) In addition to exercising the functions transferred to it by this act and otherwise provided by law, it shall be the duty of the Commission (1) to assist and advise the appropriate agencies of the several States which have the primary responsibility of managing fisheries, and any international agencies having similar official responsibilities, (2) to promote, conserve and manage any fisheries in the territories and possessions of the United States that remain the sole responsibility of the Federal Government, and (3) to construct, maintain and operate fish cultural stations relating to fish and shellfish, either independently or in cooperation with State, Territorial, and private agencies, to the extent authorized by the Congress and by law.

(d) It shall also be the duty of the Commission to prepare and submit to the Congress such programs, policies, and directives relating to the advancement, management, regulation, and portection of fisheries as the Commission deems necessary to carry out

the purposes of this act or as may be required by law.

(e) The Commission shall conduct continuing studies, shall prepare and disseminate information, and shall make periodical reports and recommendations to the public, to the President and to the Congress, with respect to the following matters:

(1) The production and flow to market of fish and fishery products domestically produced;

(2) The production and flow to market of fish and fishery products produced by foreign producers which affect domestic commercial fisheries;

(3) The trends in production of the various kinds of fish and shellfish;

(4) The measures which are appropriate to assure the maximum sustainable production of fish and fishery products and to prevent unnecessary and excessive fluctuations in such production;

(5) The measures that are necessary to prevent the excessive and harmful exploitation of the fisheries resources;

(6) The methods and practices used in matching and taking fish and shellfish that are wasteful and that have the effect of diminishing the fisheries resources in the waters of the Continental Shelf and the high seas;

(7) The competitive economic position of the various fish and fishery products with respect to each other and to competitive fish and fishery products produced by foreign producers.

(8) The market conditions, amount of production, and general economic position of fish and fishery products in the countries in which such products constitute an important part of the food supply; and

(9) Any other matters which in the judgment of the Commission are of public interest in connection with any phases of fisheries operations.

(f) The Commission shall cooperate to the fullest practicable extent with the Secretary of State in providing representation at all meetings and conferences relating to fisheries in which representatives of the United States and foreign countries participate. The Secretary of State shall, wherever possible, designate at least one member of the Commission to the negotiating team in all matters relating to international fisheries.

(g) The Secretary of State and all other officials having responsibilities in the fields of technical and economic aid to foreign nations shall consult with the Commission in all cases in which the interests of domestic commercial and sport fisheries are involved with a view to assuring that such interests are adequately represented at all times.

(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commission shall be represented in all international negotiations conducted by the United States pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, in any case in which domestic commercial and sport fisheries are directly affected by such negotiations.

(i) The Commission shall make such studies and investigations relating to fishing operations on the high seas as it deems necessary for the welfare and protection of domestic fisheries, and shall make reports and recommendations to the Congress and to the Secretary of State with respect to any practices, operations, or conditions or any other matters that it deems to be detrimental to, or vital to the security and welfare of, such fisheries.

(j) The Commission is authorized, in accordance with the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(k) The Commission may request and secure the advice or assistance of any department or agency of the Government, and any such department or agency which furnishes advice or assistance to the Commission may expend its own funds for such purposes, with or without reimbursement from the Commission as may be agreed upon between the Commission and the department or agency.

(l) The Commission shall consult periodically with the various governmental, private nonprofit, and other agencies which have to do with any phase of noncommercial fishing with respect to any problems that may arise in connection with such fishing.

(m) The Commission may make such rules and regulations as it deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and all such rules and regulations shall be published in the Federal Register as in the case of those of any other agency.

(n) The Commission shall make an annual report to the Congress with respect to its activities under this act.

TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS TO COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) There are hereby transferred to the Commission all the functions of the Department of the Interior (including the functions of the Secretary thereof and of the Fish and Wildlife Service) relating in any manner to fisheries, and the development, advancement, management, conservation, and protection thereof.

(b) In addition, the functions of the Secretary of the Interior (1) relating to the protection of fur seals, and to the supervision of the Pribilof Islands and the care of the natives thereof, and (2) relating to the Whaling Convention Act of 1949 (Public Law 676, 81st Cong.) and any other functions of the Secretary relating to hair seals, sea lions, whales, and other mammals, are hereby transferred to, and shall hereafter be exercised by, the Commission.

(c) There are hereby transferred to the Commission all functions of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the head of any other department or agency, which are now exercised by them or provided for under any act of Congress and which relate in any manner to fisheries; but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to interfere with or modify the authority of the Department of State or the Secretary thereof to negotiate or enter into any international agreements or conventions with respect to the development, management, or protection of any fisheries resources.

(d) There are hereby transferred to the Commission so much of the personnel, property, facilities, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds (available or to be made available) as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines to be necessary in connection with the exercise of the functions transferred to the Commission by subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 5. Close cooperation shall be established and maintained between the United States and Canada, and between the United States and Mexico, through fisheries agreements, in the interest of conserving and utilizing to the fullest practicable extent the stocks of food fish and shellfish which inhabit the waters of the Continental Shelf. Such cooperation shall also be established and maintained between the United States and other nations through fisheries agreements relating to the conservation and use of the stocks of food fish which inhabit the waters of the high seas.

SEC. 6. Nothing in this act shall be construed to interfere in any manner with the rights of any State under the Submerged Lands Act (Public Law 31, 83d Cong.) or otherwise provided by law.

SEC. 7. (a) It shall be unlawful for any citizen of the United States—

(1) to catch or take any salmon, trout or other fishes on the high seas (except as authorized by the Commission for experimental or sport fishing purposes) with any form of net, gear or other appliance which the Commission finds would prevent or interfere with the conservation of such fishes; and

(2) to fish for or catch any species of shellfish in the waters of either the Atlantic Ocean or the Pacific Ocean by means of tangle nets or any other device or gear which the Commission finds would have the unavoidable result of taking immature and female shellfish at the same time that marketable male shellfish are taken.

(b) The Commission is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to enforce the provisions of this section.

(c) Any person who violates any provision of this section, or any rule or regulation prescribed by the Commission pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, shall be fined not more than $____ or imprisoned for not more than _____ years, or both.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATION

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES, LOBBYING, ETC.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to make an announcement, before the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, makes certain recommendations:

Mr. President, I am recommending for membership on the Special Committee created yesterday the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

These recommendations represent the combined judgment of the many Members I have consulted on this side of the aisle. We were seeking certain qualities of experience, temperament, and interest that are essential for the type of investigation that is to be conducted. In these four Senators, we believe those qualities are combined to the highest degree. These selections have the approval of the majority policy committee and the majority steering committee.

We felt the need of men experienced in the work of the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee. It has an important jurisdiction in this matter.

We felt the need of men experienced in the work of the Government Operations Committee. It has jurisdiction over the lobby laws.

We felt the need of men experienced in the work of the Judiciary Committee. It has authority over many features of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

But we knew that our objective would not be attained merely by finding a representative from each Committee. The assignment called for men who were

experienced in the techniques of investigation, who were mature and prudent, who were vigorous and enthusiastic for the assignment, who had some background in the fields which would be explored.

To my mind, these four men do not represent committees. They represent the entire Senate and, beyond the Senate, the people of the United States, who have the basic interest in this investigation.

I first approached the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and his equally respected and beloved colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I asked them whether they desired to serve on the expanded inquiry which grows out of the fine work they have done.

Both carry heavy burdens—in fact, some of the greatest responsibilities of the Senate. Both are candidates for reelection. They felt that the additional burden of an investigation which will last for many months would be too great.

The question was explored further. In a short time, the pattern became clear.

The junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] who has served in Congress since the 76th Congress and in the Senate since 1953, is one of our most vigorous and effective members. Furthermore, he is the chairman of the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee, which has an important responsibility in this matter. His reputation rests upon distinguished service with the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, the Rules and Administration Committee, and the Senate Democratic Campaign Committee. He is a thorough man, a fair-minded man, a man of boundless energy. We are confident that he will conduct himself in the spirit of our highest traditions.

In his quiet, effective way, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] has covered himself with as many laurels as has any other man in public life. His conduct as an investigator has set standards of fairness and fearlessness which will stand unchallenged throughout the years. His very presence on this group will be reassuring to all Americans who look for a thorough and nonpartisan investigation that will be bound by one standard—the national interest.

It would be difficult to find a better qualified man for this task than the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. He is now the chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee—a group representing both branches of Congress in a field that goes to the very heart of our country's security. As chairman, he has distinguished himself by a breadth of vision and a nonpartisanship that have placed the safety of our Nation above any other consideration. He has been through this type of investigation in the past. During the 78th Congress, he was chairman of the House Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures. His conduct in that position is still cited as a model of integrity, thoroughness, and patriotism.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is a studious, careful, cautious man whose prudence and keenness enhance any congressional project. His patriotism is beyond question, and is backed by a distinguished war record second to none. He has served in the Congress since 1947, and is the author of one of the best-known books in recent years on the Congress. It is characteristic of the junior Senator from Massachusetts that this book is a sensitive and perceptive study of the highest standards of congressional activity. He is the chairman of a Government Operations Subcommittee which likely will have jurisdiction over any remedial legislation that involves lobbying. He also serves on the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, which has a responsibility in this field.

Mr. President, I believe all of us are aware of the difficult and sensitive nature of the investigation which is before us. It goes to the hard core of our form of Constitutional Government—the confidence of our people in their institutions. It is an investigation that may have many aspects—some of which cannot now be foreseen. Already, we have charges which the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are preparing to present. The committee has a tremendous task cut out for it.

The majority believe that the four Senators we are recommending represent the best possible combination of intelligence, experience, and background to insure a complete and thorough investigation. They come from the Northeast and the Southwest; from the South and the border. They represent different points of view, but all are men who have demonstrated a capacity for understanding the views of those who disagree with them. Two of them are senior Members of the Senate; two of them are junior Members of the Senate. But all four share a proven love for our institutions and a proven devotion to duty.

They will be partisans only for the public interest. And the public interest calls for one of the most searching investigations in our history—an investigation that will leave no relevant fact uncovered.

We are entrusting to these men one of the most vital functions of the Senate. Their colleagues, I know, are confident that it is lodged in safe hands.

They are the kind of men who can concentrate on the substantial, can place the trivial in proper perspective, and can aim for the constructive goal of meeting the problems of the modern age.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement, prior to the announcement: After consultation on this side of the aisle, the leadership on this side have recommended the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is the senior Republican Member, is a former President pro tempore of this body, and now is serving on the Select Committee; the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], a former Governor of that State, who also at present is serving on the existing Select Committee; the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], who has resigned his position as Chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee; and the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL].

First of all, we have determined that no Member who is a candidate for election in 1956 should be a member of this committee.

Second, we have felt that, because of the developments growing out of the so-called Harris-Fulbright bill, we wanted to balance the representation between those who have supported the proposed legislation and those who have opposed it. That was done in this case.

On this committee we have 2 of our more senior Members from this side of the aisle, and, as is the case on the other side of the aisle, 2 of our more junior Members. I believe that they will approach this problem in the proper spirit, to develop the facts for the Senate. They are to represent not individual committees, but the Senate of the United States, in one of the most important tasks ever assigned in this body to eight Members of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from California will yield before he concludes his remarks, I should like to add that the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] were, until today, members of the Senate Campaign Committee. Earlier in the day, when I notified them that the leadership desired to have them serve on this important select committee, they submitted their resignations. The resignations have been accepted, and in due course their successors will be appointed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the leadership on both sides of the aisle for the caliber of the membership of the committee which has been selected. I am satisfied that a fair and judicial hearing will be held by this committee.

I wish to say to the chairman of the committee that, as I have worked with him, I have observed his work in the Senate. I consider him a great legislative judge. By that I mean that I consider ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, to be of such judicial temperament, and to be such an able lawyer, that I know of no post in our Government which he would not be qualified to fill. Whenever I find that type of temperament in the chairman of any committee, I look forward to a judicial operation of the committee.

I may have been a little previous in my remarks with regard to the chairmanship of the committee. I assumed, from what I had read, that it was contemplated that the Senator from Tennessee would be chairman of the committee. In any event, I wish to have my comments regarding his character remain in the RECORD. I have complete confidence in his judiciousness, and in that of the other members of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should say that some suggestions have been made with respect to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] being made chairman of the committee. As the distinguished Senator from Oregon knows, that is a matter entirely for the decision of the membership of the committee. The committee will receive no recommendations or suggestions from

anyone except the eight members of the committee. Under the terms of the resolution, the membership of the committee will select a chairman, a vice chairman, and such other officers as they may wish to select.

Mr. MORSE. I was acting under the mistaken assumption that it was contemplated that the Senator from Tennessee would become chairman of the committee. I hope that nothing I have said in my commendation of the Senator from Tennessee will cause any embarrassment to anyone.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator with respect to the selections made by the majority and minority.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to state for the record that it is also my understanding that the committee of eight members will select its chairman, based upon the judgment of the members themselves. There certainly has been no understanding in advance on this side of the aisle, and I believe there has been none on the other side of the aisle, relative to the chairmanship. It has been made perfectly clear that the eight members of the committee will meet and arrive at their own judgment as to the selection of a chairman and vice chairman of the committee, and such other officers as they feel are necessary to carry on the work of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from California may be assured that I have reached no secret understanding with anyone on that subject.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am delighted to hear the nominations for membership on a committee which I consider to have one of the most important assignments ever given to a committee. The members of the committee will keep in mind the aim of good government, and the preservation of the right of the Senate to enjoy the title of the greatest deliberative body in the world. I know of no finer men who could have been chosen than those who have been named by the majority and minority leaders.

I know that the committee will pursue its investigation with diligence and thoroughness, and with a sense of justice and fairness to all. I know that the aim of the committee will be to bring about corrective results, so that no question can ever again be raised with respect to the proprieties involved in legislative debates.

I have had the great pleasure of serving with many members of the committee, both those on the minority side and those on the majority side. It was my pleasure to serve with the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] for 18 years in the Congress. I know of no man who has shown greater courage, firmer determination, or broader vision in performing any task assigned to him during his experience both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate than has my distinguished friend and colleague from Tennessee. He has a great understanding of the electoral processes, gained from his service in the House of Representatives, and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

I am delighted at the appointment of the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who, perhaps to a greater extent than any other Member of the Senate, possesses an understanding of the operation of the Lobbying Registration Act, which I had the privilege of helping to place on the statute books, along with the distinguished late Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette. That act operates in conjunction with the Legislative Reorganization Act. Those two statutes should be geared together, because it is impossible to tell where election campaign contributions leave off and lobbying activities begin, unless they are both placed under the same microscope. I am sure this will be done by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts, who has a wide knowledge of the subject.

I am pleased also by the appointment of certain distinguished senior Members of this body, including the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], who possesses a fine judicial mind.

I am pleased at the appointment of our great colleague, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. Both the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Arkansas are men of wide experience, men who will go to the limit in developing all the facts, letting the chips fall where they may.

We can be justly proud of the representation from our side of the aisle.

I am delighted with the appointment of the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], whose interest in clean politics and clean government is well known. I am pleased also with the appointment of the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], who has an intimate knowledge of election processes, and is as dedicated as is any other Member of this body to keeping them pure and undefiled.

It seems to me that we are most fortunate in the appointment of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] as one of the senior members of this committee. His appointment will enable us to enjoy the benefit of the vast experience which comes from service over a long period of time.

In the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] we also have a man with a judicial mind, who is dedicated to the task of finding the facts.

No committee has been given an assignment of such importance in many years. When these appointments are considered in the light of the wise action, taken by almost unanimous decision of the Senate, I think it will be found that a bipartisan committee with wide jurisdiction in this field can do a great deal toward writing a ticket for clean government.

I congratulate both the majority and the minority leadership on the wise choice in this case.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I thank my good friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I thank my able friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and my devoted and dear friend, the junior Senator from Oklahoma, for their very generous remarks. I believe, however, that in response to their remarks I should say—and I believe the distinguished majority leader will agree with me—that from the beginning I have stated to him that I would be happier if he would assign another Senator to the task of membership, and that I would be even happier if the committee would find someone else to serve as chairman. I still feel that way.

However, this is a job which I have said repeatedly should be done. I am in no position to run from a task which I believe is a necessary one. Therefore, I told the distinguished majority leader that I would serve as a member of the committee. I would be very happy, indeed, if the committee should choose one of my distinguished colleagues to serve as chairman. If so, I would work in the ranks as diligently as possible.

It is an enormous task, one which will require long work and devoted effort, but I hope that out of this study will come basic remedial legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee, when he first talked to me about it on Monday, told me he thought it was much more important that the job be done than that he should be selected to do it, and that if I insisted that he become a member, he would be glad to serve. However, he said he would not be offended in the slightest if another member were selected and he were not. As a matter of fact, he said he would be pleased if that did happen.

It was only late this afternoon that I finally told the Senator the composition of the committee and notified the other members.

I appreciate the Senator's attitude. He will have the full cooperation, as he usually does on all legislative matters, of the leadership on the majority side. I am proud of the good work done by the minority leader in the selections he has made. I am sure those Senators will be equally cooperative with the members of the committee. From here on out it is largely a matter of judgment of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise only to say that as a member of the Steering Committee it was my privilege and responsibility to be consulted on the assignments from the majority side.

I believe the RECORD should show that the members of the Steering Committee present—and there was a substantial majority present—were in full agreement with the selections announced by the majority leader.

I feel that the majority leader's selections are excellent. I have had the privilege of talking with two of my colleagues who are seat mates of mine, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], about this very difficult assignment. As one who sits close to them and as one knows them equally well, I should like to say that no two finer selections could have been made. That also applies to our colleague, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator

from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], both of whom have demonstrated their great knowledge of the processes of government and great personal integrity. I wish to commend again, as I have already done, both the majority and minority leaders on one of the most difficult assignments that they have had to make.

I feel that the program will now be under way in good hands and will lead toward constructive results. It surely needs it. I should like to say to my colleagues that a tremendous responsibility is vested in the chairman of the special committee. If the chairman is to be the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], as I have heard, then I wish to say we are very fortunate indeed, because he has demonstrated again and again the kind of intellectual and moral courage and the sort of brilliant and yet understanding knowledge of the responsibilities of Government and officials of the Government that will stand well with the country in the days ahead.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to thank the Senator from Minnesota for his observations. He is always very generous and understanding of the majority leader. I wish the record to be crystal clear that the election of the chairman of the committee is entirely within the jurisdiction of the members of the committee. I agree with the Senator's statement, that if the members decide that the Senator from Tennesee [Mr. GORE] is the best-equipped member of that committee to serve as its chairman, that is a matter for it to decide. If I were a member of the committee, I should be very happy to have the Senator from Tennessee act as chairman of the committee. Likewise, I believe that any member of that committee would make a distinguished chairman. I do believe that the record should be made abundantly clear that it is entirely a matter for the committee, and that there are no pressures or suggestions or attempts to decide the matter for the committee in advance.

I know that is the way the Senator from Tennessee wants it, and that is certainly the position of both the majority and the minority leaders.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce for him the following assignments to the special committee established by Senate Resolution 219:

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires to address the Senate, and if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, February 24, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 23 (legislative day, February 22), 1956:

SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Philip L. Rice, of Hawaii, to be chief justice of the Supreme Court, Territory of Hawaii, for a term of 4 years, vice Edward A. Towse whose term has expired.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Herbert G. Curtis, Glenwood, Ala., in place of F. T. Bryan, removed.

ALASKA

Glenda A. Cobb, Annette, Alaska, in place of D. V. Richard, resigned.

John F. Connery, Barrow, Alaska, in place of D. K. Brower, removed.

Edna Peratrovich, Klawock, Alaska, in place of E. F. Demmert, deceased.

Evelyn L. Conwell, Krotzebue, Alaska, in place of A. G. Francis, resigned.

Jenabe E. Caldwell, Unalaska, Alaska, in place of C. H. Hope, resigned.

Alice R. Brusich, Ward Cove, Alaska, in place of M. D. Crawford, removed.

ARIZONA

Cathryn A. Pulsifer, Camp Verde, Ariz., in place of Olive Tompkins, resigned.

Nancy R. Caldwell, San Simon, Ariz., in place of A. M. Hall, retired.

ARKANSAS

Wendell R. Kimbrough, Alicia, Ark., in place of A. M. Matthews, deceased.

Ted M. Anderson, Batesville, Ark., in place of E. F. Crutchfield, transferred.

CALIFORNIA

Ethel M. Stott, Diablo, Calif., in place of Helen Cooper, retired.

Eugene M. Freitas, Herlong, Calif., in place of B. K. Geiger, removed.

George P. Ashmun, Hughson, Calif., in place of M. A. Brophy, retired.

Harry L. Smith, Perkins, Calif., in place of William Lais, retired.

COLORADO

George R. Newmyer, Center, Colo., in place of W. B. Sutley, resigned.

Charles Herman Klipfel, Pueblo, Colo., in place of R. H. Talbot, deceased.

Ralph A. Nielson, Sanford, Colo., in place of A. J. Reed, retired.

HAWAII

Satoshi Ishimoto, Lihue, Hawaii, in place of M. D. Drier, deceased.

IDAHO

Leo G. Huguenin, Mullan, Idaho, in place of C. W. Bentley, removed.

ILLINOIS

Arlynn M. Price, Abingdon, Ill., in place of J. W. Lucas, resigned.

Ernie R. Rightmyer, Fairfield, Ill., in place of J. C. Stanley, removed.

John Paul Smothers, Marion, Ill., in place of A. O. Ledbetter, removed.

William I. Anderson, Metropolis, Ill., in place of L. L. Taylor, transferred.

Elizabeth R. Ervin, Pesotum, Ill., in place of H. F. Lieb, deceased.

William C. Hallock, Tilden, Ill., in place of C. H. Lindsay, retired.

Harry L. Crawford, Yorkville, Ill., in place of M. N. Beecher, removed.

INDIANA

Wilfred M. Bedel, Batesville, Ind., in place of C. H. Andres, deceased.

James L. Conwell, Greensburg, Ind., in place of C. D. Samuels, resigned.

Bill R. Davidson, Princeton, Ind., in place of E. M. Miller, retired.

IOWA

Richard R. Kraus, Ryan, Iowa, in place of J. L. Magirl, resigned.

KANSAS

Ralph R. Johnson, Vermillion, Kans., in place of S. L. Becker, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Robert S. Smallwood, Beattyville, Ky., in place of C. P. Hall, resigned.

MASSACHUSETTS

Edwin L. Naylor, Dunstable, Mass., in place of L. M. Brow, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Arthur J. Jackson, Benton Harbor, Mich., in place of A. C. Parsal, retired.

Charles A. Fisher, Bergland, Mich., in place of Esther Geroux, removed.

Harriet H. Tuttle, Comstock, Mich., in place of A. J. Price, retired.

Mary M. Schlichting, Haslett, Mich., in place of Mary Elliott, retired.

Earl E. Secor, Imlay City, Mich., in place of W. C. Schoof, retired.

Walter L. Parrott, Jr., Kingston, Mich., in place of Rhea Henderson, deceased.

Daniel G. Picot, Lexington, Mich., in place of Henry Matthews, deceased.

Arthur G. Jenkins, Livonia, Mich. Office established April 1, 1954.

Alice L. Thompson, Trout Creek, Mich., in place of J. C. Vaughan, retired.

Edward C. Hudson, Trout Lake, Mich., in place of W. H. Mullins, retired.

MINNESOTA

Lester H. Egerstrom, Murdock, Minn., in place of J. R. Kavanagh, deceased.

Rodger A. McRae, Swanville, Minn., in place of D. B. Clabaugh, transferred.

MISSOURI

Vance A. Meares, Reeds, Mo., in place of N. T. Lambeth, transferred.

Jesse O. Weaver, Steele, Mo., in place in M. L. Kelley, deceased.

Clyde R. Muller, Sweet Springs, Mo., in place of H. F. Nelson, retired.

MONTANA

Ivan W. Small, Alder, Mont., in place of N. B. Conway, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Theodore R. Butler, Portsmouth, N. H., in place of F. J. Rowe, transferred.

George W. Carr, Winnisquam, N. H., in place of W. F. Cohan, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Jacob Fetzer, Grenloch, N. J., in place of A. B. Williams, retired.

John V. Zoppel, North Bergen, N. J., in place of F. A. Hynes, deceased.

Joseph Kain, Kenvil, N. J., in place of J. F. Bird, resigned.

Laura A. Bradley, Monmouth Beach, N. J., in place of W. H. Kittell, resigned.

William C. Conner, South Bound Brook, N. J., in place of M. A. Carroll, deceased.

NEW YORK

Joseph R. Iadarola, Elmsford, N. Y., in place of T. F. English, retired.

Oliver K. Palm, Jamestown, N. Y., in place of R. C. Gifford, deceased.

Ronald M. MacKenzie, Lake Placid, N. Y., in place of F. M. Dennin, retired.

James C. Browne, Mahopac, N. Y., in place of J. W. Clark, retired.

Vincent J. Behm, Nedrow, N. Y., in place of P. P. McGuire, resigned.

George Conrad Sauer, Port Jervis, N. Y., in place of J. F. Harrison, resigned.

Edna C. Yaple, Rock Hill, N. Y., in place of P. L. Rice, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Ivan O. Wick, Brocket, N. Dak., in place of A. C. Connelly, retired.

Carl Raymond Culver, Dickinson, N. Dak., in place of A. C. Pagenkopf, retired.

Gerald D. Davis, Mooreton, N. Dak., in place of F. L. Gerou, resigned.

Ruby E. Omvig, Mylo, N. Dak., in place of M. V. Andersen, retired.

OHIO

Ruben E. Spurrier, Buffalo, Ohio, in place of James Blair, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Thornton J. Lucado, Jr., Blanchard, Okla., in place of T. C. Anthony, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

Richard S. Chesonis, Lucernemines, Pa., in place of D. M. Turify, resigned.

Henry R. Heintz, Perkiomenville, Pa., in place of N. B. Becker, retired.

Richard J. Griffith, Trucksville, Pa., in place of Gwilym Evans, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Jessie W. Jenkins, Wadmalaw Island, S. C., in place of M. P. Boykin, transferred.

B. George Price, III, Walterboro, S. C., in place of Stacy Kearse, deceased.

TEXAS

Buster Fleming, Emory, Tex., in place of J. B. Chastain, transferred.

Billy G. Williams, Freer, Tex., in place of E. C. Kelly, removed.

Joe C. Cobb, Lewisville, Tex., in place of M. S. Donald, retired.

Gilbert R. Thayer, Port Lavaca, Tex., in place of M. B. McConnico, retired.

Frederick H. Pearce, Sr., Thorndale, Tex., in place of V. F. Norris, resigned.

VERMONT

Harvey A. Dix, Brattleboro, Vt., in place of J. H. McKinnon, transferred.

VIRGINIA

George Guy Farrar, Afton, Va., in place of L. C. Dawson, retired.

Jane D. Nottingham, Carrollton, Va., in place of L. M. Latimer, deceased.

Clinton Lewis Epperson, Lawrenceville, Va., in place of T. E. Warriner, deceased.

WASHINGTON

John C. Nowadnick, Chehalis, Wash., in place of L. K. Sullivan, deceased.

WEST VIRGINIA

Kenneth B. Rouzee, Kingwood, W. Va., in place of J. T. Spahr, retired.

Guy S. Holliday, Layland, W. Va., in place of W. A. Johnson, deceased.

Charles C. Workman, Red House, W. Va., in place of L. E. Ambler, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Michael J. Stieber, Colby, Wis., in place of A. X. Umhoefer, resired.

Benjamin F. Goehring, Random Lake, Wis., in place of E. H. Toepfer, resigned.

Francis Mattis, Stone Lake, Wis., in place of J. C. Reinke, removed.

WYOMING

Bruce L. Bartholomew, Dayton, Wyo., in place of J. C. Adams, retired.

LeRoy Williams, Grass Creek, Wyo., in place of G. C. Burrier, resigned.

Iduma Slagowski, Mountainview, Wyo., in place of R. C. Taylor, resigned.

Noreen C. Hopkins, Story, Wyo., in place of A. A. Raycher, deceased.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 23 (legislative day, February 22), 1956:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Douglas Maxwell Moffat, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America, to Australia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, who hast been our shield in the stillness of the night, guide us now by Thy divine wisdom and gird us with Thy strength as we set our minds and hearts to the tasks of this new day.

May this Lenten season upon which we have entered daily become richer and more glorious in the culture and deepening of our spiritual life.

Cleanse our souls of all unrighteousness and grant that through self-examination and self-discipline we may gain the mastery over those desires and habits which are contrary to Thy holy will.

Help us to grow in the grace and knowledge of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour, from whom to turn away is to fall but in whom to abide is to stand fast forever.

To Thy name we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday next week and the following week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE PRIME MINISTER OF IRELAND

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Thursday, March 15, at any time, for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of receiving the Prime Minister of Ireland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 403) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, be, and he is hereby, elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

Resolved, That the President and the Senate be notified by the Clerk of the election of Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK as Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. McCORMACK appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office as Speaker pro tempore.

MUST CONGRESS SURRENDER ITS POWERS TO OTC?

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5550 is such a short and innocent-looking bill.

Providing that "the President is hereby authorized to accept membership for the United States in the Organization for Trade Cooperation."

That is the sum and substance of it.

So disarming.

For who could object to the vague but pleasant generalities of Organization for Trade Cooperation?

But, wait a moment.

What is this OTC?

First, let us refresh our memory of the Constitution of the United States. Under article I, section 8, we note that "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, impost, and excises" and "to regulate commerce with foreign nations."

The State Department of today, in its zeal to acquire arbitrary control over tariffs and trade, has the effrontery to expect that Congress shall sign its powers away, in violation of the trust reposed in Congress by the people, and in contempt of constitutional procedures.

How?

By transferring authority from Congress to the State Department, via legislative approval of OTC.

H. R. 5550 is the instrument by which they would have Congress abdicate its responsibilities, upset the balance of representative government, and vest far greater power in the executive branch than the people ever intended that it should have.

For some years the State Department has been inching toward this goal.

OTC is the final and most subtle maneuver.

By this sidestepping technique, the regulation of our foreign commerce would be taken out of the hands of Congress, placed under the control of the State Department, and then come within the jurisdiction of an international trade organization known as the OTC, leading inevitably to control by a specialized agency of the United Nations of the type and amount and price of foreign goods that would flood the United States to the detriment of our own workers, industries, wage levels, and standard of living.

The attempt to sugarcoat OTC as a mere forum is not honest. OTC would be organized as an assembly, to gain compliance with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Assemblies of this nature are not merely debating societies. They are lawmaking bodies.

Implicit in the OTC is the power to affect markets within the United States;

to control production, profits, and employment here.

It would place us at the mercy of low-wage countries, and all the rest of the world would have an advantage over us in this respect.

We would have nothing to gain and everything to lose right here in the United States.

The announced objective of OTC is the "substantial reduction of tariffs." Even though in 1955 more than 200 trade associations and unions in the United States officially reported serious injury by cheap imports.

Furthermore, since the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, we have cut tariffs by as much as 75 percent. In return we got nothing but promises, which were betrayed when foreign countries increased their tariffs anywhere from 6 to 76 percent.

Due to imports of cheap cotton goods, the American textile industry alone has lost 200,000 jobs in the last 3 years.

Does the State Department show any concern over plight of these, and other jobless Americans whose livelihood has been traded away?

No nation has ever done more to help other nations than the United States. But there is a limit. We cannot give ourselves away.

Already, by imports and expenditures abroad we are putting $20 billion a year into the hands of foreign buyers. What are they doing with this purchasing power? Through tariffs, embargoes, and quotas, they are limiting their purchases of American goods.

We already take a lot of their products, the things that we need, such as tin, coffee, rubber, manganese, and so forth, have long come in duty free. Together with other foreign products that pay only nominal duties, they account for two-thirds of our imports.

But the State Department is not satisfied.

It wants to play international politics, using American industries and American workers as pawns in the game.

This is the same State Department that is considering the recognition of Red China, even though that outlaw government had killed tens of thousands of American boys by naked aggression, and is completely faithless to every moral precept.

This is the State Department that is supposed to protect American interests first.

Fortunately, the Congress of the United States, directly representative of the people, and responsive to their wishes, is alert to this ill-concealed giveaway that the State Department proposes, and will reject it.

H. R. 5550 is unfair to the United States.

INCREASE IN FREIGHT RATES

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to learn that the railroads and other carriers which are presently petitioning the Interstate Commerce Commission for authority to increase their freight rates and charges by 7 percent, effective February 25, 1956, have, upon the request of the Commission, decided to postpone the effective date of their new tariffs until March 7, 1956, in order to give the Commission more time to study the testimony and render a decision on this important problem.

This latest request by the carriers is the fifth time during the last 10 years that they have petitioned for a general rate increase. Each of the prior requests has been granted in whole or in part. The present level of rates, resulting from such increases, is approximately 80 percent above the level of rates that were in effect on June 30, 1946.

While I recognize that the carriers are entitled to just and reasonable rates, I believe that the shippers and the general public, which ultimately pays the freight, must also be protected. The only way to be sure that justice is done to all is to give the Interstate Commerce Commission all the time that it needs to weigh all the factors carefully, and to arrive at a decision that is fair to all parties concerned. At a later time, I expect to make a more complete statement on this subject.

AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES FOR NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Monday, February 27, for the Committee on Armed Services to call up the bill (H. R. 8675), to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; that general debate continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not, as I understand, this bill was before our committee before a subcommittee headed by the gentleman from North Carolina. The bill has had ample consideration. It was unanimously reported by the full Committee on Armed Services. It is an important bill and certainly should be disposed of as quickly as possible. I am glad the gentleman has submitted this request for its consideration next Monday.

Mr. VINSON. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I have discussed this matter with the chairman of the Rules Committee, and it is satisfactory to him that we submit this request instead of going before the Rules Committee and obtaining a rule.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

TVA APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, this is the year of decision for the TVA. The administration has sharply reduced appropriation requests for facilities necessary to have kept TVA in position to meet growing demands for power within its area. This year the administration has demanded that TVA greatly increase amortization payments to the Treasury. This demand is fiscally unsound and is a breach of faith with the people of the TVA area.

The failure to request new appropriations for additional facilities, which will soon be desperately needed, was based by this administration on the expectation that in this session of Congress provision would be made authorizing the TVA to issue its own bonds and thereby provide funds for additional facilities without resource to the Public Treasury.

I have long advocated that this be done, provided it is done in a way which would not artificially force up costs and hamstring the agency with redtape.

At the outset I will say that by demanding an abnormal increase in TVA's amortization payments to the Treasury, this administration is stripping the agency of resources which might be essential to the prompt and economical issuance of bonds.

If this proves to be the case, on analysis, the administration again must be condemned for lack of good faith such as was demonstrated in the ill-fated Dixon-Yates contract.

I wish to plead, however, that the Congress act with more speed in making provision for TVA self-financing.

This Congress, as all Members are aware, has been working diligently. We are moving along in consideration of measures of major concern to the Congress and the Nation. Yet in the matter of TVA self-financing, it does not seem to me that we are making the progress hoped for or expected by the people of the Tennessee Valley area.

This is an election year and as such it poses extra problems for Members. As is customary, every effort will be made by both Houses to perform work promptly and to adjourn at a relatively early date.

I fear that if we do not move more expeditiously with TVA matters, they may be left hanging fire, or in the rush of final business we may not be able to give full attention and consideration to this matter which is of such deep concern to the people of my district and the Tennessee Valley.

Some fears have been expressed that if additional facilities are provided, the TVA would somehow break out of its boundaries. This is not the case, and I do not think it ever will be.

What the people of my area wish to assure themselves of is a normal and natural growth in the TVA's ability to serve the growing power demands of its

present area. Any doubt about the ability of the TVA to do so would be a damper on the expansion of business, industry, and agriculture in the entire valley.

This area has made rapid progress in the last 15 years. Much of it can be attributed to the abundance of power generated by TVA. Economic growth of the valley has increased its social stability remarkably. I submit that this has been good for the Nation as a whole. The establishment of and economic stability in any region strengthens the whole. In payment of Federal taxes alone, there has been a marked increase over the past decade and a half.

For every passing day in which TVA is unable to meet the increasing needs for power, the growth of the valley is inhibited just that much. In penalizing, or attempting to penalize, TVA for being the success that it has been, the real victim is not the TVA but the people of the Tennessee Valley. They are an industrious people. They are hard-working people. They are hopeful people. They are fine Americans.

I can see no justification for saying to these people: "You may have no hope. You may make no plans for growth and progress. You must limit your industry." But, in failing to provide for the normally growing power needs of these people, that is just what we are doing.

The people of my district and of the Tennessee Valley, having had experience with the TVA, have been and are now willing to support development projects for many other sections of the Nation. They believe in progress. I ask the Members of this House to keep progress going in the Tennessee Valley. I ask that we act promptly so that the people of my district and the entire Tennessee Valley may know what to expect and what to plan for.

REVISION OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H. R. 9473, which I introduced yesterday embodies the provisions of S. 2875 introduced by the Honorable OLIN D. JOHNSTON, chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and other similar bills. But those bills, which have for a primary purpose a long-needed overhauling of the Civil Service Retirement Act, except for one or two very minor provisions, would not benefit present annuitants but only those who are yet to retire.

The several rounds of salary increases which have occurred since 1948 have already produced a wide and only partially bridged gap in benefits between those who retired before that year and those who have retired since. The enactment into law of the provisions of S. 2875 as it stands would widen that gap.

The passage of Public Law 369 during the closing days of the 1st session of the 84th Congress removed for some annuitants a part of the inequities to which those who retired several years ago have been subjected, but it specifically excluded all those whose annuity increases under the law would, when added to the then existing annuity, bring the total to $4,104 or more. H. R. 9473 proposes to eliminate this discriminatory feature of Public Law 369.

Whenever the Congress determines that a cost-of-living increase is warranted for active employees in order that they may enjoy a decent standard of living, it is believed that in all fairness Congress should, at the same time, recognize the plight of the aged, the sick, and the disabled civil service retirees and grant them a similar increase. The principle has been recognized and approved by industry and also by the Kaplan committee. It has solid precedent in our Government, as it has been followed for years by the Navy, Army, Air Force, Coast Guard, Marines, Public Health Service, and some other Government agencies.

To remedy the foregoing deficiencies, H. R. 9473 accordingly includes the following provisions for present retirees which are not in S. 2875. A new section, as follows:

(a) The annuity of any person who now is receiving an annuity from the civil-service retirement and disability fund shall be increased, effective on the first day of the second month following the eactment of this act, by $100 plus $10 per each 2 full months elapsed between the commencing date of the annuity and the date of enactment of this act: Provided such increases shall not in any case exceed $300.

(b) The annuity of any person whose annuity was not increased by reason of the limitation contained in Public Law 369, 84th Congress, 1st session, is increased effective on the first day of the second month following the enactment of this act, by an amount in excess of $360; and the limitation in Public Law 369 is repealed as of the date of the enactment of this act.

(c) Section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by adding: "Annuities shall be adjusted simultaneously with general adjustments in salaries of employees on the same average percentage: Provided no annuitant's annuity shall be decreased by reason of this amendment."

(d) The annuity of any survivor (except as provided in subparagraph (e)) who on the date of the enactment of this act is receiving or entitled to receive an annuity based on the service of an annuitant shall be increased by $80, effective on the first day of the second month following the date of the enactment of this act.

(e) The annuity of any child who on the date of enactment of this act is receiving or is entitled to receive an annuity based on the service of a parent annuitant shall be increased by $50, effective on the first day of the second month following the date of the enactment of this act: Provided the annuity of each such child shall not exceed $1,200 divided by the number of children of such parent-annuitant then receiving annuity.

It is fully recognized that the increases covered by H. R. 9473 will not nearly equalize the annuities of employees heretofore retired with the annuities of employees who will retire after January 1, 1957, but it will, to a degree, give them some deserved consideration. A considerable part of the salary deductions collected during their Government career from the employees already retired was in 100-cent dollars, and they are now being paid in 50-cent dollars. Unless there is a decided change in the future value of the dollar, these retired Government servants will continue to be paid in 50-cent dollars.

Other provisions in H. R. 9473 which are different from S. 2875 are as follows:

Annuities are computed at present under a formula using the employee's average annual basic salary for any 5 consecutive years. I believe the average salary period should be based on a 3-year period rather than a 5-year period, and I have so provided in my bill.

Present law provides that certain employees whose duties are hazardous and involve primarily the investigation, apprehension, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the Federal criminal laws may, at age 50 and with 20 years of service, elect to retire, subject to the recommendation of the agency head. This has been interpreted to include FBI agents, customs agents, narcotic agents, port patrol officers, and so forth. S. 2875 would include employees in the field service of the Bureau of Prisons in this category. I have further broadened the provisions of this section to include customs inspectors whose duties I would classify as hazardous since these employees are charged with the preventing of smuggling, and frequently apprehend known or suspected criminals, narcotics peddlers, and so forth.

Under S. 2875 a reduction would be made in the ceiling on annuities from a maximum of 80 percent to 75 percent. I believe it should remain at 80 percent. It seems to me the reduction would be unfair to career employees with long service.

Another provision in S. 2875 is that annuities shall not be assignable, either in law or equity, or be subject to execution, levy, attachment, garnishment, or other legal process. My bill broadens this to include taxation. Employees pay income taxes on all their yearly earnings, including the amount deducted from their salaries for the retirement fund. There is no reason why they should pay taxes again on the same money that they have put into the retirement fund. Therefore, I am suggesting a $3,000 limitation on which there will be no taxation. Precedence for this has been established in the railroad retirement and social-security systems under which annuities, without limitation, are not subject to taxation.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the

majority whip if he will kindly inform us as to the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished minority whip for bringing this matter to the attention of the House at this time.

Monday is District day, but there is no business on the District Calendar. On Monday, under the unanimous-consent agreement heretofore obtained, the bill (H. R. 8675) dealing with the National Advisory Committee for aeronautical equipment will be considered.

On Tuesday House Resolution 356, concerning the Government Operations Committee, and H. R. 3383, the Colorado River storage project, will be called up for consideration.

On Wednesday there will be a joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress. The President of Italy will be the guest of the Congress at that time.

Also on Wednesday, the bill H. R. 3383, the Colorado River storage project matter will be further considered.

On Thursday an appropriation bill for general Government matters for 1957 will be considered.

There is the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Any further program will be announced later.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 404) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That ELMER J. HOLLAND, of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Banking and Currency.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 405) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That JAMES C. HEALEY, of New York, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Banking and Currency.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARE WE LOSING A CONTINENT?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, are we losing a continent? That is a question asked by Adm. Richard Byrd in an article published by him in January 1954. He raised the question because, while other nations have been claiming parts or all of the Antarctic Continent, the United States has not. As he has put it:

> The rest of the world has stuck their finger in the Antarctic pie while Uncle Sam is still sucking his thumb.

Yet, the United States has done more exploratory work in the Antarctic than all those other nations put together. Great Britain, Argentina, Chile, Australia, Norway, and France each have claimed parts. Russia has claimed all of it. She has sent a force to Antarctica to participate in the coming geophysical year activities. She has already planted her flag on the continent and clearly indicates through publicity releases that she intends to press her claims.

The Soviet action and statements have caused some concern in Great Britain. Dr. C. H. M. Waldock, professor of public international law at Oxford University, recently urged Britain to emphatically stake out her claims to the Antarctic before Russia takes over. He disagreed with a Soviet claim that Russia had discovered Antarctica, and said that Britain should maintain its claims with "absolute distinctness."

Argentina has zealously pressed her claims. In 1952, a group of Englishmen sailed toward the Palmer Peninsula, a 750 mile toe which stretches up toward South America. As they approached the shore they were greeted by a volley of shots overhead. It was a warning not to land on Argentine territory. Three days later a 4-gun British Navy frigate appeared on the scene, and an Argentine apology followed. The incident pointed up the competing claims of Argentina and Britain. Palmer Peninsula was named after Nathaniel Palmer, a Yankee sealer who was credited with its discovery in 1821. But Britain, Argentina, and Chile claim it. The latter has buried her claims under a military building constructed there.

Antarctica is a continent of 6 million square miles of land—about as large as the United States and Europe combined. Glacial ice covers most of it except where the mountains rise above the ice. On the fringes there are ice-free areas. Admiral Byrd found one oasis—a green valley protected by high cliffs. He saw fresh water mountain lakes warmed by ocean currents.

Admiral Byrd is now on his fifth expedition to the south polar region. Captain Finne Ronne and Lincoln Ellsworth are two other Americans who have done tremendous exploratory work there. The reports of these three intrepid men indicate quite clearly that the frozen real estate at the bottom of the world is actually a storehouse of fabulous riches. Byrd says he saw a vein filled with enough coal to supply the whole world. He brought back to America evidence that invaluable deposits of oil, copper, silver, molybdenum, iron, gold, and uranium lie beneath the ice waiting to be tapped. Atomic energy and new mining techniques can uncover these vast resources.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the valuable resources in the Antarctic, which could be made available to us when those in the United States become depleted, there is the strategic value of that region to be considered. It could serve as a possible naval or airplane base in the future. Admiral Byrd has said that if the Panama Canal were knocked out in some emergency then naval and commercial vessels would be compelled to sail around the southern tip of South America. It would be vitally important then to have the control of the Palmer Peninsula in our own or friendly hands.

Mr. Speaker, it seems imperative that we delay no longer in asserting our claims to that portion or portions of Antarctica where we have concentrated our exploratory efforts. The National Security Council fully realizes the strategic importance of that region. Congress should act at an early date upon my measure, House Joint Resolution 25, which would declare our sovereignty over those areas. Congress as far back as about 1830 has authorized expeditions to the Antarctic. Whenever the subject of pressing our claims have arisen the State Department has stated that it would not act without congressional direction. But Congress has always failed to act. I think it should act now—in this session. There is no question of colonialism or imperialism involved. There are no people yet living in Antarctica—only penguins. I hope the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which my bill has been referred, will hold early hearings upon it.

IRRIGATION AND POWER PROJECTS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, today I will insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the complete information relative to the number of irrigation and power projects this country is sponsoring in foreign lands. The RECORD will show there are 139 projects in 32 foreign countries. The International Cooperation Administration, which is a continuation of the Marshall plan and the FOA, sent me a report which shows that from April 3, 1948, to March 31, 1955, we were obligated to spend $288,600,000 on projects in Europe, the Far East, the Near East, Africa, and South Asia.

I know some of my colleagues hesitate to support irrigation or power projects in our own country. They, at the same time, do not hesitate to support similar projects all over the world. Some of these projects are in areas whose names not only mystify, but defy pronunciation. It is my opinion that $288 million plus for these projects is just the beginning. When a project is once started, it must be completed. This will take a good many millions more of the taxpayers' dollars. I have never voted for this giveaway program, which to date has drained the taxpayers of about $50 billion.

I do hope my colleagues will be tolerant when the upper Colorado River project comes up for consideration next week. I hope they will be tolerant and understanding when other good reclamation and power projects are presented for their consideration. In my opinion these projects are nothing more than an investment in the resources of this country. They repay every dollar which is invested in them. On the contrary the Foreign Aid reclamation and power projects pay back not one penny. In some countries they help to produce the very crops that are in surplus here at home. It makes it impossible for us to support our agricultural products. In many of the 32 foreign countries, the good will of this country is at its lowest ebb, in spite of all the dollars poured into these foreign lands. I commend a reading of the report which I will insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

SENATOR PAUL DOUGLAS OPPOSES UPPER COLORADO RIVER PROJECT

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the distinguished Members of this body just a few moments ago asked your favorable consideration of the upper Colorado scheme. I would ask the Members also in their deliberations to consider the statements of a member of the other body, a distinguished economist, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, who describes it as a lavish, extravagant, and unjustified program, and stated his opposition to it on the basis that, "This project is not good for the Nation. That is why I oppose it."

Other elucidating statements made by Senator DOUGLAS during debate on the project April 20 last year in the other body include the following:

The area covered by this bill is the worst place in the country at which to develop hydroelectric power. * * *

The cost of installing power capacity in the area covered by this bill will be over $500 per kilowatt, or 4 to 5 times the cost on the Tennessee River, and more than 5 times the cost of most dams on the Columbia River. * * *

If we were to pick out one of the worst places in the United States at which to erect a public power project, we would pick out this one. * * *

I doubt that this sum—the appropriation for power—will be paid out, for power from coal oil and shale oil in this region can probably be produced at the same or a lower cost. Furthermore what about atomic energy? Will not that be ready for use in 60 years?

* * * so if we add the hidden interest costs, which will amount to more than $1,100,000,000, the cost of the irrigation features will come to more than $2 billion and the total cost of all features to probably close to $3 billion or more.

The average cost of construction, let alone interest, for the project as a whole would be $952 an acre * * * if we include interest, the cost per acre will be $2,142. The cost for the central Utah project with interest will be $3,953. These are fantastic figures. The most fertile land in the country * * * is not worth more than $600 or $700 an acre. Here we are proposing to spend more than $2,000 an acre for land which, when fully irrigated, will not be worth more than $150 an acre. On a big project, we will be spending approximately $4,000 an acre.

We must remember that these irrigation projects are not in low altitudes * * * (at which) the average temperature is high and the growing season long. They are, instead, in the mountains, at altitudes from 4,500 to 7,500 feet, where the growing season is short, where the winters are long, and where the crops produced will be, by the admission of the proponents of this bill, primarily alfalfa, hay, and some corn, for the feeding of livestock. These are costs which cannot be borne. Irrigation can better be used to put water on the more fertile land of the Midwest to raise the yields per acre there. This would be at a very low cost instead of at the astronomical costs of this project.

* * * who then will pay for this gigantic project? The interest is forgiven, and borne by the taxpayer. Eighty-five percent of the principal is not to be paid by those who own the land, but is supposedly to be saddled on the power revenues. If we examine the costs and the power revenues, we find that it would be almost impossible for the power system to earn the money necessary to meet the 85 percent of direct irrigation costs. * * *

This is a lavish, extravagant, unjustified program.

MISUSE OF WELFARE AND UNION FUNDS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a magazine article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, an article in the current March 6 issue of Look stresses the necessity of legislation which will prevent the embezzlement and misuse of welfare funds collected from employers, dues and other funds collected from employees.

The management of Look should be universally commended, especially by the officers of unions and those who are interested in union welfare, for giving wide publicity to the activities of a few dishonest extortionists and racketeers. Some are graphically exposed by Clark Mollenhoff and Fletcher Knebel of Look's Washington bureau. Both Mr. Knebel and Mr. Mollenhoff are well-known factfinders, whose exposé in this issue of Look is documented and factual.

Unless the warning conveyed in the current issue of Look is heeded, money contributed by employers to a trust fund to be used only for the welfare of employees will continue to be embezzled, wasted, and misspent by individuals who should not go unwhipped of justice.

Unless the public, alerted by this and similar articles, insists upon remedial legislation, union dues and special assessments arbitrarily taken from the employee's pay check will be used to advance the political ambitions of union officers who do not represent the rank and file of organized labor.

The article to which reference is made reads as follows:

CAN BIG LABOR CLEAN HOUSE?

(By Fletcher Knebel and Clark Mollenhoff)

On the crisp December day last year when the AFL and CIO were married, some members of the wedding arrived for the ceremony only one step ahead of the sheriff.

Fifteen million workers entered the new temple of labor. At their head walked 68,000 local leaders. Most of these men came in the honored tradition of trade-unionism, but some came in the name of power and plunder. What distressed those who desired a bright future for the new AFL–CIO was not that a minority had come with unclean hands, but that nobody challenged them at the door.

For 2 years before the merger of the AFL and CIO, congressional investigators had spread upon the record a story that should have shamed every honest champion of labor.

Local union chiefs had played fast and loose with health and welfare funds. One insurance pool was looted of $1 million. Bombings, beatings, and vandalism beat a tattoo on the jukeboxes of the Midwest. Men who dared risk the wrath of labor thugs had their faces smashed.

The cynical self-interest of some labor bosses was bared to public view. Some claimed the fifth amendment privilege before congressional committees on the handling of funds of their own union members. Others got rich while paying lip service to the workingman. One leader bought diamond rings with union money and gave them to fellow labor bosses.

The handling of the $11 billion worth of new union-welfare insurance became a big business. In some places, it also became a big racket, spawning kickbacks, exorbitant commissions to pals of union chiefs and lucrative undercover deals that were cloaked from rank-and-file union members. In some locals, corruption rode into office with allies of the underworld.

The big issue with some labor czars was not how to boost the wages of the men, but how to keep themselves out of the clutches of the internal-revenue agents.

The stench finally became so great in one union, the International Longshoremen's Association, that George Meany, then president of the old AFL, booted that crime-ridden organization out of the AFL. But in the shadows of that expulsion, many officers of other unions who had battened on the wages of labor went unchastised and unrebuked by their superiors in the bureaucracy of labor.

From outside the big AFL–CIO merger, white-crested John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers, bellowed a warning to his union contemporaries that human jackals were feeding on these welfare funds.

The new labor merger took account of the mounting criticism. It urged Congress to provide criminal penalties for officers who tamper with union-welfare funds or fail to file financial reports. It also denounced dishonest, corrupt, unethical conduct by union leaders and established a committee on ethical practices.

Al J. Hayes, president of the International Association of Machinists, heads the new five-man committee on ethical practices, which went to work early this year under wide authority to investigate racketeering and corruption.

The big question is not what the committee will find, but what it will do about it. Thus far, precious little has been done. Labor's hierarchy finds it easy to pass the buck. As a sample, the 1,250,000-member Brotherhood of Teamsters, largest union in the AFL–CIO, has been pockmarked with crime and terror, but President Dave Beck has failed to move against the culprits.

When AFL-CIO President George Meany was asked on a CBS-TV panel show if he had delivered Beck an ultimatum to cleanse his union, Meany demurred. "We do not have an FBI," he said. "We do not have an investigating department. We don't have that kind of money. The job of cleaning these things up is in the hands of the international union. They are supposed to watch these things."

One place where these things have been watched is Congress. Here, from the hearings and reports of Senate and House investigative committees, are glimpses of nine men of labor who remained uncensured months after their public testimony:

Eugene C. (Jimmy) James, secretary-treasurer, Laundry Workers International Union:

Senator IRVING M. IVES. "Is there any question that we can possibly ask you here, the answer to which will not incriminate you?"

Mr. JAMES. "I respectfully refuse to answer the question on the ground that the answer may tend to incriminate me."

Jimmy James may have set a record for reluctant witnesses before the Senate subcommittee on welfare and pension plans, headed by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois. He invoked the fifth amendment no less than 229 times at one hearing. He even refused to answer when asked his union connection.

The big question was a $1 million one. A total of $1,008,500 had disappeared in 4 years from money collected to buy insurance premiums for the laundry workers. Through an intricate system of financial juggling, much of the money, according to Senate investigators, went through the hands of Louis B. Saperstein, a favored Newark, N. J., insurance broker, and wound up in a bank account controlled by the handsome, well-tailored Jimmy James.

Seldom has a Senate committee's official report used such words as "embezzled" and "looted," the verbs attached to the shrunken insurance pool of the laundry workers. "It is equally clear," declared the Douglas subcommittee, "that through James and/or Saperstein $900,000 in premiums and $82,500 in special service fees, and $26,000 in proceeds of the local 46 hotel-division funds were embezzled."

The report also stated that "James, who did not have any direct connection with the welfare fund, must bear the ultimate blame for having looted it of substantial money rightfully belonging to the beneficiaries, his own fellow union members."

Jimmy James had come a long way since the day, 15 years ago, when he was running a Detroit pool hall at a loss. He had bulled his way up through the echelons of professional labor organizers with obvious profit. Today, he can afford a limousine, a 10-room ranch house on 35 acres near Wheaton, Ill., 6 horses in the corral and a fine wardrobe of suits with matching accessories.

Jimmy James was cited by the United States Senate for contempt. He still serves as secretary-treasurer of the laundry workers. President Sam J. Byers made no move to unseat him. In fact, Byers missed the hearing on his union's welfare fund. A doctor's certificate excused him from appearing.

Angelo Inciso, president, Local 286, UAW (AFL), Chicago:

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS. What was the purpose of this trip?

Mr. INCISO. I went to Europe to see how the living conditions were and also to see how the situation was.

Senator DOUGLAS. In other words, you were conducting a——

Mr. INCISO. Good-will tour.

Senator DOUGLAS. To whom were you spreading good will?

Mr. INCISO. Myself.

From a general account containing regular union dues and assessments, as well as health- and welfare-insurance funds, the 42-year-old Chicago labor boss financed a $3,400 tour of Europe. Inciso lived high on the hog from the union contributions of his 3,500 members. What's more, he had no apologies to make to nosy Senators. "I fight for them to get them the best of everything, and I am sure that when I travel they should give me the best of everything," he said. Inciso apparently felt, however, that this mutual regard was not shared universally. He arrived for the hearing with two bodyguards, who were requested to check their firearms at the door.

His lush junkets on union funds included trips to South America, with stopovers in Jamaica and Mexico; and to Puerto Rico, Europe, and California. Inciso insisted that these trips were on union business, but Senator DOUGLAS told Inciso's superior: "The only conclusion we can draw is that they are pleasure junkets paid for by relatively low-paid workers." Inciso also sought relaxation in a $45-a-day hotel suite in Las Vegas.

From the $350,000 to $400,000 a year that pours into his union pools, Inciso dispenses largesse to friends as freely as to himself. When a Chicago employer ran low on cash, Inciso loaned him $40,000. He believes he gave one $1,200 "gent's diamond ring" and another $1,100 "gent's diamond ring" to officials of the teamsters' union. Reason: "When you are on strike, it is wonderful to have friends who will * * * help you * * * and the teamsters * * * have done me many such favors." Inciso bought $360 diamond money clips from union funds, gave one to a teamsters' official and another to an attorney.

From his expensive trips abroad, Inciso always returned with an enormous love for the United States, despite past convictions for bootlegging and thievery. "Conditions are so terrible," said Angelo, of South America, "that I tried to forget it."

Inciso is not the only one who manages to forget his trips and easy spending of union funds. The president of the AFL International Union of United Automobile Workers of America, Earl Heaton, has yet to demand that Inciso give an accounting of his personal welfare.

N. Louis (Babe) Triscaro, president, Excavating and Building Materials Local 436, Teamsters Union, Cleveland:

Representative CLARE HOFFMAN. "Did you report the $200 a week, for example, as administrator of the welfare fund?"

Mr. TRISCARO: "I refuse to answer on the ground it may tend to incriminate me."

Babe Triscaro ruled as boss of a welfare fund for his union. He told the House Antiracketeering Subcommittee that he set aside 15 percent of these collected moneys for "administration." From this administrative budget, he promoted the welfare of his teamsters in curious ways—with the approval of union executives, he testified.

He spent $430 for cases of whisky as Christmas gifts to fund officials and gave them $96 worth of fight tickets. He also anted up $250 for a Bill Presser testimonial dinner. Luncheons, baseball tickets, and raffle chances flowed from the insurance pool's "administration."

In 2 years, Triscaro's local collected $790,000 for welfare, but under his rule, only about 20 percent had been used to buy insurance premiums for the workers.

What was he doing with the remainder? The Babe said he intended to build a clinic as a monument to himself.

"There is people," he said, "that are worried about their families. There is people that want to get them free benefits and have those benefits for a fact. And I felt that it would have been a sort of monument to me and the papers would have to throw flowers at me instead of dirt as they have been doing for the last 23 or 24 years. So I felt that it would be a monument to me and my membership."

As for his own income during the years when the welfare of his members nestled so close to his heart, Triscaro invoked a brand of welfare for himself and sought refuge behind the fifth amendment when questioned about matters in his income-tax returns.

Triscaro still rules his union roost; President Dave Beck of the International Teamsters has made no move to dislodge him.

Edward J. Gallagher, president, Pointers, Cleaners & Calkers Union, Local No. 52, Chicago.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT: "And there is no appeal to any person from your decision as to how funds shall be spent?"

Mr. GALLAGHER: "No, sir."

Ed Gallagher operated one of the fanciest vanishing union welfare funds of our era, a hearing before a Senate subcommittee on welfare and pension funds indicated. A 7½-cent-per-hour levy on employers yielded the Pointers, Cleaners & Calkers' welfare fund $215,752 in 4 years. At the end of that period, the fund had shriveled to $7,339, with hardly a scrap of documentary evidence to show that union members had received any benefits from it. Part of the money was transferred by check into the union's "defense" fund, whence it went out on drafts which were cashed in spots ranging from a Chicago bar and grill to a Florida motel.

Gallagher stoutly maintained that he doled out the cash in "welfares" to members who needed it for ailments, births, funerals, etc. But he admitted he had scant written proof to show the nature of the welfare. Even his attorney, Nathan Cohen, conceded that Senators might properly term Gallagher's method of operation: "How Not To Operate a Welfare Fund."

Endorsements on some of the checks seemed to indicate transactions far from the realm of hospitals and clinics: a $1,166 repair bill for Gallagher's new Cadillac; a $347.07 check to an airline for tickets to Miami; a $1,700 payment on a Chrysler for a union official.

One $500 check through a furrier was explained by Gallagher as probably a 10-week disability payment to a member who used it to buy something for a "sweetheart" or "whatever you might call it."

The Senators were not impressed by Gallagher's protest of virtue in connection with the vanishing welfare fund. Their report concluded "that a great portion of the welfare fund and, for that matter, the other fund created by deductions from employees' wages went to the benefit of Gallagher."

The Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers International Union, presided over by Harry C. Bates, has taken no action on Ed Gallagher of its Chicago affiliate.

Anthony Doria, international secretary-treasurer, UAW (AFL).

Mr. DORIA: "I think labor representatives today are entitled to the position they hold."

Senator DOUGLAS: "To diamond rings?"

Mr. DORIA: "If the man sitting across the table from me wears a diamond ring, I think I am entitled to the same thing. I represent my people on the same level."

President Angelo Inciso's fast and loose spending of union funds of a local under Doria's jurisdiction troubled the international secretary-treasurer not a whit. In fact, he was at pains to explain to investigating Senators that a new day of plush comfort had downed for labor leaders. Diversion of money collected for the benefit of the rank and file to the high living of union officials received his tacit approval. He declined to plunge into the icy water of ethics.

Senator DOUGLAS denounced as highly improper, if not illegal, the practice of expensive junkets from union funds by the men entrusted with the money. Doria believed DOUGLAS had missed the point.

"Senator, to the contrary," he said. "It is expenditures such as these that expand the horizon of labor leaders to the point

where they can more adequately compete with what is sitting across the table from them that has been doing this for 100 years."

This attitude toward the custodians of these funds has brought no public reprimand from Doria's immediate superior, Earl Heaton, international president of the AFL auto workers.

William Presser, president, Ohio Conference of Teamsters.

Representative CLARE E. HOFFMAN: "Didn't you withdraw from the Cleveland Trust Co. during 1952 something like $46,829.88?"

Mr. PRESSER. "I refuse to answer that question on the ground it may tend to incriminate me."

In the course of one session before a House antiracketeering subcommitte, headed by Representative GEORGE H. BENDER, Republican, of Ohio, Presser used that phrase or its equivalent 55 times, even refusing to answer the simple inquiry as to what compensation he received from his teamsters' union.

Presser is lord of a jukebox and cigarette-vending machine empire that sprawls over northern Ohio. The nickels and quarters yield a rich harvest. A typical location for a vending machine is valued at $300. In 1953, Presser was fined $1,500 on a Federal charge of conspiring to create a monopoly in the candy and cigarette business.

A criminal record is no bar to employment under Presser. According to witnesses and the report of the Bender subcommittee, this is the pattern of operations in Presser's domain: Employers are forced to join the union. Operators outside the association risk stench-bombings, beatings, picketings, and wrecked machines. Distributors who sell to operators on the union blacklist learn what enforcement means. One distributor who tried it was bombed 2 days later. Another operator who was stench-bombed 3 times now carries a .38 for protection.

Although Presser disclaimed liability for violence in his territory, the subcommittee found that it "must of necessity be the responsibility of Presser." More than a year has passed since the congressional report, but International President Dave Beck of the teamsters has taken no action on Presser.

Paul Dorfman, secretary-treasurer, local 20467, Waste Material Handlers' Union, Chicago:

William F. McKenna, general counsel of House Committee on Government Operations:

Mr. MCKENNA. "Mr. Dorfman, do you report part of the income of the Union Insurance Agency of Illinois on your returns as personal income each year?"

Mr. DORFMAN: "I decline to answer the question. The answer might tend to incriminate me."

House investigators received 70 similar answers from Paul Dorfman. Most of the investigative interest centered about Dorfman's connection with the Union Insurance Agency of Illinois, which handled lucrative union welfare-fund accounts of the Union Casualty and Life Insurance Company of Mount Vernon, N. Y.

Dorfman admitted that his wife Rose and his son Allen were partners in Union Insurance, but declined to answer questions about his wife's cut of the profits. However, a committee investigator presented a breakdown. It showed that in fiscal 1952, Allen Dorfman got $31,000 or one-fourth of the net profits, while Rose Dorfman received three-fourths, or $94,000. The following year, the investigator said, they split the net profits 50–50, or $118,500 for each.

Commissions and expenses received by the agency in a 4-year period totaled $791,000, according to the investigators, the bulk of it in connection with two teamsters' welfare funds and a fund of local 1031 of the electrical workers.

Paul Dorfman testified he knew both James Hoffa of the teamsters and Frank Darling of the electrical workers, but declined to answer when asked if he discussed insurance with them.

Allen Dorfman, the son, invoked the fifth amendment 64 times while appearing before the House committee.

Paul Dorfman still rules as secretary-treasurer of the Waste Material Handlers' Union, which operates on a direct charter from American Federation of Labor headquarters. President George Meany has taken no action in the matter.

James R. Hoffa, vice president, Brotherhood of Teamsters;

WILLIAM F. MCKENNA: "How many Cadillacs do your business agents use?"

Mr. HOFFA: "Well, I'll tell you, we have, let's see, in our particular local union I guess maybe about 11 Cadillacs, or 12. We have a couple of Fords and maybe a Mercury. * * * We change them every year."

When Jimmy Hoffa, labor's little Napoleon, meets one of his teamsters, he likes to fling a "Hiyuh, capitalist!" greeting. As a servant of the workingman, Hoffa has become quite a capitalist himself. His individual and family ventures show no lack of vision.

They included, according to testimony befor a House Subcommittee on Welfare Funds and Labor Racketeering, headed by Representative WINT SMITH, Republican, of Kansas, an outfit known as Test Fleet, Inc., which leased equipment to a company hauling automobiles. Hoffa's wife and Mrs. Owen Bert Brennan, wife of another Detroit teamster official, established the business for $4,000. Within 4 years, the subcommittee said, it had returned the ladies $62,000 in dividends, although their only work was to ask that a dividend be declared now and then.

Hoffa said he owned a $10,000 chunk of Northwestern Oil Co. in North Dakota. Others with a $10,000 interest included an officer and an agent of the insurance company which held the teamsters' welfare-insurance business, with a fat profit for the company.

Other past Hoffa enterprises were half of a $25,000 stock interest in a realty company, a share of the Columbus Trotting Association, which operated a racetrack, and a $3,500 share of Jack-O-Lantern Lodge, a Wisconsin girls' camp. Other investors in the girls' camp included insurance agents for the firm that handled the teamsters' welfare account. Hoffa also said he lost $20,000 in a "little syndicate" that included a brewery.

For a time, Mrs. Hoffa drew $100 a week on the payroll of the jukebox local in Detroit, but never went near the office. Hoffa said this was really a method to repay him money he loaned to the union.

At the time House investigators quizzed him in 1953, Hoffa also swore that he owed more than $38,000 to individuals, although none of the sums were formalized in notes or other evidence of intention to repay.

House probers were interested in Hoffa's capitalistic ventures primarily because some of them involved mutual investments with Dr. Leo Perlman, head of Union Casualty and Life, and Allen Dorfman, head of Union Insurance Agency, which handled huge teamster welfare funds under Hoffa's influence. Hoffa said he received no money for swinging the insurance to the Dorfmans and Perlman, but he insisted on his right to draw a normal profit from joint business enterprises with these same people.

Hoffa, twice convicted of labor-law violations, still retains his official teamster positions. International President Dave Beck has made no move to oust him. Some people think Beck couldn't—that Hoffa has more power than Beck.

M. Frank Darling, President and business manager, Local 1031, Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Chicago:

Representative PHIL M. LANDRUM: "You think he just paid you $42,000 to have his name spread out over the air?"

Mr. DARLING: "I think he felt the advertising for a new company competing against older companies for insurance, and particularly advertising that would reach factory workers that he was trying to reach, that he thought it was worth it."

In addition to his chores for the Chicago electrical workers' local, Frank Darling had active financial dealings of his own.

One of them was an 80-percent interest in a short-lived girls' baseball league. For one team, he obtained a $42,000 sponsor, Allen Dorfman's Illinois agency. In return, the girls advertised the insurance firm on their uniforms. What interested House investigators in this deal was the fact that Dorfman's agency handled the rich welfare fund of Darling's Local 1031 of the electrical workers, which in 4 years paid premiums totaling $2,500,000. In 4 years, Allen Dorfman's commissions on the deal totaled $250,000, the Smith subcommittee reported. Dorfman's partner in the agency was his mother.

Admiral Corp., which employed five or six thousand members of Darling's union, also anted up $20,000 for sponsorship of one of Darling's girl baseball teams. The Smith subcommittee noted that girl baseball was a "personal enterprise of Union President Darling" and "totally unrelated" to collective bargaining between the company and Darling's union.

Darling's union office sweetened his financial life in other directions. He received commissions from a furniture and appliance store which gave discounts to his union members. He received about $1,000 in 1952 from check-cashing companies which cashed paychecks of his union members at a profit. Darling said he arranged with company officials to permit the check cashers to park outside the plant's gates.

If some of Darling's ventures seemed to indicate a conflict of interest, officials at international headquarters were not disturbed. Neither the late International President J. Scott Milne nor his successor, Gordon M. Freeman, made any move to oust or censure Darling.

These are but nine men of labor. There are scores of other Pressers, Dorfmans, Gallaghers, and Jameses ruling unions throughout the land. Some have been investigated by Congress, Others have not. The question before labor's new house is what the Hayes committee on ethical practices will do about them.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill, H. R. 8750.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

TREE PLANTING ON SURPLUS CROPLANDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, in 1949, 16 of my distinguished colleagues in the House from both sides of the aisle joined me in introducing legislation to provide cooperative forest management advice and assistance to farmers and other owners of small woodlands. The proposed bill became law in 1950 and now some 270 technically trained foresters are employed by 41 States which are

cooperating with our Federal Forest Service in this woodland management endeavor. Each year now some 30,000 small owners are helped to do a better job of growing, harvesting, and marketing their tree crop.

Mr. Speaker, the tree crop is one that is not in surplus. It never has been in surplus. A recent review of our timber resource status for the next 50 years indicates increasing needs for the products of our forests—particularly pulp and paper products. We know that there are some 60 million acres of denuded, overcut and depleted forest land in need of regeneration to trees. Tree planting is therefore truly a subject of great importance and of national interest.

We are fortunate today that the general public, and more particularly our farmers, realize that trees can be used for many purposes. Tree seedlings can be planted on open lands, grown for a various number of years, harvested for pulpwood or lumber, or just left to grow as insurance against a time when national needs in an emergency may require huge quantities of wood and cellulose derivatives such as were required in World War II.

In the proposals to create a national soil bank there are millions of acres of surplus croplands which can be planted to trees. However, the farmer who diverts such land needs Federal aid in the form of tree seedlings and technical help to get them planted and tended for the several years it takes to establish the new plantation. There are many such acres in the South that can be diverted to trees, for whatever period desirable, then if conditions demand, the better acres could be converted back to the growing of crops.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today will make it possible to give farmers the tree seedlings needed to plant open lands that have been declared surplus for the growing of crops. The bill also provides the additional technical forest management assistance necessary to insure a good job of planting and care of the seedlings being done by the farmer. It will help get surplus croplands in the South into trees; it will do this same job anywhere in the Nation where incentives are needed to get the tree planting job on diverted acres underway.

One feature of the bill calls for the State forestry commissions to appoint a county forestry or tree planting committee to act as an advisory group to counsel with the other State and Federal agencies in the counties in the preparation of a coordinated tree planting plan.

Since there are some 90 forest tree nurseries now being operated by 43 States in cooperation with the United States Forest Service, a local county advisory group familiar with tree planting procedures as to the procurement of seedlings will be essential to help plan and carry out the tree planting activities at the county level.

Mr. Speaker, the planting of forest tree seedlings on designated surplus croplands is a sound idea. It would not solve the problem of huge crop surpluses now on hand, but it will help to prevent the further accumulation of these surpluses.

It is my hope that the Congress will give serious attention to this matter of the careful and calculated use of trees in any program of Federal aid and assistance to farmers in the wise use of their surplus cropland. Land in a national soil bank that is put to work growing trees will be a capital investment that will produce attractive annual interest rates. Well stocked forests return up to 15 percent per year interest on the investment. At the same time the land will be protected from deterioration while growing a crop that never has been in surplus.

I feel that sound and substantial progress is being made in the great field of forestry conservation and improvement in the United States. We are fortunate in having an able and dedicated Forest Service. It is headed by Richard E. McArdle, one of the greatest foresters this Nation has produced. He is joined in this work by an outstanding corps of capable and conscientious experts on forestry. The Nation is fortunate also in the caliber of the State foresters who are spearheading effective work in their respective States. Representative of this group are Joseph Kaylor, of Maryland, and H. C. Coulter, of Florida. Through the efforts of the State and National leaders like these, America can truly rejoice in the efforts which are being made to save her forests. Even so, we are barely holding our own. The great work of education in conservation must be stepped up and forest conservation must be improved if we are to meet the demands of the future. The proposal set forth in my bill is only one step, but I believe it is an important step and I hope it will receive the endorsement of my colleagues.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to my distinguished colleague who has always been outstanding in this important field.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I compliment the gentleman for his outstanding work in behalf of forestry in this country. Would the gentleman's bill furnish free seedlings to those who have already reduced their acreage? Is the gentleman's bill broad enough to cover that?

Mr. SIKES. It is broad enough to cover that phase also.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] has expired.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] is recognized for 90 minutes.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, shortly after coming to Congress, I had the privilege of attending a banquet honoring Captain Carlson, the brave commander of the *Enterprise*, which he rode for 13 days while it floated on its side in a turbulent and stormy sea. That act of loyalty, bravery, and devotion captured the interest of good people everywhere. After many eulogies, Captain Carlson was presented and afforded an opportunity to speak, and the following is almost verbatim what he said:

> I deserve no honor nor praise. I am only a plain seaman who was entrusted with a little piece of America, and my only regret is that I failed to bring it safely home.

Mr. Speaker, it was men like Captain Carlson who gave us this country for our home, and every Member of Congress is peculiarly given the responsibility of guiding the destiny of this Nation for the purpose that it shall always remain our home, strong and undivided. In humble recognition of that trust and accompanying responsibility, it is sometimes hard to determine when to speak and not speak. This much I do know: if my uttered thoughts will add to the confusion of the moment, then I owe it to my God and country the duty to remain silent. On the other hand, when I see this great country of ours torn with strife and confusion, if I can add a single word of counsel, or furnish any information to the end that peace, friendship, and understanding can prevail over our land, even though that counsel is not accepted, and my feeble efforts come to naught, I am constrained to believe that I owe the duty to the present and to posterity to speak out.

Mr. Speaker, I am appalled and sorely grieved over the strife and bitterness aroused over our land at a time when everyone knows, or should know, that we are facing the most critical era in all of human history. Never has it been so important that the true and loyal citizens of this country stand agreed and united. I do not like strife; neither do my people. I do not like the idea of stirring section against section, as apparently some do, and neither do the people whom I represent. There is nothing romantic in fighting or the drawing of blood, and no one knows this better than I or my people. Some have said in the past few days, and there is substance to those sayings, that internal strife in this country has mounted to such alarming proportions that the present is comparable to the days of 1860. God grant that these statements are wrong. The War Between the States constitutes the blackest pages of our history. Fire-eaters and agitators both North and South brought about that tragic era. Good men both North and South worked fervently and prayerfully for a peaceful solution then, but the voice of reason was drowned out by demagogues and the ignorant of that day. During those terrible and trying days preceding that gigantic war—and it was a horrible war, some of the battles still being comparable to the major battles of World Wars I and II, snuffing out the lives of the cream of our young manhood both North and South—a kinsman of mine stood on the floor of Congress, and though the atmosphere was charged with hatred and prejudice, quoted the Biblical statements of Abraham to Lot, saying:

> Let there be no strife, I pray thee, between me and thee. Is not the whole land before us? * * * If we cannot agree, let us divide it.

Those were the words of Alexander H. Stevens, of Georgia. Perhaps the

strongest friendship existing in the Congress at that time was a strange paradox, because that friendship was between Stevens of Georgia and Abraham Lincoln of Illinois. As then, so it is now; the agitators did not do the fighting, and it was the quiet, peaceful boys of the North who died by the thousands in Virginia, Mississippi, Georgia, and other Southern States, and the identical type of beardless boys from the South, many of whom now sleep in unmarked graves in the Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania hills. Mr. Speaker, simply as a matter of history and probably in explanation of my present position, my mother's father spoke out against secession at the secession convention in Georgia. My grandfather said then:

> Let us not grow weary in seeking a peaceful solution. Even the agitators, both northern and southern, are mortal. The grave will claim them, if good people will postpone their grievances to a more convenient time.

He recommended against secession, but said that if that was the act of his State, then he would offer his life to his State, and as captain of the 11th Georgia Regiment under Longstreet, though always small and never strong physically, he participated in all of the battles of northern Virginia, beginning with Manassas, including Gettysburg, and was with General Lee when he surrendered at Appomattox.

Mr. Speaker, I know war, and I know the result of strife. Beginning with the Revolution, young men by my name and by my mother's name have given their lives in battle. In the district I represent is Andersonville Cemetery. Thirteen thousand northern prisoners died and are buried there. Many times have I walked through the cemetery and read the names of those who sleep there. They are American names, they were American boys, just as the southerners were American boys, and I always shuddered over the realization that both sides lost thousands of men that this country could ill afford to spare. Disloyal people agitate, Mr. Speaker, but only the loyal fight and die.

Mr. Speaker, a sad situation exists over my section today. Of a truth, it exists in every section. This condition is not caused by the old-fashioned Yankee, or by the old-fashioned southerner. This confusion and strife lie directly at the door of the arch enemies of the church, and the human race. This condition was started by Lenin, carried on by Stalin, and furthered by the Communist Party International. That I want to burn into the heart of every person who loves this country. I know whereof I speak. I am weighing my words carefully, for who knows but what someday all of our remarks on this floor will be scrutinized carefully by future generations, and that we will be judged by what we have said and done here. We must tell the truth and the truth only, for only truth can stand through eternity.

Mr. Speaker, the House Un-American Activities Committee has repeatedly furnished to us and to the public unassailable and unimpeachable evidence that the Communists began years ago to stir up racial strife in America. Sad to relate, but completely true. This conspiracy could have been wiped out years ago, but the United States Supreme Court, by the reversal of a conviction in Georgia rendered it impossible to destroy that conspiracy. In the 175th Georgia Supreme Court report, pages 832–869, will be found the case of Herndon against the State. Herndon was indicted in Fulton County, Ga., for the offense of attempting to incite insurrection, and the Fulton County jury did its duty and convicted Herndon, and the court did its duty and sentenced Herndon to the penitentiary for not less than 5 and not more than 20 years. In that report, the evidence in that case is found. It was proven that Herndon joined the Communist Party in Kentucky and was sent to Atlanta as an organizer for that party; that he held meetings in vacant houses and in private homes; that the Communist Party was declaring that this country must be overthrown by force and violence, and that he was teaching this doctrine at those meetings; also, that they must accept the Communist Party decisions, irrespective of their own opinions; that the Communists were planning for the Negro of the South a territory known as the Black Belt, containing portions of Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, and Georgia, and thence up the coast through several States, and that in this territory the Negroes would be given the complete rights of self-determination, including the right to set up their own government in this territory, and the right to separate from the United States; that all of the lands in that territory would be taken from the whites and given to the Negroes. It appeared quite plainly that this territory was to be acquired only through successful revolutionary struggle, and by force and violence.

Mr. Speaker, in volume 301, United States Code Reports, pages 242–264, will be found the majority opinion of the United States Supreme Court reversing the conviction of Herndon in Georgia. Some of the so-called tired old men who sat upon that Court dissented, thinking that Herndon's conviction should stand. Those men were not tired, but disgusted over the failure of our highest court to sustain the principles on which this country must exist. God bless those so-called tired old men.

Mr. Speaker, had the United States Supreme Court called a halt then, communism could have been snuffed out as easily as passing your hand over a candle to extinguish its flame. The House Un-American Activities Committee has repeatedly told us how Communist organizations would bring Negroes from the South up to large cities in the North, indoctrinate them with communism, and send them back South to sow the seeds of discontent. I personally know this to be true. Before coming to Congress, as prosecuting attorney I tried the cases known as the Ingram cases. A Negress and her 3 sons ambushed and methodically killed a white man 65 years of age and weighing 125 pounds. This man was murdered with a rifle, claw hammer, hoe, and rake by all 4 of the Ingrams as he lay helpless upon the ground. These persons were tried and convicted, having every constitutional right accorded them. The sentences were for life imprisonment. The next afternoon, while sitting in my room at home, I was startled to hear a radio broadcast emanating from California wherein it was charged that this Negress and her sons had been railroaded to prison. Within 24 hours my judge was literally deluged with telegrams from all sections of this country, all using practically identical language and expressions of hatred, some of which contained the names of Communists, with their Communist lodge numbers, as they had not gone underground at that time. This identical language told me, and should tell everyone, that they were simply the result of instructions from headquarters. Millions of dollars were raised over this country ostensibly for the defense of the Ingrams, and this I can prove.

The House Un-American Activities Committee has previously taken notice of the fact that millions of dollars have been raised for the Communists by these campaigns. The NAACP entered into the Ingram case. The Civil Rights Congress distributed leaflets all over Chicago denouncing the South. When the motion for new trial was heard in Americus, approximately 250 persons from other sections of the country descended upon that little town. They did everything they could to incite a riot. They invaded the jail and the private home of the sheriff. I was there and well understood what they wanted to accomplish. They wanted one southerner to strike them so they could wire Congress that civil-rights legislation must be enacted against the barbarians of the South. I restrained the southerners, but no one could restrain those shock troops. They were not looking for the truth and they did not want the truth. They did not want the truth then, and they do not want the truth now. They did not think nearly as much of the Ingrams as you do, and they simply used that incident to promote their cause. I have the complete file of that case, Mr. Speaker, including the telegrams, and I will be delighted to show them to any congressional committee. As a sample of what some of the Negro newspapers did, I have a newspaper published by one of the largest, wherein it tells of them sending a reporter to Georgia to see the Ingrams, and that he was tied to a lamppost in Atlanta, severely beaten, and was told that was the way we treated Yankees. The paper goes on to say that this brave, loyal, and truthful reporter did finally get to Americus, went to the old wooden jail, and talked with the Ingrams. The truth is that the reporter never got any further than Atlanta, inasmuch as he became enamored over a colored female in Atlanta, spent his money in debauchery, and wrote that terrible lie. Instead of the jail being a wooden jail, it is and was completely of brick construction and built about the year 1900. Then you might want to see an edition from another large Negro newspaper, wherein it published the photograph of the Negress defendant holding up a sweater which had been torn to shreds, and above that photograph in

boxcar headlines, was this statement: "He Tried To Go With Me." So, that paper spread to the four corners of this country the lie that she and her children killed the white man in defense of her honor.

Mr. Speaker, prior to the visit of that reporter, I had personally held that sweater in my hand many times. I tell you. and all the officers working on this homicide will tell you that the sweater was not torn until the visit of that reporter. I also tell you that I had repeatedly discussed this homicide with that defendant and she had repeatedly told me that the white man had never made any improper advances or suggestions to her, but contended to the officers and to me that the killing was done to prevent the white man from shooting her with a rifle. The evidence of course showed that no self-defense was involved, and that the white man was ambushed and chased 200 yards before he was caught from behind and methodically beaten to death.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the South has, for all practical purposes, been invaded. The case that I have related my personal experience with has been repeated time and time again in my section. The United States Court has destroyed our white primary. To destroy that primary, you would have to decide that a straw vote held by southern white people was illegal. Now, under the United States Supreme Court edict, despite the fact that before that decision virtually every Negro in Georgia claimed to be a Republican, they are now voting as Democrats in our primary, and then voting en bloc in the general election, without any regard whatsoever for their obligation to support the candidate nominated in the primary. So, they are getting 2 votes to 1 vote for the white man. I could tell you for days and days wrongs that have been inflicted upon the white people of the South, but I shall only attempt to tell enough now that would cause an honest person to see the situation in its true light. I well know that there are groups in America which positively do not intend to believe. The Communist conspiracy was that the fight against us would be first waged on the grounds of equality, but denying that intermarriage and integration was sought or desired. That lasted only for a season. They are now demanding in unmistakable terms social equality and intermarriage. In fact, they are now contending that their race is the greatest in all history, and that they are only displaced Africans. I have never read in history where all of the native Africans were displaced, but I suppose the Communists could prove that as easily as they do that the Wright brothers did not build the first airplane.

In the South, the Negroes incited by outsiders first started the boycott and the bringing of economic pressure. I had hoped that they would not. I hope now that they will quit. They cannot win an economic boycott, and I will tell you why. No matter how low you reduce a white man in poverty, the white man will rise again from his own efforts. There is very little in history that would justify the Negro in feeling that he would do so by his own efforts. The economic pressure groups formed in the South by white people were simply in answer to the economic pressure put into practice by the Negro. Since the economic pressure and boycott theory they inaugurated did not turn out so well for the Negro, the NAACP and the Antidefamation League of the B'nai B'rith would pass a Federal law making it a felony for white people to join any such organizations, and they ask this legislation knowing full well that they are the ones who set these practices into motion.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt that any State in the Union has finer school buildings for the Negroes than does my State of Georgia. They were built for the Negroes by the white man's tax dollars, in the full faith that the United States Supreme Court would hold that separate but equal school facilities would satisfy all constitutional concepts. Now, this so-called superior race does not wish to be left to themselves. Strange, isn't it. Only the inferior could possibly insist upon mixing with a group when they know they are not wanted.

Now, a great hue and cry is heard over the land about the trouble at the University of Alabama and the troubles in Mississippi. Just why some people in other sections want to regulate our conduct from our cradle to our graves, I will never know. Never have we tried to regulate other sections of this country except our own. It is not because we do not know of many more grievous circumstances that have occurred in other sections than have occurred in our section. We know that in New York City gangs of Negroes are running wild on the streets, shooting, stabbing, robbing, and raping. We have heard of the wolf gangs in Harlem. We know about the terrible race riots in Detroit. We know about the race riot in Cicero. Some of us have even read the book by Camille DeRose, in which she tells how this race riot was planned by the NAACP, and how she was betrayed by her disloyal colored friends. We know the charges that were made in her book about corrupt courts, and the unfaithful officers in those courts. We also know that the only way we could properly judge what the facts were in any of these instances we would have had to have been on the ground and witnessed them first hand. Consequently, we do not indict and convict those cities. We leave those matters strictly to them, to be determined in the manners that their consciences dictate. All that we ask, and I think it is a reasonable request, is that they quit indicting and convicting us when they should know that they are incapable of knowing the facts.

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago my State was gratuitously insulted by the United States Department of Justice. That Department ordered the FBI to investigate the jury system of Cobb County. That investigation cannot be justified, for if the jury system had been illegally set up, every defendant would have had the right to challenge that jury system before going to trial in any case. Everyone knows that upon any kind of showing of any irregularity in a jury panel in Georgia, that the United States Supreme Court will set aside the verdict of that jury.

Mr. Speaker, there is another problem that I wish to discuss, which I think is or should be of much concern to our country. That problem is that in our military, some of our southern boys are being mistreated because they are imbued with our southern traditions, and even their right of expression of their views is being denied them. Has the time come in this country that a man cannot express his opinion while serving his country? If so, when did that time come about? Mr. Speaker, for some reason, maybe economic, the exact reason I do not know, our southern people have liked the military. The South and the West furnished this country practically all of the admirals and generals that led our armies to victory in World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to remind the public that Gen. Courtney Hodges, the commander of the First Army, and the first army that penetrated into Germany, was from the little town of Perry, Houston County, Ga., and in the district that I have the honor to represent. Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that General Hodges believed in our southern traditions, but he was a wonderful fighting man, wasn't he? Mr. Speaker, Captain Dixon, that intrepid young flyer that thrilled the world in the early days of World War II by his simple announcement to his commander, "Scratch off another flattop," was born and reared in the little city of Richland, Stewart County, Ga. The world was glad to hear that news, Mr. Speaker, because up to that time our forces in the Pacific were faring badly indeed. His father and his family still live in Richland, and I apprehend, Mr. Speaker, that every one of them is completely southern, but unalterably a loyal citizen of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the district that I have the honor to represent will always remember with pride that young Luther Story, Americus, Ga., weight 125 pounds, was probably the greatest hero in that so-called police action in bleak and mountainous Korea. Luther Story has not been aggrandized, but his record and the citation accompanying the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously awarded to his mother tells eloquently what he did. He was Private Story, Company A, 9th Infantry Regiment, a weapons squad leader. The citation says that Story observed a large group of the enemy crossing the river to attack Company A, and that he seized a machine gun from his wounded gunner and killed an estimated 100 enemy soldiers. And, facing certain encirclement, the company commander ordered a withdrawal, but Private Story noticed the approach of a truck loaded with enemy troops and towing an ammunition trailer. Alerting his comrades to take cover, he fearlessly stood in the middle of the road throwing grenades into the truck; out of grenades, he crawled to his squad, gathered up additional grenades, and again attacked the vehicle. Private Story was wounded in this action, but disregarded his wounds and rallied the men about

him and repelled the attack. Realizing that his wounds would hamper his comrades, he refused to retire to the next position, but remained to cover the company's withdrawal. When last seen by his withdrawing comrades, he was firing every available weapon and fighting off another hostile assault. Mr. Speaker, Private Story, his mother and father, sisters and brothers, and all of his people were and are complete adherents to our southern sentiments. We have many others in our district that are made from the same kind of mold, who will fight for our Republican form of government, and I do not believe there is anyone here so naive that he would not welcome this assistance. I know, however, that there are some in our country who would deny such people any right of voice whatever in this Government.

Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to read and hear people arguing that my people have rebelled against our Government, because my people say that the United States Supreme Court decision concerning segregated schools was wrong. Those people do not know history, or else they feel that my people occupy a colonial status and should not be permitted to express their opinion. I think it well at this time to give our critics the benefit of some history. I want to tell those critics that one of the motivating causes of that unfortunate War Between the States was that the North and East refused to accept a United States Supreme Court decision.

I am referring to the Dred Scott decision. Beveridge, in his book Abraham Lincoln, IV, page 158, has this statement:

> Not until Republican leaders in the Senate next year, as a matter of party strategy, concentrated their attacks on the complicity of the Supreme Court in a crafty scheme to spread slavery over the whole country, did Lincoln take up that indictment.

On pages 157, 158, same volume, we read:

> The Dred Scott decision, cried Trumbull, was an "odious and infamous opinion of a slave driving court which must be wholly and totally revolutionized."

Consequently it appears, Mr. Speaker, that an entire political party in the year 1857 not only criticized a Supreme Court decision, but demanded that the decision be revolutionized. That helped bring about a war, but I doubt that any southerner disputed their right to oppose the decision, although they did not agree on the dispute.

President Abraham Lincoln vigorously denounced the Dred Scott decision, and I think, whether he was right or wrong, he had the right as an American citizen to do it, it being an American privilege. In Springfield, Ill., June 26, 1857, Mr. Lincoln said:

> We think the Dred Scott decision is erroneous. We know the Court that made it has often overruled its own decisions, and we shall do what we can to have it to overrule this.

Also:

> Judicial decisions are of greater or less authority as precedents according to circumstances. That this should be so accords both with commonsense and the customary understanding of the legal profession. If this important decision had been made by the unanimous concurrence of the judges, and without any apparent partisan bias, and in accordance with legal public expectation, and with the steady practice of the departments throughout our history, and had been in no part based on assumed historical facts which are not really true; or, if wanting in some of these, it had been before the court more than once, and had been affirmed and reaffirmed through a course of years, it then might be, perhaps would be, factious, nay, even revolutionary not to acquiesce in it as a precedent. But when, as is true, we find it wanting in all of these claims to the public confidence, it is not resistance, it is not factious, it is not even disrespectful, to treat it as not having yet quite established a settled doctrine for the country. But Judge Douglas considers this view awful.

In that speech, Mr. Lincoln referred to the fact that this same Supreme Court once decided a national bank would be constitutional, but General Jackson, as President, disregarded the decision and vetoed a bill for a recharter, partly on constitutional grounds, using this as an argument to buttress his contention that objections did not constitute rebellion. Also, in that same address, Mr. Lincoln said:

> That all there ever was in the way of precedent up to the Dred Scott decision, on the points therein decided, had been against that decision.

And again in the same speech, Mr. Lincoln said:

> Again and again have I heard Judge Douglas denounce that bank decision and applaud General Jackson for disregarding it. It would be interesting for him to look over his recent speech, and see how exactly his fierce philippics against us for resisting Supreme Court decisions fall upon his own head.

Also:

> I have said, in substance, that the Dred Scott decision was in part based on assuming historical facts which were not really true, and I ought not to leave the subject without giving some reasons for saying this: I therefore give an instance or two, which I think fully sustain me.

Then, Mr. Lincoln proceeded to point out statements made by Justice Taney which he said were not historically true, and cited statements by Judge Curtis, who said that Justice Taney had erred in the recitation of historical facts.

Mr. Speaker, all of these quotations from Mr. Lincoln have been taken from Lincoln Works I, Nicolay and Hay, pages 226 to 230, which I obtained from the Library of Congress. So we say, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Lincoln did exactly what my people are doing. My people have not rebelled against this Government because of the school case decision, although they have criticized that decision. Criticism of that decision has not been restricted to the South, but actually is common amongst the legal fraternity in every section of the United States. Everything Mr. Lincoln said about the Dred Scott decision applies equally to the school decision, except in one particular; maybe the Supreme Court was conscious of Mr. Lincoln's criticism that the Dred Scott decision was not unanimous. I say, and I believe Mr. Lincoln would have said, that the school case decision was contrary to all precedents, and that a unanimous decision was indicative of political or partisan bias, as he used that language in the Dred Scott case. Certainly Mr. Lincoln would have said that the school decision was based upon a false assumption of historical facts. I feel certain also, that Mr. Lincoln would have said that the school case decision was based on sociology instead of law, and would have repudiated that decision on that ground also.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes it appears that some people in this country willfully distort the views and the acts of Mr. Lincoln. Every historian knows that the Emancipation Proclamation was not conceived or designed for the freeing of all slaves. Every historian knows that Mr. Lincoln termed it a war measure, and contended that he had the power as Commander in Chief to do everything that he deemed expedient to defeat the enemy. Mr. Lincoln explained that the freeing of the slaves in States of rebellion would weaken the abilities of those States to wage war. Mr. Lincoln excepted States and portions of States which had slaves but which were not a part of the Confederate States of America, and had not taken part in the War Between the States. It is common knowledge that Robert E. Lee, who voluntarily freed all of his slaves, fought against generals on the battlefield who had their slaves with them during those conflicts.

While citing statements from Mr. Lincoln, it might be well for the people to be reminded again what Mr. Lincoln said concerning the Negro race. In that same Springfield, Ill., speech, he said:

> There is a natural disgust in the minds of nearly all white people to the idea of indiscriminate amalgamation of the white and black races; and Judge Douglas evidently is basing his chief hope upon the chances of his being able to appropriate the benefit of this disgust to himself. If he can, by much drumming and repeating, fasten the odium of that idea upon his adversaries, he thinks he can struggle through the storm. He therefore clings to this hope as a drowning man to the last plank. He makes an occasion for lugging it in from the opposition to the Dred Scott decision.

The last two quotations, Mr. Speaker, are taken from pages 230–231 of the volume heretofore referred to. Page 234 of that same volume quotes Mr. Lincoln as follows:

> But Judge Douglas is especially horrified at the thought of the mixing of blood by the white and black races. Agreed for once—a thousand times agreed. There are white men enough to marry all the white women, and black men enough to marry all the black women; and so let them be married.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lincoln was a segregationist no matter what any wild-eyed leftwinger says. I ask that volume IV, "Abraham Lincoln," by Albert J. Beveridge, be read. Page 155 of that volume quotes Mr. Lincoln in his Springfield, Ill., address, saying:

> The only "perfect preventive of amalgamation," Lincoln insisted, was the separation of the races; but since that could not be done at once, "the next best thing is to keep them apart where they are not already together." For instance, if whites and blacks "never get together in Kansas, then they will never mix blood in Kansas."

And the same page says:

Colonization of Negroes in Africa was the only way to bring it about, declared Lincoln; and he bemoaned the fact that no political party was doing anything for colonization. It was a hard job; "but where there is a will there is a way, and what colonization needs most is a hearty will." When the people should come to see that it was morally right and also to their interest or, at least, not against it, "to transfer the African to his native clime, we shall find a way to do it, however great the task may be."

Mr. Speaker, any student of history knows that Mr. Lincoln was not considering the abolition of slavery in the slaveholding States, but was objecting to the extension of slavery in the new States, such as Kansas, Nebraska, but those who do not know can find for themselves on page 216 of the last-quoted volume that Mr. Lincoln's purpose was not to extend. According to the last-quoted volume, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lincoln spoke at Charleston, and on page 312 he is quoted, saying:

"While I was at the hotel today," began Lincoln, "an elderly gentleman called upon me to know whether I was really in favor of producing a perfect equality between the Negroes and white people. [Great laughter.] * * * I will say, then, that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races [applause]; that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people. * * * And, inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together, there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I, as much as any other man, am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race."

A few days ago, Mr. Speaker, the 147th birthday of Mr. Lincoln was observed by much speechmaking, some temperate, but many being highly inflammatory and completely inconsistent with anything Mr. Lincoln ever said or stood for. The executive secretary of the NAACP stood at Springfield, Ill., on that day and urged that our schools be immediately desegregated under the principles of Mr. Lincoln. I do not think that Mr. Lincoln ever did or said anything that could sustain any such position.

Mr. Speaker, some of the Southern States, including the State that I was born in, still live in, and will be a resident of so long as I live, have seen fit to exercise their undoubted right to dispute the correctness of the United States Supreme Court decision concerning public schools. None of those States have rebelled or suggested rebellion. They think that they have a right to dispute that decision, and I think so, too. To dispute that decision, or even abolish public schools and substitute private schools, could not constitute rebellion in any sense of the word. Nevertheless, we have read in the papers, heard over television and radio, and even on this floor, that because we have disputed the correctness of that decision that we should not be allowed to receive one cent of any school-construction money that might be provided under the pending legislation for school-construction purposes. On February 6, 1956, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] posed this question:

Are these defiant States entitled to school lunch money for segregated schools? Are they entitled to money under Public Laws 815 and 874 for construction and operation of schools in federally impacted areas?

Since that time, another Member of this House has suggested that the farmers in the States disputing that Supreme Court decision are not entitled to receive support prices for their farm products.

Mr. Speaker, we know only too well that there are some who would be completely willing to compel the southern taxpayers to pay into that school construction fund and deny them 1 cent of their own money. We also know that there are some who would deny our States any money whatever for schools in federally impacted areas, although they know that the impact is due solely to our defense installations in our section of the country. Many of the children that they would deny this education would not be southern or of southern extraction. They are the children of the workers from the four corners of this Nation, engaged in building airplanes, ships, atomic energy projects, and the like. There are too many who would starve the people of our section by denying the benefit of the support prices on farm products, simply because our people do not believe that the Supreme Court should go unchallenged when it assumes a dictatorial role.

Mr. Speaker, in the past few days my people have read with much apprehension statements from Mr. Nixon, Mr. Harriman, Mr. Kefauver, and others. In California, Mr. Adlai Stevenson told a Los Angeles Negro audience that he would not cut off Federal funds from segregated schools nor use Federal troops to enforce segregation. Mr. Stevenson was asked the blunt question as to whether he would use the Army and Navy to enforce the Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation in public schools. Mr. Stevenson wisely said:

That is exactly what brought on the Civil War. It can't be done by troops or bayonets.

Mr. Stevenson said that he would not deny Federal aid to Southern States that refused to integrate their schools, adding:

You should not cut off your nose to spite your face.

Mr. Stevenson explained that he was for integration, but that he would not have anything to do with dividing this country at the most serious time this country has ever faced. Make no mistake about it, these agitators wanted bloodshed, for the newspaper article concerning these questions and answers also said when Mr. Stevenson gave those answers:

There was a murmur of protest in the crowd, and one tall Negro standing next to this correspondent said flatly: "I think he is a phony."

And also that Mr. Stevenson's stand was not one that pleased many in his audience of 200 at the Watkins hotel. Thank God that there is one man soliciting the nomination for President who is not willing to throw this country into confusion, strife, and bloodshed. Can that man's position fail to appeal to our noblest and Christian instincts? Has the lust for power and high office developed to such an extent that a man would array section against section and brother against brother? Can it be that aspirants for the high office of President would cause confusion when we are told that Russia has developed missiles that penetrate 1,500 miles? Can any man who has the interests of this country at heart sow seeds of disruption when it is so vitally necessary now that we remain united? Can any northerner or southerner approve the demagogic statement of Governor Harriman to the effect that he would cut off all Federal funds to all States which refused to desegregate schools and proposed immediate Federal enforcement of the Supreme Court's desegregation ruling?

Mr. Speaker, can anyone approve the various statements attributed to Mr. KEFAUVER, particularly when the statements attributed to him in secret meetings are completely contrary to his public utterances?

Mr. Speaker, can any sound mind believe that it would be conducive to peace for the Federal Government to tax the Southern States for school construction, assistance to schools in federally impacted areas, school lunch money, and the benefits of the farm program? Do they believe that this issue is one of dollars and cents? It would be a tragedy indeed for such punitive action to be taken. I hope that it will not be taken. Do not agitators know that they are kindling hatred, do not they remember the story of Aesop? Dr. Holley, perhaps the greatest Negro educator in the United States, does remember that story, and he commends it to the consideration of Mr. Harriman, Mr. KEFAUVER, and their like. Here is what Dr. Holley said:

Aesop understood how men's minds work. He has a story about the North Wind, the South Wind, and the man with a cloak. The swift harshness of the one merely drove the man to gather his garment closer about him, while the gentleness and warmth of the other gradually prevailed upon him to take the garment off. This is the same truth that the modern minstrel offers: You can push me, but don't shove me.

There are too many people shoving us, and they are wittingly or unwittingly making the job of preserving the peace harder for temperate people everywhere.

A few days ago, Mr. Speaker, a Negro schoolteacher in Fort Gaines, Ga., made a speech to a Negro audience, and told them that they had mighty good schools built with white people's money, and that it was in their best interests to forget integration "and remember that they had not learned how to pool their resources and build even a recreation hall for their children"; that everything they had came from the white people and without assistance from the Negro race. He also told them that "we still want that which we either do not deserve or that which we are not ready for. I have noted from time to time that every time something happens to Negroes, it is stated that it is because of his color. I say 99 or more percent of what happens

to Negroes as well as others is because of what he has done to warrant it." A few days later, that Negro schoolteacher advised the school authorities at Fort Gaines that threats made upon him, his wife, and family, by Negroes in that community had forced his resignation; that he was hastily leaving town, knowing that his life was not safe.

Mr. Speaker, outsiders have fanned the flames of hatred in our section to such an extent that that Negro schoolteacher was absolutely correct, for the chances were good that those Negroes would have killed him, and that cool heads might not have been able to control the situation.

Mr. Speaker, there has been much said about the unfortunate trouble at the University of Alabama. The NAACP has not left a stone unturned to agitate in that instance. A few days ago the Washington newspapers carried a story to the effect that two Negro soldiers waylaid a white student on that university campus, and although they did not know the student, they assaulted him, saying only that their savagery was because of the treatment accorded the Negress student. I had hoped that the NAACP would change its tactics, and would come to the defense of a white person for a change, but it did not, and they do not intend to do so. The truth is, the NAACP does not accord a white man any civil rights.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post, February 20, 1956, issue, page 3, carried an article entitled "Civil Rights Parley Aims To Bar Leftists." That article says that there is to be a 3-day meeting here in Washington beginning on March 4, and that the organizer of that meeting has warned that leftwing groups are attempting to infiltrate it, and that he has pledged every effort to keep Communists from influencing the gathering. The executive secretary of the NAACP is described in that article as writing a letter to the NAACP branches warning against leftwing infiltration among delegates to that meeting.

Mr. Speaker, does not this warning excite our interest? Can it be that Communists may attend that meeting? Evidently so. Now I ask that organizer, were you not warned way back in 1948, and was not the NAACP warned back in 1948 by George S. Schuyler in his article appearing in the Pittsburgh Courier, and did he not tell you then to quit playing footsie with the Communists? Is it news to these leaders that the Pittsburgh Courier, July 31, 1948, page 19, carried an article by Marjorie McKenzie, wherein it was stated that the indicting of 12 Communist leaders on charges of conspiracy to overthrow the United States Government by force was a direct attack on civil rights? Did that reflect the opinion of these organizations then, and does it now?

I well understand, Mr. Speaker, that some ministers are contending that to dispute the recent Supreme Court decision in the school case is a sin against God. I note that in Mr. Lincoln's speech he was regretting the fact that several ministers in his section were saying that slavery was ordained by God. We find ministers on both sides of this issue now. Some say that God has told them that to dispute that decision is wrong. I wonder why God did not tell George W. Truett, Spurgeon, and even Paul the Apostle that. It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that God would tell everybody of good will that, including me, for if I know my heart, I would accept anything that he told me. As a matter of fact, all of the lawbooks that I have ever read on the Bible tell me that God Almighty never approved the brotherhood of man, and that the only brotherhood was that established through the brotherhood of Christ, and the indispensable ingredient of that brotherhood was that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, and that he died as our substitute. If anyone cares to show me where the Bible endorses any other brotherhood, I will welcome that information.

Mr. Speaker, the Communists are still holding out to the Negroes the establishment of the black belt, to be composed of Southern States. See hearings before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, July 14, 1949, 81st Congress, 1st session, and particularly see hearings before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, 80th Congress, 1st session, July 21, 1947, and see the picture of the proposed black belt on page 90 thereof. In view of that history, I think every Congressman should read the recent book by Theodore Browne, entitled "The Band Will Not Play Dixie." That book was published about 6 months ago and is now in the Library of Congress. That book tells about a Negro reporter who was interested in one Solomon Morehouse, who was interested in establishing the black belt in the South. According to the book, that reporter, when he was not being intimate with every female he met, was seeking Solomon Morehouse, and according to the book, this reporter discovered that a Georgia Senator had kidnaped Morehouse, carried him to Georgia, turned him over to the Ku Klux Klan, and wrecked Morehouse mentally, on the direction of the Georgia Senator, Mr. Salter; that Morehouse escaped Senator Salter and the Ku Klux Klan, and that this reporter, after risking his life to help Morehouse, went to Atlanta, and while there, Atlanta was burned to the ground and the black belt established. Of course everyone knows that there was never a Georgia Senator by the name of Salter, and all of those sayings concerning Georgia were tissues of lies. But how well that fits in with the situation today. Have they abandoned the idea of the black belt? Are the agitators willing to listen to reason? I doubt it, unless we can have the help of the Members of this great body in trying to preserve peace and unity. There is a fact that we southerners realize, and all police departments recognize, and all people had better recognize in this country. That is that there is scarcely a Negro dwelling anywhere that does not contain an assortment of deadly weapons, consisting of shotguns, rifles, pistols, knives, razors, ice picks, and so forth. On the other hand, there are few white homes over this land containing those deadly weapons. It would surprise the white people of Washington, New York, Chicago, Detroit, and other large metropolitan cities if they knew that virtually every Negro home is practically an arsenal. I think that their police could tell them this was so.

Mr. Speaker, all of these things I have said have been simply for the reason that I want other sections to know our side. My section needs the help of good people now, and I solicit the help of the Congress of the United States in their behalf. I think we deserve that help. We deserve your sympathy. I hope we are going to have your sympathy and your assistance. We do not wish to see the white gentile race disappear, and we do not intend for it to disappear. If you will sympathize with us now to the end that we shall have peace, I promise you that we will return that friendship, and if the struggle comes between godless communism and our form of government, that every southerner will take his position in the ranks and give an account of his citizenship and loyalty that will be an inspiration to coming generations.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. If the gentleman will just wait a few minutes until I have concluded my remarks.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I trust that in the spelling in your manuscript your pronunciation of the word "Negro" is not followed, that is, that the word in the printed record of these proceedings will not be spelled as the gentleman pronounces it.

Mr. FORRESTER. I will be happy to pronounce it for the gentleman, and I will be glad to accept anything he says in that respect.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Then, sir——

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield any further.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] would like for the gentleman from Georgia to put it in capital letters and pronounce it "K-n-e-e-g-r-o-w."

Mr. FORRESTER. Now, I will take up where I left off. I am quoting Mr. Lincoln now.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TUMULTY. Do I construe the gentleman's remarks at this point as a commentary on what Archbishop Rummel, of New Orleans, said? He has stated publicly that segregation is a sin. Does the gentleman imply he is a member of the Communist Party; that he is carrying on Communist propaganda?

Mr. FORRESTER. Let me say to the gentleman now he was not listening.

Mr. TUMULTY. I was listening.

Mr. FORRESTER. Oh, no; you were not. I will say to the gentleman and I will say it to the churches: "No; I never said any such thing."

Mr. TUMULTY. Will the gentleman tell me what his opinion is with regard to what the archbishop said?

Mr. FORRESTER. I do not even know that the archbishop said anything.

Mr. TUMULTY. He has said that segregation is a sin. That was announced publicly. I wonder if the gentleman has any opinion about that.

Mr. FORRESTER. I say that is one man's opinion. I do not yield to the gentleman further.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Did not the newspaper article also say that the archbishop's own flock down in Louisiana was not accepting his statement; that they were proceeding to do as they have been doing about advocating segregation in the schools?

Mr. FORRESTER. Unfortunately, I did not know about that incident. I had not read that incident. But I am sure that whoever said it is going to have a division in his congregation. I am certain about that.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I read it and the article stated that his congregation is not accepting his dictum in that respect. I insert herewith a news item from the Atlanta Journal of February 20, 1956, captioned "Catholic Solons Ignore Prelate on Race Plea":

CATHOLIC SOLONS IGNORE PRELATE ON RACE PLEA

NEW ORLEANS, February 20.—A group of Catholic lawmakers Monday proceeded with plans to prevent integration of Louisiana Catholic schools, despite a pastoral letter from Archbishop Joseph Rummel condemning segregation as morally wrong and sinful.

The 6-page letter was read at all masses Sunday in the 120 churches throughout the archdiocese of New Orleans and clearly indicated the archbishop intends to end segregation in church and school facilities as soon as a special committee completes its study of the problem.

The archbishop gave no hint when that would be, but church spokesmen previously have used the target date of sometime after September 1956.

Representative E. W. Gravolet, Jr., of Plaquemines Parish said the pastoral letter would have no effect on his group's plans to restore parochial schools to Louisiana's 1954 school segregation laws when the legislature meets in May.

The State's segregation laws were declared unconstitutional last Wednesday by a 3-judge Federal appeals court, which ordered New Orleans public schools to begin carrying out the 1954 United States Supreme Court decision banning school segregation.

"We're going to appeal that decision," said Gravolet in behalf of other Catholic lawmakers supporting his proposed bill to head off parochial school integration. "If the appeal fails then we'll come up with some new segregation laws. Catholic schools definitely will be included.

"It's a matter of justice. Catholic schools should be treated the same as public schools. Why discriminate against Catholic parents and children?"

Parochial schools were removed from the State's segregation plans at the insistence of Archbishop Rummel.

The archdiocese is the largest in the Deep South with a Catholic population of more than a half million. More than half of the South's Catholics and about one-fifth of the Nation's Negro Catholics live in Louisiana.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. I have heard the story that when these people came to Lincoln, some of the ministers from Chicago came and told him that God had sent them to tell him that he ought to free all of the slaves. Mr. Lincoln said:

Now, that is rather strange.

He said:

God has never said anything like that to me and it seems very strange that he would send that message to me through the wicked city of Chicago.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I have listened with attention to the very able statement that the gentleman from Georgia has made. Since he honored me by mentioning a discussion in which I participated on the floor the other day, I would like to go a little further into the matter that I was discussing at that time. The gentleman, I know, has read my speech, because he put the questions I posed, whether or not, as a matter of law, under the decision of the Supreme Court and without any further legislation such as the amendment to be proposed by the gentleman from New York, [Mr. POWELL], these funds should not be withheld. Now, I was intrigued by the statements made about Mr. Lincoln, especially those where Lincoln criticized the Dred Scott decision and suggested that perhaps he had a right, oftentimes a duty, as a lawyer and as a citizen to oppose a Supreme Court decision in which he did not believe but that after one, two, three, or several decisions then it would be somewhat revolutionary to suggest that they should not be followed.

Mr. FORRESTER. I do not have too much time to yield, but I thank the gentleman for catching what I said.

Mr. METCALF. May I continue for a moment?

Mr. FORRESTER. My time is very limited.

Mr. METCALF. I understand it is, but the gentleman was kind enough to mention my discussion, and I would like to put it in the right order and the right perspective. I want to say to the gentleman from Georgia that I agree wholeheartedly with the statements that were made by Mr. Stevenson that this is a matter that should not be handled by force, and I hope that the administration will clarify, by probing the Supreme Court's decision, some of the matters surrounding it before we even use executive or administrative orders. And, I hope this Congress will leave it to the administration and to the courts to work the question out before Congress tries to adopt any such legislation as the Powell amendment whether on the school bill, on the agricultural bill, Public Law 815 or any of these other acts before the Congress.

Mr. FORRESTER. I thank the gentleman for that statement, and I am glad the gentleman was listening. And, I am glad the gentleman said he posed the question; that the gentleman was not saying it was his opinion but simply posed it as a legal question.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for bringing up this matter that is fraught with so much difficulty, and is a matter that I know the gentleman realizes is not at all pleasant. But as a great American, as a great Congressman from a great State, he has sensed it to be his duty to inform this Nation of this great problem that we have, especially now, in our beloved Southland.

Mr. Speaker, to those who are not familiar with the problems of the Southland may I say it is very difficult to explain—and I believe the gentleman would agree with me—when I say that there is an indignation over this attempt to solve these great problems on the basis of a Supreme Court decision.

Those of us who believe in the Jeffersonian principle of States rights feel innately that this great problem of the administration of our schools should rest with our States and I think those of us from the South are doing this Nation a disfavor if we do not point out a fact, however unpleasant it may be, which is that our people are not in sympathy with this Supreme Court decision. We feel that the administration of our schools is a matter that should rest with our States.

Specifically I want to congratulate the gentleman for introducing legislation that would keep the Federal courts from the administration of our schools. The gentleman will recall that I have introduced similar legislation. I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Georgia if he knows whether or not we will have an opportunity of an early hearing on his bill which I think is a very good bill.

Mr. FORRESTER. That I am not prepared to answer now, but I do want to take this time to thank the gentleman for introducing a companion bill and for the splendid assistance he has rendered me in the preparation of my bill, and getting it into the House.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia.

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say to my distinguished colleague from Georgia that I deeply appreciate the erudite speech he has made here today. My only regret is that every Member of this House is not present.

The gentleman has gone into this subject with such complete understanding and such a great show of intelligence that I feel there is nothing more that any of us could add to complete the statement he has made. But with respect to his appeal, at the conclusion of his speech, to all the Nation for sympathetic understanding of the situation in the South, may I say that sympathetic understanding of the situation means

sympathetic understanding of ourselves no matter what part of this Nation we come from. The day has long passed when we can afford to substitute irresponsibility for clear facts. We cannot be politically irresponsible any more.

Yesterday I had the great pleasure of spending the day in Georgia. I appeared at the 100th anniversary celebration of the county of Berrien. I spoke there to thousands of people for some 45 minutes. I dwelt on the great love of the South not just for the South but for this Union, this country of ours. I warned the colored citizens of our State that they must not listen to the voices of false idols that are tempting them to destroy completely the terrific advance they have made in their own welfare, in their relations with one another, and in their relations with us, their white friends, in the past number of years.

At the conclusion of that speech there were hundreds of people who came up to me with tears streaming down their cheeks and said, "We are with you. Take the message back to the other Representatives in Congress to tell the other people in this Nation for heaven's sake not to sacrifice principle, the principles of this great Government, for political expediency in any section of this Nation. Let us all stand together united, as we have tried to do so valiantly since the unfortunate War Between the States."

I thank the gentleman for his wonderful speech and for the opportunity he has given me to comment upon it.

Mr. FORRESTER. I thank the gentlewoman from Georgia, and I want her to know that I receive much confidence and satisfaction out of her statement that she endorses the remarks I have made, because in my heart what I want to do is reflect the sentiments of my people and the people all over the United States of America.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I am delighted to yield to my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia who has just addressed the House that I appreciate the message he has brought us. I know of my own personal knowledge that the gentleman is a former solicitor general with a great record of service to the people of his judicial circuit in that capacity. I know that the gentleman is a close student of the law and of the Constitution of the United States. I know also that he is not a man who by nature is quarrelsome. He is a man who, when the occasion requires it, will rise to his feet and state his convictions and will do it in no uncertain terms.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished gentleman for the facts he has brought to us today about the speeches of Abraham Lincoln. The speeches of Mr. Lincoln have been quoted out of context in many instances to support positions which Mr. Lincoln actually did not support. I appreciate that the gentleman has done the research necessary to bring to us today with reference to some of these issues the true position of Mr. Lincoln. I think it will be worthwhile to the Congress and to the country that these facts have been brought forth today. I want to thank the gentleman also for the courage he has displayed at this particular time in stating the facts relating to some of the issues which plague us to such an extent today. There were some of us who as long as 5 years ago took the floor in this body to point out that the Supreme Court of the United States was preparing to usurp legislative functions; was preparing to change the law, which function belongs exclusively to Congress, and was preparing to amend the Constitution, which function belongs only to this Congress and to the States. What we are seeing take place today, which the gentleman has pointed out to us, is merely the result of that unwarranted action on the part of the Federal Supreme Court. The people of this country do not intend to let the Supreme Court of the United States become a dictator. The people do not intend to have the rights of the States taken away from them by any unwarranted action of the Supreme Court. If this policy is persisted in, you are going to see even more tumult and turmoil than has occurred up to this time.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for what he has said and I commend him for making this learned speech to us today.

Mr. FORRESTER. May I say to the gentleman from Georgia that I do not know of anyone who has more courageously faced up to these issues than the gentleman from Georgia? If my colleague approves of anything that I have said or done here today, it is a source of much satisfaction to me.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. I commend my colleague for his splendid presentation of the position of the South. I wish that the people of other sections of the country could realize just how difficult our problem is. I wish they could realize that we are not trying to keep the negro in subservience; that we believe they should have all their legal rights; but we do object to the mingling of the races socially and in our schools because we know it is going to mean a mongrel race. I commend the gentleman for the way he has presented the facts this afternoon. The gentleman was an able solicitor general in his State. He knows about the prosecution of the three cases that he has told you about today. I agree with my colleague from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] that as bad as that decision was and as wrong as it was on the matter of segregation in our schools, it is realized by legal minds everywhere that it was fundamentally wrong in a deeper legal sense in that it was legislative in nature and a usurpation of the powers of the Congress by the Supreme Court. A couple of weeks ago, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial taken from the Wall Street Journal in which that most conservative newspaper criticized the Supreme Court not for this recent decision with reference to segregation, but for the decision in which they held that the Federal Government had the right to regulate the collection of natural gas at the wellhead. Now I know nothing about the soundness of that decision because I have not studied it, but the Wall Street Journal made the point that the Supreme Court was usurping the legislative power of the Congress. That is the fundamental issue in this whole problem. A very distinguished former judge of the United States circuit court of appeals, Judge Sibley, who is retired now but whose mind is as keen as ever, recently made this statement to me: "The older judges are concerned because the present-day judges tend to decide the law not as it is but as they think it ought to be."

As this fine old southern gentleman said to me, "whatever judge or court does that is legislating." It seems to me that like all of our problems in the South—and this problem will pass as all others have passed—this problem will be solved by the understanding, calm people, by moderate people of our Nation, and it will be settled properly. I do not know what the solution is, myself, but eventually it will be settled. But if the Supreme Court continues to usurp the power of Congress, then our way of life is doomed.

Mr. FORRESTER. I certainly thank the gentleman. The gentleman is a splendid lawyer, a man of fine reputation and standing, and I get much comfort out of the fact that he agrees with me in what I have attempted to say.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the genleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I will be glad to yield to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. I want to commend my distinguished and courageous colleague from Georgia for bringing this matter to the floor of the House. I know he did so after careful preparation. I know he did so after carefully weighing and studying the words with which he brought this message to the floor. I would like to add, if I may by way of emphasizing some of the things that the gentleman has said: The Supreme Court decision handed down on Black Monday, the 17th of May 1954 did more to destroy the progress that had been made in race relations in the South than anything that has happened in the past 80 years. The U. S. News & World Report, in a current issue, carries an article based on questions asked and answers given by 15 newspaper editors and publishers of the South, including white newspaper editors and publishers and Negro editors and publishers alike, and without exception each of them said that the progress which had been made toward an early solution of this problem is worse now than it was 2 years ago. Every one of them placed the blame for this worse situation on the decision of the Supreme Court. Mr. Speaker, as a lawyer, as a man whose adult life has been devoted to the practice of law, I am of the firm opinion that the decision in the school cases, handed down on May 17, 1954, may be marked as the beginning of the decline and fall of the United States of America, because it was most definitely

the beginning of the end of constitutional law on the basis of legal precedents heretofore established. It is the first time in the history of that great Court that it ever completely disregarded 80 years of judicial precedents and admittedly based that decision on the sociological writing of a Swede by the name of Gunnar Myrdahl. The Court in that case could not quote any legal precedents for the decision which it handed down. They had to go outside of the judicial precedents from the Supreme Court of the United States and the court of last resort of every State in the Union. They had to completely overturn 80 years of established judicial precedents, and base that decision on sociological and psychological grounds.

Mr. Speaker, if the time ever comes that our laws are disregarded and cast into the discard in order that the Supreme Court of the United States, or any other court can usurp the powers of legislation, then, when that day comes our sacred form of constitutional government which we love, which we respect, and which we revere will be gone and will be gone forever. It will be like the tomb and the grave: Once it receives its victim it never returns him or gives him back.

Mr. FORRESTER. I thank the gentleman very much. The gentleman himself was a prosecuting attorney just as I was, and he also served as president of the Georgia Bar Association. I appreciate the fine contribution he has made.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the House that Lincoln also said that those who remain silent when they should speak out makes cowards of men, or something along that line; so I want to compliment the gentleman from Georgia for so ably expressing his convictions and speaking out.

I can say to the gentleman from Georgia that the people of South Carolina, the vast, overwhelming majority of them agree with the statements expressed by my distinguished and able colleague from Georgia. And at this point I want to take the opportunity to congratulate the entire American people of all of the 48 States of this great Union for not solving its racial and religious differences as the racial and religious differences of the Middle East are being solved today by mass killings, strife, and threat of general war. I was told when there a few years ago that a hundred thousand people have been killed and many more wounded in the Near East in the last 10 years because of racial and religious differences.

I was told in Karachi, Pakistan, that 1 million people have been killed since the close of World War II because of religious differences between the Moslems and the Hindus. My driver in Karachi told me that his own wife and children were burned to death before his very eyes because he differed with the other crowd in religion.

I am glad that America is not today solving its religious and racial problems as are being solved in that area of the world.

Also I could point out South Africa where a thousand people have been killed recently—purely on racial grounds.

I think the United States of America can point to its record with pride. Every single American State and every American city, should be proud of and advertise, this record in America, but the South should be particularly proud. Let us continue our record of racial tolerance, of respect for the other man's religion and respect for the other man's rights. We have made in America both North and South, East and West, a better record along that line than any other country, or any other region of the world that I know of, and I hope and pray we will not resort to the methods being adopted and resorted to in the Near and Middle East at this very moment because of racial belief and religious prejudice. The South can well point to our splendid record with pride. I hope all Americans who really believe in our country will let us and help us continue to solve our problems as the South has so wonderfully been doing for many years.

Again I commend the distinguished gentleman from Georgia for pointing out this insidious threat to American unity and our national well-being.

Mr. FORRESTER. I thank the gentleman very much. I now want to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], a gentleman who has been in this fight in the heat of the day. I am happy and proud to be able to yield to him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia has spoken with candor and courage. He has told the truth, in spite of the fact that he knows that it will bring down upon his head vilification, abuse, slander, libel, and every form of smear from the radical and left-wing press of this country.

I think the gentleman might well point out that those who are farthest removed from this problem and who are the most ignorant about it are the first to come forward with solutions for it.

They think that we, who are closest to the problem and who know most about it, should be forced to accede to their desires, even if it means our own self-destruction, the mongrelization of our people, and the end of constitutional government.

I want to congratulate the gentleman also for pointing up the illegality of the recent Supreme Court decision. Of course, I can add nothing to what the gentleman has said on the subject, but I would like to point out that it is a sad day in this country when the United States Supreme Court is so irresponsible that its decisions can be attacked by reputable lawyers who, in brief after brief, show the illegality of their decisions and not have one single eminent or reputable attorney rise to defend the legality of the decisions which they rendered. I challenge anyone in this House or in the other body to come forth with a legal defense of the Black Monday Court decisions. They cannot be supported or defended on the basis of law or judicial precedents.

Mr. FORRESTER. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS. I want to command the gentleman for his fine statement. I share the view he has of our Supreme Court. I believe I can correctly say that 90 percent of the good lawyers of American men who have studied law, today have no respect for the ability of the members of the Supreme Court. I have been in the Congress for 12 years. We have spent half the time since I have been here correcting the illegal, unwise decisions rendered by the Supreme Court. Now we are concerned with the decision in the school case. Two years ago we were concerned with the tidelands oil case. That Court since 1935 has knocked down literally scores of old legal precedents that have been the law of this land for a hundred or more years.

One of the Justices of that Court—he is not on the bench now—made this statement with reference to one of the decisions in a dissenting opinion. He said that the thing that disturbed him most about the Court was the trend that the Court was following, namely, repealing or knocking down old legal precedents. He said it was impossible for a man to tell from day to day what the law was and that the opinion in that particular case reminded him of a railroad ticket that had stamped on it: "Good for this day and this train only."

What is the hope of those of us who believe in States rights, who believe in the Constitution, who believe we should have a country of laws and not a country of men? The only hope I see is for the majority of those members of the Court to fade away and for the appointees in the future to be better than they have been in the past, especially the Chief Justice; according to the testimony of the Vice President of the United States, the school decision was political. It has been my opinion all along that that decision in the school case was a political decision. There is not one single legal authority cited in that case to uphold their final conclusion. It is politics headed by a master politician, a man who was able to carry water on both shoulders in his own State and get the nomination of both parties. Is that not a politician?

I want to commend the gentleman for the courageous speech he has made and say that it will take more than a Supreme Court decision to make your people and mine violate their own laws and customs and do things in our schools that no member of the Court does in his own family. Again I want to commend the gentleman.

Mr. FORRESTER. I certainly thank my colleague.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I see that my colleague's time is about up and I do not want to trespass upon it at the present time. It seems as if the Su-

preme Court has been pretty well taken care of today. I do want to say to my colleague that we in Alabama have the same problem that he has in Georgia. It is going to take time and patience to work it out. We are having some trouble at the present time which has been brought about in my own district largely by a man not too far removed from this Chamber today. The people who are suffering are those whom he says he wishes to help. In discussing this decision of the Supreme Court, other sections might laugh at our plight today, but tomorrow it will be some other sections of our country who are, I am sure, dedicated to States rights and the principles of self-government the same as we. I just want to say that I approve of every word that the gentleman has spoken and congratulate and commend him upon this great address.

Mr. FORRESTER. I certainly appreciate that statement from my friend.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I, too, wish to congratulate the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] on the wonderful speech he has made here today. He is one of the most able and conscientious Members of the House. I just hope that the solid thinking people from all sections of our country will recognize the truth of the statement he made here today. I concur with what he had to say and he certainly speaks the sentiment of the vast majority of the white people not only in Georgia and Mississippi but in other Southern States.

Mr. FORRESTER. I thank the gentleman.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who took part in this debate with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. METCALF]. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] may extend his remarks at this point.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Georgia mentioned in the fine statement he has just made the recent disturbances that took place at the University of Alabama. This institution is located in the congressional district that I have the privilege to represent.

Reports concerning the admittance of two Negro women to the University of Alabama have not always presented the complete record.

Let me cite a specific instance relating to Pollie Anner Myers Hudson, one of the two who recently sought admittance to the University of Alabama. In the February 20 issue of Time magazine, on page 40, it is stated that Pollie Anner Myers Hudson was denied admission "on grounds of 'her conduct and marital record' (she is involved in a divorce action), . . ."

This statement, to say the least, omits many of the pertinent facts in her case. Let me now quote to you from the February 13 issue of the news magazine South:

> Pollie Anner Myers, unmarried and pregnant, applied for admission the third week in September 1952. Two months later, November 14, 1952, she married Edward Hudson, whose 3-year sentence for burglary had been revoked in Jefferson County in 1948. Six months and 4 days after the marriage Pollie Anner Myers Hudson gave birth on May 18, 1953, to a male child. It was a normal birth, length of pregnancy was 40 weeks.
>
> Henry Myers, the woman's father, was sentenced from Elmore County on September 26, 1938, for 1 year and a day for possession of a still and manufacture of whisky. Edward Hudson, from whom the Associated Press reported she was separated and seeking a divorce, was sentenced to 3 years in the penitentiary February 14, 1947, for daytime burglary of an uninhabited dwelling in Jefferson County. Probation was revoked October 8, 1948, and sentence was imposed. He was sentenced for a year and a day on August 28, 1948, on another charge of burglary of an uninhabited dwelling.

To substantiate these facts, the magazine South printed in the same issue a photostatic copy of the marriage license of Pollie Anner Myers Hudson and her husband, Edward Hudson, as well as a photostatic copy of the birth certificate of her child.

I regret to say that I have never seen these unpleasant but significant facts published by the press at large.

The University of Alabama, now in its 125th year of operation, has a proud and distinguished record in the field of education. From its halls have graduated many men and women of distinction.

I am quite certain the University of Alabama is only one of many great institutions in this country which would not have admitted a student, white or colored, under the same conditions that existed in the case of Pollie Anner Myers Hudson.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] on the able speech he has just made. It shows that he has given a lot of study to the subject he discussed. I hope all the Members who are not present today will read his remarks in the RECORD because, as he has plainly pointed out, the Supreme Court in the segregation case and many other cases in recent years failed to follow judicial precedent and the Constitution in its decisions.

The Supreme Court should interpret the law as what it is and not what they think it should be, as someone has said.

Our Founding Fathers believed not only in a balance of powers between different branches of the Federal Government, but also believed in a restriction on the abuse of Federal power through the exercise of certain governmental functions by the various States.

I hope that the people in other sections of the country besides the South will appreciate the danger of interfering with States rights as was done in the segregation case.

SUBVERSIVE CHARACTER OF NAACP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARSHALL). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include citations of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and other pertinent data.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. SPEAKER, on February 3, the Memphis Commercial Appeal carried an article written by Paul Malloy quoting from an interview with Thurgood Marshall, Negro special counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. In the article it was stated, and I quote:

> The meeting sponsored by the Memphis NAACP chapter heard Marshall angrily deny claims his organization is Communist tainted.

Marshall said:

> Edgar Hoover, boss of the FBI, says we are not subversive. Our conventions have been addressed by Harry Truman, and President Eisenhower and Vice President Richard Nixon.

Subsequently, on Tuesday, February 21, 1956, Frederick Woltman, Scripps-Howard staff writer, writing in the Washington Daily News, stated, and I quote:

> The country's largest Negro organization, which has been accused of working in league with Communists by white citizens councils in the South, has taken steps to head off the move.
>
> Each of the 1,300 local branches and youth councils of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) has received a stern warning that the Communists are making intensive efforts to infiltrate the nationwide civil rights assembly here in Washington March 4–6.
>
> Roy Wilkins, NAACP executive secretary, directed units of his organization to exercise special care in selecting delegates to avoid any possibility that the assembly will be captured by leftwing individuals and groups.
>
> "Otherwise," Mr. Wilkins said, "The whole civil rights movement will receive a black eye and we will get very little attention, if any, by Congress."
>
> The Communist Party in the Daily Worker last week officially called for support of the mass lobby.

Which of these statements are we to believe—the statement of Thurgood Marshall, made in Memphis on February 3, which would lead the people of the country to believe that the NAACP is free of subversive influences, or are we to believe the article of Mr. Woltman dated February 21? It seems to me that

if the NAACP is free of subversive influences on February 3, there would be no need to issue a warning about intensive efforts to infiltrate on February 21.

The issue of the Daily Worker which Mr. Woltman refers to in his article is dated Tuesday, February 14. In it an editorial appears, and I quote:

The great debate will go on. But the Negro people and other democratic forces will not lose sight of the primary requirement for action: Demand that Eisenhower and Brownell act to enforce civil rights in the South. Support the mass lobby for civil rights in Washington March 4, 5, and 6.

Roy Wilkins, NAACP executive secretary, would have the people of the Nation believe that the NAACP has just been marked as a Communist target for infiltration.

In 1925 the Communist line as published by the Daily Worker Publishing Co. in the official report of the American Communist Party's fourth national convention held in Chicago, Ill., August 21–30, the party was directed to penetrate the NAACP.

Even in this organization (NAACP), under present circumstances, it is permissible and necessary for selected Communists (not the party membership as a whole) to enter its conventions and to make proposals calculated to enlighten the Negro masses under its influence as to the nature and necessity of the class struggle—

The report reads.

Now, let us look at this fellow Wilkins. He seems to be greatly disturbed about this issue of Communist infiltration of the NAACP because of its effect being the whole civil-rights movement will receive a black eye. Here is the record from the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities, United States House of Representatives:

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Roy Wilkins, national administrator and executive secretary, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Daily Worker of July 15, 1949 (p. 5), in an article datelined Los Angeles, July 14, reported that "Roy Wilkins, acting secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, told a press conference * * * he voted for Benjamin J. Davis, Negro Communist, at the last election. Davis is now on trial for his Communist beliefs, along with 11 other national Communist Party leaders in New York City. Wilkins, however, refused any comment on the trial itself." The same information appeared in the Daily People's World of July 13, 1949 (p. 1).

Mr. Wilkins was a member of the national committee, International Juridical Association, as was shown on the leaflet entitled "What is the IJA?" and a letterhead of the group dated May 18, 1942; he was identified as being from New York State. The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the International Juridical Association as "a Communist front and an offshoot of the International Labor Defense" report 1311 of March 29, 1944); the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as having "actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line" (report dated September 17, 1950, p. 12).

A letterhead of the Conference on Pan American Democracy dated November 16, 1938, contains the name of Roy Wilkins in a list of sponsors of that group, cited by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included on his consolidated list released April 1, 1954); the special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Conference as a Communist-front organization which defended Carlos Luiz Prestes, a Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International (report 1311 of March 29, 1944; also cited in report dated June 25, 1942).

According to the Daily Worker of September 24, 1937 (p. 6), Roy Wilkins was one of the sponsors of a joint meeting of the American League Against War and Fascism and the American Friends of Chinese People.

The American League Against War and Fascism was cited by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; also consolidated list of April 1, 1954); it had previously been cited by the Attorney General as a "Communist-front organization" (in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10); and as "established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7442.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the American League * * * as "completely under the control of Communists" (reports of March 29, 1944; January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; and June 25, 1942). American Friends of the Chinese People was also cited by the special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist-front organization (report of March 29, 1944).

The Daily Worker of January 23, 1937 (p. 8), reported that Roy Wilkins spoke for the International Labor Defense in Brooklyn. The International Labor Defense was cited by the Attorney General as the legal arm of the Communist Party and as subversive and Communist. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446; and press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list released April 1, 1954.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the ILD as the legal arm of the Communist Party (reports of January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944); the Committee on Un-American Activities also cited the group in a report released September 2, 1947.

Roy Wilkins spoke at a New York State convention of the Workers Alliance, as reported in the Daily Worker of February 11, 1939 (p. 1), and February 7, 1939 (p. 5). The Workers Alliance was cited as a Communist-penetrated organization and later as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7443, and press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; included on consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The special committee cited the Workers Alliance as among the successes in the Communist-front movements (report dated January 3, 1939; also cited in reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944).

In an article by Blaine Owen which appeared in the Daily Worker of June 17, 1936 (p. 1), entitled "1936 Communist Party Convention Significant to Negroes," he stated: "The greatest significant undoubtedly attends the 1936 convention of the Communist Party," Roy Wilkins, assistant national secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and editor of the Crisis, said today. "It must be patent to anyone who has kept track of the news that the political leftwing—and especially the Communist program—has been an important factor in bringing the plight of the Negro people, along with other underprivileged groups, more sharply to the attention of those parties which have been in power. * * * Nevertheless, there is no doubt in my mind that the program and demands of the Communists have had a very wholesome effect of the Negro people themselves. They have been emboldened by the basic and basically right demands put forth." This, it was pointed out to Wilkins, is what the Communist Party means when it bases its entire campaign on the proposal for and toward the realization of the broad People's Front. He nodded.

To understand the civil rights movement as propagated by the NAACP, I feel that a person must know something of the history and development of the American Negro movement here in the United States subsequent to the reconstruction period.

In 1895, Booker T. Washington, president of Tuskegee Institute, Alabama, was selected to speak for the southern Negro at the Atlanta Exposition. Dr. Washington stated his position clearly and with great effect. I would like to quote several paragraphs from Booker T. Washington's address which I feel sum up the entire philosophy enunciated by him and his group:

The wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremest folly, and that progress in the enjoyment of all the privileges that will come to us must be the result of severe and constant struggle rather than of artificial forcing. No race that has anything to contribute to the markets of the world is long in any degree ostracized. It is important and right that all privileges of the law be ours, but it is vastly more important that we be prepared for the exercises of these privileges. The opportunity to earn a dollar in a factory just now is worth infinitely more than the opportunity to spend a dollar in an opera house.

Also:

Cast it down in agricultural, mechanics, in commerce, in domestic service, and in the professions. And in this connection it is well to bear in mind that whatever other sins the South may be called to bear, when it comes to business, pure and simple, it is in the South that the Negro is given a man's chance in the commercial world, and in nothing is this exposition more eloquent than in emphasizing this chance. Our greatest danger is that in the great leap from slavery to freedom we may overlook the fact that the masses of us are to live by the productions of our hands, and fail to keep in mind that we shall prosper in proportion as we learn to dignify and glorify common labor and put brains and skill into the common occupations of life; shall prosper in proportion as we learn to draw the line between the superficial and the substantial, the ornamental gewgaws of life and the useful. No race can prosper till it learns that there is as much dignity in tilling a field as in writing a poem. It is at the bottom of life we must begin, and not at the top. Nor should we permit our grievances to overshadow our opportunities.

There was an entirely different school of thought, however, which was headed by Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, of Atlantic University. Dr. DuBois was a very bitter critic of the Washingtonian movement, which he referred to as "the Tuskegee machine." Dr. DuBois was the leader

of the left-wing element of American Negro Society which, in 1905, met at Niagara Falls, N. Y., and devised plans whereby complete social equality could be attained. This group was subsequently called the Niagara movement.

The Niagara movement was not very effective, because it was hampered by lack of funds. However, in 1908, a race riot occurred in Springfield, Ill., the home of Abraham Lincoln, which aroused the interest of the dormant abolitionist movement in the North. As a result of the feeling which was aroused by the Springfield race riots, William English Walling made a strong appeal for the emancipation of the American Negro in the fields of political and social equality. This appeal later became the clarion for the formation of a new organization, called National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which joined the white liberals of the northern abolitionist traditions with the Negro liberals of the Niagara movement.

Dr. DuBois was one of the founding fathers of the present-day NAACP, which was founded in 1909. This Dr. DuBois, who broke away from the Booker T. Washington group, was the leader of the Niagara movement. His record of citations from the House Committee on Un-American Activities takes up nine pages single-spaced:

FEBRUARY 21, 1956.

Subject: Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, founder NAACP, leader Niagara movement.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Worker (Sunday edition of the Communist publication, the Daily Worker) on April 27, 1947, reported that "almost 100 Negro leaders, headed by W. E. B. DuBois, Paul Robeson, and Roscoe Dunjee, last week called upon President Truman 'to repudiate decisively' steps to 'illegalize the Communist Party.' * * * As Negro Americans * * * we cannot be unmindful that this proposal to outlaw the Communist Party comes precisely when our Federal Government professes grave concern over the democratic rights of peoples in far distant parts of the world" (p. 8 of the Worker).

Dr. DuBois sponsored a statement attacking the arrest of Communist Party leaders (Daily Worker, August 23, 1948, p. 3); he sponsored a "Statement by Negro Americans" on behalf of the Communist leaders (the Worker of August 29, 1948, p. 11); he filed a brief in the Supreme Court on behalf of the 12 Communist leaders (Daily Worker, January 9, 1949, p. 3); he signed statements on behalf of Communist leaders, as shown in the following sources: Daily Worker, January 17, 1949 (p. 3); February 28, 1949 (p. 9); Daily People's World, May 12, 1950 (p. 12); Daily Worker, September 19, 1950 (p. 2); and in 1952, he signed an appeal to President Truman, requesting amnesty for leaders of the Communist Party convicted under the Smith Act (Daily Worker, December 10, 1952, p. 4); also an appeal on their behalf addressed to President Eisenhower (Daily People's World, November 17, 1954, p. 2). Dr. DuBois was one of the sponsors of the National Non-Partisan Committee to Defend the Rights of the 12 Communist leaders, as shown on the back of their letterhead dated September 9, 1949.

A statement on behalf of Eugene Dennis, a Communist, contained the signature of Dr. DuBois, identified as an educator (Daily Worker of May 5, 1950, p. 2); he signed a telegram of the National Commitee To Win Amnesty for Smith Act Victims, greeting Eugene Dennis on his 48th birthday (Daily Worker, August 11, 1952, p. 3); Eugene Dennis was formerly secretary general of the Communist Party.

The Daily Worker of August 2, 1949 (p. 2), disclosed that Dr. DuBois endorsed Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., well-known Communist leader; he was honorary chairman of the Committee To Defend V. J. Jerome, chairman, cultural commission of the Communist Party, United States of America (letterhead dated June 24, 1952). A leaflet of the Civil Rights Congress (dated March 20, 1947) named Dr. DuBois as having defended Gerhart Eisler, Communist. He was one of the sponsors of the Committee To Defend Alexander Tractenberg, former member of the national committee of the Communist Party (Daily People's World of April 17, 1952, p. 7; and the Daily Worker of April 18, 1952, p. 6).

The Daily Worker of February 16, 1948 (p. 16), reported that some "80 leading New York civic leaders, trade unionists, and professionals yesterday joined Dr. William Jay Schieffelin, president emeritus of the citizens union, to demand the prompt seating of Simon W. Gerson to the city council seat made vacant by the death of Councilman Peter V. Cacchione, Brooklyn Communist. * * * The civic leaders' statement is directed to Mayor O'Dwyer and city council majority leader Joseph T. Sharkey. It is a reprint of a letter to the New York Times by Dr. Schieffelin in which he charges that the real reason for the refusal to seal German (sic. Gerson) is 'the current anti-Communist hysteria.'" Dr. DuBois was named as having signed the statement. (See also advertisement in New York Times of February 19, 1948, p. 13.)

Dr. DuBois was a member of a committee formed to protest the arrest of Pablo Neruda, Communist Chilean senator and world famous poet; he signed a statement of the organization in support of Neruda. (Daily Worker of April 7, 1948, p. 13, and April 10, 1950, p. 2, respectively.) He was sponsor of a reception and testimonial for Harry Sacher, defense attorney for the Communist leaders. (Daily Worker of December 5, 1949, p. 2.)

When Earl Browder (then general secretary, Communist Party) was in Atlanta Penitentiary serving a sentence involving his fraudulent passports, the Communist Party's front which agitated for his release was known as the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder (special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944); the Attorney General of the United States had cited the Citizens' Committee as Communist (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447, and press release of Apr. 27, 1949). Dr. DuBois was a member of the Citizens' Committee * * * in 1942, as shown on their letterhead dated February 11, 1942; he sponsored a dinner of the group, according to the Daily Worker of February 5, 1942, and signed the call to the National Free Browder Congress, as shown in the Daily Worker of February 25, 1942, pages 1 and 4.

A 1950 letterhead of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born carries the name of Dr. W. E. B. DuBois in a list of sponsors of that organization; the same information appears on an undated letterhead of the group, distributing a speech of Abner Green at the conference of December 2–3, 1950; a letterhead of the Midwest Committee for Protection of Foreign Born dated April 30, 1951, names him as a national sponsor of the organization. He signed the group's statement opposing the Hobbs bill (Daily Worker, July 25, 1950, p. 4); he signed their statement opposing denaturalization (Daily Worker of August 10, 1950, p. 5); and signed a telegram prepared and dispatched by the organization to the Attorney General of the United States, protesting holding nine noncitizens without bail under the McCarran Act. (Daily Worker of November 24, 1952, p. 3.) He was also listed in the Daily Worker of October 21, 1954 (p. 2) as one of 95 sponsors of the National Conference to Defend the Rights of Foreign Born Americans, to be held December 11 through 12 in New York City by the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.

The special committee cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" (report of March 29, 1944: also cited in report of June 25, 1942); the Attorney General cited the organization as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; also redesignated pursuant to executive order 10450, see consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

"For years, the Communists have put forth the greatest efforts to capture the entire American Labor Party throughout New York State. They succeeded in capturing the Manhattan and Brooklyn sections of the American Labor Party but outside of New York City, they have been unable to win control" (Special Committee's Report 1311 of March 29, 1944). Dr. DuBois spoke at a State conference of the American Labor Party (Daily Worker of December 12, 1950, p. 5); he spoke at a dinner, April 18, opening the presidential campaign in New York City (Daily Worker of April 14, 1952, p. 8, an advertisement; and the Daily Worker of April 21, 1952, p. 1); he spoke at an election rally in Madison Square Garden, May 13, held under the auspices of the American Labor Party (Daily Worker of May 8, 1952, p. 8, an advertisement; and May 14, 1952, p. 1); and he spoke at an election rally in Madison Square Garden, October 27 (Daily Worker of October 22, 1952, p. 8, an advertisement; and October 29, 1952, p. 2).

The Daily Worker of March 29, 1948 (p. 7), named Dr. DuBois as a member of the Executive Board and of the Policy Committee, Council on African Affairs; he signed the council's petition to the United Nations as shown in the Daily Worker of June 5, 1950 (p. 4); drafted their statement against the policy of the United States in Korea (Daily Worker of July 25, 1950, p. 3) and spoke at the Council's conference on April 24 at Friendship Baptist Church in New York City (Daily Worker, April 23, 1954, p. 8 and April 26, 1954, p. 6). The Attorney General cited the Council on African Affairs as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948); also redesignated—consolidated list of April 1, 1954.

The Attorney General cited the Jefferson School of Social Science as an "adjunct of the Communist Party" (press release of December 4, 1947); also redesignated—consolidated list of April 1, 1954); the Special Committee reported that "at the beginning of the present year, the old Communist Party Workers School and the School for Democracy were merged into the Jefferson School of Social Science." (Report 1311 of March 29, 1944.) Dr. DuBois was honored at the Jefferson School, as shown in the Daily Worker on February 1, 1951 (p. 2); it was announced in the Daily Worker on January 2, 1952 (p. 7), that Dr. DuBois was scheduled to conduct a seminar on "Background of African Liberation Struggles" at the Jefferson School; the January 26, 1952, issue of the same publication (p. 7), named him as a faculty member of that school, as did the Worker, October 4, 1953 (p. 10) and the Daily Worker, October 14, 1953 (p. 8)—advertisement. He signed statements on behalf of the Jefferson School as shown in the Daily Worker, November 25, 1953 (p. 2) and the Daily People's World, July 6, 1954 (p. 7).

In a report of the special committee, dated March 29, 1944, the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship was cited as having been, in recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian (report dated March 29, 1944); the organization has been cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated consolidated list of April 1, 1954). Dr. DuBois signed a statement of the national council in 1947 (Daily Worker, October 17, 1947, p. 4); he signed the organization's statement protesting the Iron Curtain, as reported in the Daily People's World on May 20, 1948 (p. 5); he signed a statement of the council, praising Henry Wallace's Open Letter to Stalin in May 1948 (from a pamphlet entitled "How To End the Cold War and Build the Peace," p. 9); he signed their statement calling for a conference with the Soviet Union (Daily Worker, June 21, 1948, p. 3); he signed their Roll Call for Peace (Daily Worker of August 31, 1948, p. 5); he sent greetings through the national council on the 31st anniversary of the Russian Revolution (Daily Worker, November 10, 1948, p. 11); he signed the council's appeal to the United States Government to end the cold war and arrange a conference with the Soviet Union (leaflet entitled "End the Cold War—Get Together for Peace," dated December 1948); he spoke at the Congress on American-Soviet Relations, December 3–5, 1949, arranged by the national council and signed the council's letter to the American people, urging that a unified democratic Germany be established (Daily People's World, August 13, 1952, pp. 4 and 6).

A letterhead of the Conference on Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, dated August 21, 1949, lists the name of Dr. W. E. B. DuBois as having signed an open letter of the organization, addressed to Senators and Congressmen, urging defeat of President Truman's arms program; he answered a questionnaire of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy in favor of recognition of Chinese Communist Government, as shown in Far East Spotlight for December 1949–January 1950 (p. 23).

The Conference for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact was cited as a meeting called by the Daily Worker in July 1949, to be held in Washington, D. C., and as having been instigated by "Communists in the United States (who) did their part in the Moscow campaign" (Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 378 on the Communist "Peace" Offensive dated April 1, 1951). The Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy has been cited as Communist by the Attorney General (press release of April 27, 1949); also redesignated-consolidated list of April 1, 1954.

A page of signatures from the Golden Book of American Friendship with the Soviet Union, "sponsored by American friends of the Soviet Union, and signed by hundreds of thousands of Americans," was published in the November 1937 issue of Soviet Russia Today (p. 79); the Golden Book was to be presented to President Kalinin at the 20th anniversary celebration. The page carried the title, "I hereby inscribe my name in greeting to the people of the Soviet Union on the 20th anniversary of the establishment of the Soviet Republic," and a facsimile of the name, W. E. B. DuBois, appeared on that page.

The Golden Book of American Friendship was cited as a "Communist enterprise" signed by "hundreds of well-known Communists and fellow travelers" (Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944).

A letterhead of the New York Committee To Win the Peace, dated June 1, 1946, contains the name of W. E. B. DuBois in a list of New York committee members. The National Committee To Win the Peace, with which the New York committee is affiliated, was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General. (Press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated consolidated list of April 1, 1954.)

Dr. DuBois sponsored a petition of the American Council for a Democratic Greece, as disclosed by the Daily People's World of August 23, 1948 (p. 2); he signed a statement of the same organization, condemning the Greek Government, as reported in the Daily Worker of September 2, 1948 (p. 7). The American Council for a Democratic Greece has been cited as subversive and Communist, an organization formerly known as the Greek-American Council (Attorney General of the United States in press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948); also redesignated—consolidated list of April 1, 1954.

Dr. DuBois was a sponsor of a conference of the National Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions, October 9–10, 1948, as shown in a leaflet entitled "To Safeguard These Rights," published by the Bureau of Academic Freedom of the National Council; a letterhead of the National Council (received for files January 1949) named him as a member-at-large of that organization; he was named as vice chairman of the group on the leaflet, Policy and Program Adopted by the National Convention, 1950; a letterhead of the same organization's southern California chapter, dated April 24, 1950, lists him as a member-at-large of the national council; he was elected vice chairman of the group in 1950 (Daily Worker, May 1, 1950, p. 12); a letterhead of the group dated July 28, 1950, names him as vice chairman of the group; he endorsed a conference on equal rights for Negroes in the arts, sciences, and professions sponsored by the New York Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions (Daily Worker, November 9, 1951, p. 7); the call to the conference contained the same information. A letterhead of the national council, dated December 7, 1952, named him as vice chairman.

The call to a Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, issued by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions for New York City, March 25–27, 1949, as well as the conference program (p. 12), and the Daily Worker of February 21, 1949 (p. 9), named Dr. DuBois as one of the sponsors of that conference; he was a member of the program committee of the conference, honorary chairman of the panel at cultural and scientific conference (program, p. 7), and spoke on the Nature of Intellectual Freedom at that conference (p. 78 of the edited report of the conference entitled "Speaking for Peace").

The National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Committee on Un-American Activities in its review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, released April 19, 1949; in the same review, the Scientific and Cultural Conference was cited as a Communist front which "was actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations."

The Daily People's World of October 28, 1947 (p. 4), named Dr. DuBois as one of the sponsors of a national conference of the Civil Rights Congress in Chicago, November 21–23, 1947; he sponsored their Freedom Crusade (Daily Worker, December 15, 1948, p. 2); the Call to a Bill of Rights Conference, called by the Civil Rights Congress, for July 16–17, 1949, in New York City, named him as one of the sponsors of that conference; the program of the National Civil Rights Legislative Conference, Janauary 18–19, 1949, called by the Civil Rights Congress, lists him as one of the conference sponsors; he was chairman of a conference of the Congress, as reported in the Worker of January 2, 1949 (p. 5); Dr. DuBois was defended by the Civil Rights Congress (Daily Worker, February 13, 1951, p. 3); he signed the organization's open letter to J. Howard McGrath, United States Attorney General, on behalf of the four jailed trustees of the bail fund of the Civil Rights Congress of New York (advertisement "paid for by contributions of signers" which appeared in the Evening Star on October 30, 1951, p. A–7); he participated in the organization's sixth anniversary dinner in New York City, March 26, 1952 (Daily Worker, March 28, 1952, p. 4).

The Civil Rights Congress was formed in 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations, the International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties; it is "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it" (Rept. 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities, dated September 2, 1947); the Attorney General cited the congress as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948); also redesignated—consolidated list of April 1, 1954.

Dr. DuBois spoke in Washington, D. C., on May 9, 1947, under the auspices of the Washington Book Shop, as shown by a leaflet of the Book Shop, cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General; it had previously been cited by the Attorney General as follows: "Evidence of Communist penetration or control is reflected in the following: Among its stock the establishment has offered prominently for sale books and literature identified with the Communist Party and certain of its affiliates and front organization" (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated—consolidated list of April 1, 1954; and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447). The special committee cited the Washington Book Shop as a Communist-front organization (report of March 29, 1944).

The Workers Book Shop catalog for 1948 (p. 5), advertised Dr. DuBois' The World and Africa for sale; the 1949–50 catalog (p. 11) advertised his Black Folk Then and Now; the Worker for March 1, 1953 (p. 16), carried an advertisement of Dr. DuBois' books, The Battle for Peace and Black Reconstruction on sale at the Workers Bookshop, New York City. The Workers Book Shops are a chain of Communist bookshops which are official outlets for Communist literature.

As shown on the following sources, Dr. DuBois was a member of the Advisory Council of Soviet Russia Today: Letterhead of the publication dated September 8, 1947; a letterhead of September 30, 1947; and an undated letterhead received April 1948. The Daily People's World of November 6, 1952 (p. 7), reported that Dr. DuBois had written an article for the November issue of New World Review; and his article entitled "Normal United States-China Relations" appeared in the issue of August 1954 (pp. 13–15). He was also shown by the Daily Worker of October 20, 1954 (p. 7), as one of those who attended the annual banquet held by New World Review on October 14 at which special tribute was paid to Mr. and Mrs. Paul Robeson. Soviet Russia Today has been cited as a Communist-front publication by the special committee in reports of March 29, 1944, and June 25, 1942; the Committee on Un-American Activities also cited it as a Communist-front publication in a report dated October 23, 1949. Soviet Russia Today changed its name to New World Review, effective with the March 1951 issue.

The Daily Worker of July 6, 1951 (p. 7), reported that Dr. DuBois was author of the pamphlet, I Take My Stand for Peace, published by the New Country Publishers, official Communist Party publishing house which has published the works of William Z. Foster and Eugene Dennis, Communist Party chairman and executive secretary, respectively. (Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of May 11, 1948).

In 1947 and 1948, Dr. DuBois was contributing editor on the staff of New Masses magazine and later of Masses and Mainstream. (New Masses, July 22, 1947, p. 2; Masses and Mainstream, March 1948, vol. 1, No. 1; and issue of August 1950, p. 1; June 1954, inside front cover.) He contributed articles to the following issues of New Masses and Masses and Mainstream: New Masses for September 10, 1946 (p. 3) and June 10, 1947 (p. 20); Masses and Mainstream for April 1951 (pp. 10–16); and February 1952 (pp. 8–14).

In 1940, Dr. DuBois signed New Masses letter to President Roosevelt as shown in New Masses for April 2, 1940 (p. 21); he was honored at a dinner in New York City, January 14, 1946, arranged by New Masses and at which awards were made for greater interracial understanding (Daily Worker of January 7, 1946, p. 11, cols. 1 and 2); the endorsed New Masses, as reported in the Daily Worker of April 7, 1947 (p. 11); he sponsored a plea for financial support of New Masses, as disclosed in the issue of that publication for April 8, 1947 (p. 9); he received the New Masses award for his contribution in promoting democracy and interracial unity at the publication's second annual awards dinner (New Masses of November 18, 1947, p. 7); the February 1953 issue of Masses and Mainstream carried a chapter from Dr. DuBois' book, The Soul of Black Folk, written 50 years ago (Daily Worker, February 23, 1953, p. 7); he was author of In Battle for Peace, described as the story of his 83d birthday, and which was published by Masses and Mainstream (the Daily Worker of June 18, 1952, p. 7; Daily People's World of September 17, 1952, p. 7; the Daily Worker of September 23, 1952, p. 7; and the Worker of December 21, 1952, p. 7).

The Attorney General of the United States cited New Masses as a Communist periodical (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7448); the special committee cited it as a nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party. (Report of March 29, 1944; also cited in reports of January 3, 1939 and June 25, 1942.) Beginning with the March 1948 issue, New Masses and Mainstream (Marxist quarterly) consolidated into what is now known as Masses and Mainstream, with the announcement that "here, proudly, in purpose even if not in identical form, is a magazine that combines and carriers forward the 37-year-old tradition of New Masses and the more recent literary achievement of Mainstream. We have regrouped our energies, not to retire from the battle but to wage it with fresh resolution and confidence" (Masses and Mainstream for March 1948, p. 3).

A letterhead of the Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case, dated March 15, 1952, carried the name of Dr. W. E. B. DuBois in a list of sponsors; he joined in a request of that committee for a new trial for Ethel and Julius Rosenberg (Daily Worker of June 12, 1952, p. 6); he participated in a rally October 23 in New York City, to demand clemency for the Rosenbergs (Daily Worker, Oct. 27, 1952, p. 8); he signed an amicus curiae brief presented to Supreme Court in Washington, D. C., urging a new trial for the Rosenbergs (Daily Worker of November 10, 1952, p. 3; and the Daily People's World of November 13, 1952, p. 8). He wrote an article entitled "A Negro Leader's Plea To Save Rosenbergs" (The Worker of November 16, 1952, p. 3M); and the Daily Worker of January 21, 1953 (p. 7), reported that he had urged clemency for the Rosenbergs.

The Daily Worker of April 11, 1949 (p. 5), reported that Dr. DuBois was a member of the Sponsoring Committee of the World Peace Congress in Paris; he was cochairman of the American Sponsoring Committee of the Congress, as disclosed on a leaflet entitled "World Congress for Peace, Paris," April 20–23, 1949, he was proposed as a candidate for the World Peace Prize, awarded by the World Peace Congress (Daily People's World of December 7, 1951, p. 4); he was a member of the Executive Committee of the World Peace Congress (Daily Worker of September 14, 1950, p. 5); he was one of the sponsors of the Second World Peace Congress in Sheffield, England (Daily Worker of October 19, 1950, p. 3); he was elected to the Presiding Committee of the World Peace Congress (Daily Worker of November 17, 1950, p. 1); he was a member of the World Peace Council of that Congress (Daily Worker of November 24, 1950, p. 9); a mimeographed letter dated December 1, 1950, contains his name in a list of sponsors of the American Sponsoring Committee for Representation at the World Peace Congress.

Dr. DuBois was a member of the United States Sponsoring Committee of the American Intercontinental Peace Conference (Daily Worker of December 28, 1951, p. 2, and February 6, 1952, p. 2); the Peace Conference was called by the World Peace Council, formed at the conclusion of the Second World Peace Congress in Warsaw; he was awarded the International Peace Prize for "six world figures" by the World Peace Council (Daily People's World of January 29, 1953, p. 7; the Worker of February 8, 1953, p. 5; and Daily People's World, November 25, 1953, p. 4). He awarded the Stalin Peace Prize for 1953 to Howard Fast in ceremonies held in the Hotel McAlpin in April 1954. (See Daily Worker, April 26, 1954, pp. 3 and 6 and the Worker, May 9, 1954, p. 9.)

The Daily Worker of June 20, 1950 (p. 2), reported that Dr. DuBois signed the World Peace Appeal; the same information appears on an undated leaflet of the enterprise, received by this committee September 11, 1950. A mimeographed list of individuals who signed the Stockholm World Appeal To Outlaw Atomic Weapons, received for filing October 23, 1950, contains the name of Dr. DuBois. He was Chairman of the Peace Information Center where the Stockholm peace petition was made available. (Daily Worker of May 25, 1950, p. 2; and Aug. 16, 1950, p. 5.)

The World Peace Congress which was held in Paris, France, April 20–23, 1949, was cited as a Communist front among the "peace" conferences which "have been organized under Communist initiative in various countries throughout the world as part of a campaign against the North Atlantic Defense Pact" (Committee on Un-American Activities in reports of April 19, 1949; July 13, 1950; and April 1, 1951). The World Peace Council was formed at the conclusion of the Second World Peace Congress in Warsaw and was "heralded by the Moscow radio as the expression of the determination of the peoples to take into their own hands the struggle for peace." (Committee on Un-American Activities in a report dated April 1, 1951.)

The World Peace Appeal was cited as a petition campaign launched by the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress at its meeting in Stockholm, March 16–19, 1950; it "received the enthusiastic approval of every section of the international Communist hierarchy" and was "lauded in the Communist press, putting every individual Communist on notice that he 'has the duty to rise to this appeal.'" (Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of April 1, 1951.)

The American Peace Crusade, organized in January 1951, was cited as an organization which "the Communists established as a new instrument for their 'peace' offensive in the United States" (Committee on Un-American Activities in its reports of February 19, 1951, and April 1, 1951); Dr. DuBois was one of the sponsors of the crusade (Daily Worker of February 1, 1951, p. 2); minutes of the sponsors meeting which was held in Washington, D. C., March 15, 1951 (p. 4), named him as one of the initiators of the crusade and also as having been proposed as cochairman of that meeting; he was a sponsor of the American People's Congress and Exposition for Peace, which was held in Chicago, June 29–July 1, 1951, called by the American Peace Crusade to advance the theme of world peace (Daily Worker, April 22, 1951, p. 2; May 1, 1951, p. 11; the American Peace Crusade, May 1951, pp. 1 and 4; the Daily Worker of May 9, 1951, p. 4; Daily Worker of June 11, 1951, p. 2; a leaflet of the congress; Daily Worker of July 1, 1951, p. 3; a leaflet entitled "An Invitation to American Labor to Participate in a Peace Congress"; the call to the American People's Congress; the Daily Worker of July 3, 1951, p. 2). He signed a petition of the crusade, calling on President Truman and Congress to seek a big-power pact (Daily Worker, February 1, 1952, p. 1); he attended a meeting of Delegates Assembly for Peace, called by the crusade and held in Washington, D. C., April 1 (Daily Worker, April 3, 1952, p. 3); he was one of the sponsors of a peace referendum jointly with the American Peace Crusade to make the end of the Korean war a major issue in the 1952 election campaign (Daily People's World of August 25, 1952, p. 8).

Dr. DuBois issued a statement on the death of Stalin which read in part as follows: "Let all Negroes, Jews, and foreign-born who have suffered in America from prejudice and intolerance, remember Joseph Stalin" (Daily Worker of March 9, 1953, p. 3); the Daily Worker of January 18, 1952 (p. 8), reported that he had renewed his fight for a passport in order to attend the American Intercontinental Peace Conference in Rio de Janeiro; it was reported in the Washington Evening Star on May 10, 1952 (p. B–21), that Dr. DuBois was refused admission to Canada to attend the Canadian Peace Congress because he refused to undergo an examination by the Canadian Immigration Service. On September 14, 1952, the Worker (p. M6), reported that Dr. DuBois had experienced passport difficulties when leaving the United States; and on May 4, 1953 (p. 2), the Daily Worker reported that United States delegate, Betty Sanders, told the opening session of the Continental Cultural Congress in Santiago, Chile, that DuBois would have attended in person "as well as in spirit," if he had not been denied a passport.

According to Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, "subversion" means "act of subverting, or a state of being subverted; overthrow; utter ruin; destruction. That which subverts."

The time element would prevent my reading all of these citations on the various individuals who compose the high echelon of this organization. I will, however, read excerpts from some of them and would like to ask later for permission to incorporate each of them in full in the RECORD.

OCTOBER 13, 1955.

Subject: Arthur B. Spingarn, national president, member of board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Arthur B. Spingarn is listed as an individual participation in the Conference on Africa, held by the Council on African Affairs in New York City, April 14, 1944, according to the Council's pamphlet, For a New Africa (p. 37).

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Council on African Affairs as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948. The Attorney General redesignated the organization April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

An undated leaflet, The Only Sound Policy for a Democracy and the Daily Worker of March 18, 1945 (p. 2), listed Arthur Spingarn, president NAACP, New York, N. Y., as one who signed a statement of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties supporting the War Department's order on granting commissions * * * to members of the Armed Forces who have been members of or sympathetic to the views of the Communist Party. An advertisement in the New York Times, April 1, 1946 (p. 16), listed Arthur B. Spingarn as a signer of a statement of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties opposing use of injunctions in labor disputes.

The Attorney General cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The group was cited previously by the Attorney General as part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party." The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the National Federation * * * as among a "maze of organizations" which were "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law."

An undated letterhead of the Public Use of Arts Committee listed Arthur B. Spingarn as a sponsor of the organization. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 112), cited the Public Use of Arts Committee as a Communist front which was organized by the Communist-controlled Artists Union.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Channing H. Tobias, chairman of the Board of Directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

An undated leaflet, "The South Is Closer Than You Think," named Channing Tobias as a member of the executive board and as cochairman of the New York committee, Southern Conference for Human Welfare. The "Southern Patriot" for December 1946 (p. 8) named him as an advisory associate for 1947–48 of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. This organization has been cited as a Communist front by the special committee on Un-American Activities (Report of March 29, 1944, p. 147); and, was the subject of a separate report by the Committee on Un-American Activities (Report No. 592, June 12, 1947) wherein it was cited as a Communist-front organization "which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South" although its "professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States."

Channing H. Tobias was shown as a member of the Council on African Affairs, Inc., in the pamphlets, "Eight Million Demand Freedom" (back cover). "For a New Africa" (p. 36), "Africa in the War" (inside back cover), and "Seeing Is Believing"; the leaflets, "The Job To Be Done," and "What of Africa's Place in Tomorrow's World?" all issued by the organization; and a letterhead of the council dated May 17, 1945. In this connection, it should be noted that the New York Times reported on May 29, 1948 (p. 6) that Channing H. Tobias had resigned from the Council on African Affairs. The Council on African Affairs has been cited as a subversive and Communist organization by the Attorney General (letters to Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated pursuant to Executive Order 10450 in Attorney General's memorandum to heads of departments, April 29, 1953).

The call to a dinner forum on "Protestantism Answers Hate," which was held in New York City, February 25, 1941, named Channing H. Tobias as one of the sponsors of the forum, arranged by the Protestant Digest Associates; he was a member of the editorial advisory board of the Protestant Digest, as shown on a letterhead of the publication dated October 7, 1941; and the June-July 1942 issue of the Protestant named him as an editorial adviser. The Protestant Digest, later known as The Protestant and published by Protestant Digest Associates, was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as "a magazine which has faithfully propagated the Communist Party line under the guise of being a religious journal." (Report of March 29, 1944, p. 48.)

A letterhead of the People's Institute of Applied Religion, dated April 9, 1942, named Channing H. Tobias as one of the sponsors of that organization. The United States Attorney General has cited the People's Institute as subversive and Communist. (Letters to Loyalty Review Board, released June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated pursuant to Executive Order 10450 in Attorney General memorandum of April 29, 1953.)

The Daily Worker of March 4, 1939 (p. 2) reported that Channing Tobias endorsed the fifth New York City Conference of the American League for Peace and Democracy; and a letterhead of the organization, dated June 12, 1939, showed him as a member of the executive board. The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as "The largest of the Communist front movements in the United States" and added, "The league contends publicly that it is not a Communist-front movement, yet at the very beginning Communists dominated it. Earl Browder was its vice president." (See Report of January 3, 1939, pp. 69–71 and March 29, 1944, p. 37; also cited in Reports, January 3, 1941, June 25, 1942, and January 2, 1943.) The Attorney General, in 1942, cited it as being established in 1937 "in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, pp. 7443–7444); and later, the Attorney General cited the ALPD as a subversive and Communist organization. (Letters to Loyalty Review Board, released June 1, 1948 and September 21, 1948; also redesignated in Attorney General memorandum, April 29, 1953.)

Identified as being from New York City, Channing H. Tobias was named as one of those who signed the January 1943 message of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties addressed to the United States House of Representatives (leaflet containing the message attached to an undated letterhead of the organization). He sponsored the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, June 7–9, 1940 in Washington, D. C., as shown by the call to the conference, in which source his address was shown as New York City. The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties has been cited as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party" (special Committee on Un-American Activities, Reports of March 29, 1944, p. 50; June 25, 1942, p. 20; and January 2, 1943, pp. 9 and 12); as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, astensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communist attempts to create sympathizers and supporters of their program" (Attorney General Biddle, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446); and as subversive and Communist (Attorney General letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; also redesignated April 29, 1953). The organization "was established as a result of a conference on constitutional liberties held in Washington, D. C., June 7–9, 1940." (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446, and the report of the special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944, p. 102.)

Dr. Channing H. Tobias, National Council, YMCA, was listed in the call for a New York State Conference on National Unity to be held in New York City, December 6, 1941, as a signed of the call. This conference was cited as a Communits front by the special Committee on Un-American Activities. (Report of March 29, 1944, p. 133.)

Dr. Tobias was shown as a sponsor of the United Nations in America dinner, April 17, 1943, in New York City, in the invitation to that dinner issued by the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. This organization was cited as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" by the special Committee on Un-American Activities (reports of March 29, 1944, p. 155, and June 25, 1942, p. 13), and as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (letters to Loyalty Review Board, released June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated, April 29, 1953).

The call to a Win-the-Peace Conference, an official letterhead of the conference, dated February 28, 1946, and the Daily Worker of March 5, 1946, listed Dr. Tobias as a sponsor. The National Committee To Win the Peace, which was formed at that conference in Washington, D. C., April 5–7, 1946, has been cited as a subversive and Communist organization by the Attorney General. (Letters to Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated by the Attorney General, April 29, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order 10450.)

On a letterhead dated August 6, 1945, the American Committee for Yugoslav Relief listed Dr. Channing H. Tobias as a member of its sponsors committee. The Attorney General has listed this organization as being subversive and Communist. (Letters to Loyalty Review Board, released June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated, April 29, 1953.)

The hearing before a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate on nomination of Channing H. Tobias to be Alternate Representative of the United States at Sixth General Assembly of the United Nations, shows Dr. Tobias testified as follows relative to some of the information outlined above:

"Now, gentlemen, I come directly to the question at issue. In the first place, let

me say that my political affiliations have been as follows: I have never supported other than the two major parties, Republican and Democratic; I have always been a political independent.

"So far as communism is concerned, in its ideology and as a system of government, it has always been repugnant to me for the very obvious reason that it is godless, and I am a Christian. It is at variance with the Christian religion in which I so firmly believe, and to which I have devoted my life.

"Now as to the charges that I had presented to me this morning, I want to be as frank as I can. There is a statement that the Daily Worker of March 4, 1939, reported that I had endorsed the Fifth New York City Conference of the American League for Peace and Democracy, and there are other committees like that that appear on the list.

"The answer is that in that day of hectic anxiety to win the war and to improve relationships among our people there were few people who were thinking about what might be the possible standing of these groups in the minds of American people. As one by one they have been debunked and their true purposes have been made known, I, along with all decent Americans, have withdrawn signatures and withdrawn from participation, which was very meager at the best. I make no wholesale denial concerning any of these. I may have given my signature for membership or for sponsorship. Most of them I do not recall except as names, and you must admit that they all had very good names, high-sounding names.

"SOUTHERN CONFERENCE FOR HUMAN WELFARE

"There are 1 or 2, however, that I recall, in which I had working relationships. First of all, reference is made to the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. I was a member of that group, because as it was organized and as it first operated, it had the support of some of the finest people in America. I do not need to call names. The record is available. The purpose as outlined and the work done by the New York committee challenged support of people of both races in New York until the time came when it was quite evident that some of its leaders were using it to enhance the party line. Then, along with others, I withdrew from affiliation with it.

"COUNCIL ON AFRICAN AFFAIRS

"The Council on African Affairs is mentioned, and I am very glad that that is mentioned, because it happens to be one of the few things on which I have a little documentation. I was a member of the Council on African Affairs from its beginning, because its director had been a faithful secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association. As a matter of fact, I had helped to bring him into association work and was instrumental in having him assigned during the First War to a field of service in Africa under a British command, and after that for 15 or 16 years, he served as a representative of the YMCA in South Africa. It was during his experience down there that he became embittered and came back home.

"He organized a group to try to bring the facts of African life before the public. We thought it worthwhile to do that. As the years passed by, it was quite evident that there was Communist infiltration and it got so strong that this young man, who had himself very largely followed the line against the advice of his best friends, was threatened with expulsion from the directorship of the council.

"There was a memorable meeting on February 3, 1948, a meeting at which I made a simple motion at the beginning, which resulted in a discussion that lasted 5 hours.

"Dr. Yergan, who had been the director of that organization and who is now so completely convinced of the treachery of the Communist leadership and its program, is being used by loyalty organizations that find him helpful in exposing those treacheries. He was up for expulsion. A group of us * * * tried to wrest the organization from the hands of that group.

"I made a motion at the very beginning that the simple statement that had been made after the Department of Justice declared the group subversive, that it was neither Communist, Fascist, nor subversive, a very simple statement, be made declaring the sentiment of the council. That motion was never put.

"After 5 hours of wrangling and delaying tactics, common to the group that was then in the ascendency of the council, I arose and offered my resignation, and said that I could no longer have any part with the group when it was quite plain what was happening there." (Pp. 9 and 10.)

At this point in the hearing (pp. 11–13), Dr. Tobias quoted from an article in the New York Times of February 4, 1948, headed, "Tobias Firm in Stand Opposing Leftists," and a similar article in the New York World-Telegram of the same date; and the articles were entered in the record together with one from the New York World-Telegram of October 13, 1948, headed, "Dr. Yergan Denounces Commies as Wreckers." Then testimony was continued:

"PROTESTANT MAGAZINE

"Dr. TOBIAS. Reference is made here to the Protestant magazine. I am glad that it is here. This is a magazine that was founded a few years ago by Mr. Kenneth Leslie, who I did not know at the time. He sent a sample copy of it which seemed to be legitimate, or furnished the material for a legitimate organ of Protestantism. He asked for my signature, and, if you will look at any copy of that magazine and view the names of those who agreed to serve on the advisory board, you will see a practical who's who of the Protestant ministry of this country. They believed at the beginning that it was legitimate. Pretty soon it showed that it was not, and when that came out, along with others * * * I wrote and asked that my name be left off of all communications and off the published list of advisers of the committee. A principal reason for my disgust with it was that I found after a short while that it was definitely meant for one purpose, and that was to sound an anti-Catholic note. I am a Protestant but I am interfaith believer. * * *

"So that connection with that was connection with something that, at the beginning we regarded as legitimate, and found out was not, and when we found out that it was not, discontinued relationships.

"PEOPLE'S INSTITUTE OF APPLIED RELIGION

"There is mention here of the People's Institute of Applied Religion. Many of us were taken in on that. It was largely on the ground of the fact that a man by the name of Claude Williams published a book of his struggles and hardships in the South, in the interest of race relationships.

"At the beginning it looked like a perfectly worthwhile movement. I gave it some support, made contributions to it, until I found out that it was plainly being dominated by leftists and I had no more to do with it and have had no more to do with that or any of the rest of these organizations that are referred to here.

"I mention those because I happen to know what the record is about them. As I have said, many of the others I have no recollection of except as names, and I am perfectly willing to answer questions, but I want to say this final word before I have finished, and I want to put this into the record also. It is a little difficult when one gets attacked from the right and left to know the answer. I never read the Daily Worker, never have read it, but a friend of mine put this copy of it into my hands, and I want to read from it. This was on Thursday, January 25, 1951:

"'Six prominent Negroes have taken it upon themselves to attempt to mobilize the Negro people behind the war program of Wall Street and Washington. They are * * * Channing H. Tobias, only United States Negro director of a Wall Street bank, and one of the two Negro directors of a Wall Street cartel set up to exploit Liberian resources and peoples; * * * With the exception of Dr. Mays, these individuals have long been go-betweens through whom the billionaires who own and run the United States try to lead and control the main organization of Negro struggle.'

"I want that, Mr. Chairman, included in the record.

"Senator SPARKMAN. Without objection, it will be done" (pp. 14 and 15).

Dr. Tobias concluded his statement with this paragraph:

"I want to say in all frankness and candor that whether or not I go on this delegation is not too important. What is important, however, is whether or not 15,000,000 loyal Negro Americans get the impression that its leadership is being crucified because of innuendoes, allegations, and associations. The answer to that question is more important than any word that I could possibly say at Paris.

"Thank you" (p. 16).

During the questioning which followed his statement, Dr. Tobias testified, "I have never been, am not now, a member of the Communist Party" (p. 23). In answer to a question on the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties he replied: "That is also a name organization. I happened to know the principal leader in that. That was Mr. George Marshall who was a brother of James Marshall, of the Board of Education of New York, and the son of the late Louis Marshall. Other than that, I know nothing about it. I had no activity in it whatever" (p. 25).

Regarding the American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born, Dr. Tobias said, "That is also just a name," that he had no other activity in it other than joining in the invitation of sponsoring a dinner, that he did not know at the time it was subversive, and added: "The very fact that it was supposed to be interested in foreign-born citizens—I was interested in them, too, and assumed that it was a good cause" (p. 25).

When questioned about the Win-the-Peace Conference and the New York State Conference on National Unity, Dr. Tobias answered that he knew nothing about either and did not remember them. However, he replied to questions on the American Committee for Yugoslav Relief: "Yes; I remember that. They gave a dinner at which Mrs. Roosevelt, I think, was one of the principal speakers. Everybody was interested in trying to help that cause at that time. * * * I don't know whether it has been placed on the subversive list or not, but at that time it was regarded as a perfectly respectable organization. * * * I don't remember membership in it at all. Sponsorship, I think is all" (from pp. 26 and 27).

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Allan Knight Chalmers, national treasurer, member of the board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

In connection with his public testimony on August 17 and 18, 1937, before the special

Committee on Un-American Activities, Mr. Walter S. Steele furnished additional information which was printed in the hearings following his testimony and from which the reference below is taken:

"A good example of one of the united fronts in the United States is the Scottsboro Defense Committee * * *. The national chairman of this committee is the Reverend Allan Knight Chalmers, head of the Church League for Industrial Democracy; member of the advisory board of the National Religion and Labor Foundation; executive committee of the War Registers League; sponsor of the Emergency Peace Campaign, and a member of the sponsoring committee for the testimonial dinner given in honor of Norman Thomas in 1936." (Public hearings, vol. 1, p. 628.)

Except for the Scottsboro Defense Committee, none of these organizations has been cited in any manner either by the Committee on Un-American Activities or the Attorney General of the United States. The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Scottsboro Defense Committee as a Communist-front organization in reports of January 3, 1939 (p. 82), and March 29, 1944 (p. 177).

Rev. Allan Knight Chalmers was listed among the sponsors of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights in the program of that conference held February 12, 1940. The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights as a Communist front which was succeeded by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (report of March 29, 1944, pp. 96, 129). The Committee on Un-American Activities cited it as being among a "maze of organizations" which were "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law" (report of September 2, 1947, p. 3).

A leaflet entitled "Protestantism Answers Hate" contains the name of Dr. Allan Knight Chalmers, Broadway Tabernacle, New York, in a list of sponsors of the call to a dinner forum in New York City, February 25, 1941, under auspices of Protestant Digest Associates. The Protestant Digest was cited by the special committee as "a magazine which has faithfully propagated the Communist Party line * * *." (Report 1311 of March 29, 1944.)

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Grace B. Fenderson, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The pamphlet, "For a New Africa" (p. 37), proceedings of the Conference on Africa held under auspices of the Council on African Affairs, April 14, 1944, named Mrs. Grace B. Fenderson as a conference participant.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Council on African Affairs as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Willard S. Townsend, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

One Willard Townsend was a signer of a plea for the release of Earl Browder from prison, according to an advertisement which appeared in the Washington Post, March 12, 1942. He was identified as international president of the United Transport Service Employees of America (CIO).

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: A. Philip Randolph, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Daily Worker of September 12, 1950 (p. 2), reported that A. Philip Randolph, president, AFL Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, opposed the jailing of the Communist leaders.

The Attorney General of the United States reported that A. Philip Randolph, president of the National Negro Congress, refused to run in April 1940 "on the ground that it was 'deliberately packed with Communists and Congress of Industrial Organizations members who were either Communists or sympathizers with Communists'" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688).

Walter S. Steele, in testimony in public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 21, 1947 (p. 92), referred to A. Philip Randolph as follows:

"A. Philip Randolph, one-time president of the National Negro Congress, resigned his position because of the Communist control thereof. At the time of his resignation, at a meeting held in Washington, D. C., he charged that the congress was controlled by the Communist Party, through which he found it was chiefly financed."

George K. Hunton testified in public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 13, 1949 (p. 451), concerning the Communist infiltration of the National Negro Congress with reference to A. Philip Randolph as follows:

"In the National Negro Congress they did make progress. That was a sound, constructive organization started about 10 years ago. It was a good organization, with a sound, constructive program, and the Commies moved in, and within a year and a half the white Communist members completely outnumbered the Negro members and took over. Be it said to his credit that the then president, A. Philip Randolph, roundly denounced them and then resigned, and said no longer would the National Negro Congress represent the feeling of the Negro people who organized it * * *."

Manning Johnson testified in public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 14, 1949, as follows concerning the National Negro Congress and A. Philip Randolph:

"Mr. TAVENNER. What was the relationship of that commission (Negro Commission of the Communist Party) to the American Negro Labor Congress, the League of Struggle for Negro Rights, and the National Negro Congress?

"Mr. JOHNSON. The Negro League was formed by the Communist Party, and its program was identical with the program of the Communist Party for the Negro.

"The majority of members of the American Negro Labor Congress were Communists or fellow-travelers. It was a very narrow, sectarian organization, and the party decided to change its name and broaden its activities, so the name was changed to the League of Struggle for Negro Rights. * * *

"The League of Struggle for Negro Rights was never successful in penetrating any broad sections of the Negro people. It remained a very narrow and sectarian organization. So the party, after having received the open letter, which was really drawn in Moscow and called for breaking away from narrow organizations, in line with this open letter, at a meeting of the national committee which, as I recall, was in the latter part of 1934 or early part of 1935, we discussed the general situation among Negroes, and the conclusion was that there was considerable unrest among them and that the time was historically right for the formation of a broad and all-inclusive organization.

"As a result of that discussion and that conclusion, the national committee of the party, upon the recommendation of one of the members of the Negro commission present at that meeting, decided to set up the National Negro Congress. The national committee gave James W. Ford the responsibility, along with the Negro commission of the national committee, to form that congress.

"We were fishing around for someone to head the congress, and we found there was no finer person to get who was not a member of the party than A. Philip Randolph. He was approached and agreed.

* * * * *

"The third—and fatal—National Negro Congress was held in Washington, D. C. The Communists had become so drunk with power, and they felt they had such strong control over the congress, that they thought they could walk roughshod over the liberals, and they antagonized A. Philip Randolph and he began to fight James W. Ford and others.

"James W. Ford and others insisted I fight A. Philip Randolph, and I refused to do so, and at that time I predicted they were on the road to breaking up the congress.

"The fight widened to such an extent that Randolph began to speak openly against Communist domination. I used to wonder how Randolph could be so naive as to not know it was a Communist-front organization.

"Before the third congress met, we got wind that Randolph was going to resign. We had Communists go to that congress representing various paper organizations so as to give them control in voting.

"When Randolph saw the congress was packed with Communists, Randolph resigned and walked out * * *." (Pp. 510–512.)

A. Philip Randolph supported a statement to Congress issued by the American League Against War and Fascism against neutrality measures as reported by the Daily Worker of February 27, 1937 (p. 2). The Daily Worker of April 22, 1938 (p. 2), reported that A. Philip Randolph was one of the signers of a letter urging open hearings on the neutrality act which was sent to Congress under auspices of the American League for Peace and Democracy. A. Philip Randolph was nominated as a member of the National Labor Committee of the American League for Peace and Democracy at the American Congress for Peace and Democracy held in Washington, D. C., January 6–8, 1939, as shown by the pamphlet, "7½ Million * * *" (p. 32). Lettersheads of the China Aid Council of the American League for Peace and Democracy dated May 18, 1938, and June 11, 1938, name him as a sponsor of the council. He was a sponsor of the Easter drive of the China Aid Council of the American League * * *, as shown by the Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 2). A photostatic copy of a letterhead of

the American League for Peace and Democracy dated April 6, 1939 listed A. Phillip Randolph as a national sponsor of that organization.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the American League Against War and Fascism as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front organization (in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 53), cited the American League Against War and Fascism as "organized at the First United States Congress Against War which was held in New York City, September 29 to October 1, 1933. Four years later at Pittsburgh, November 26–28, 1937, the name of the organization was changed to the American League for Peace and Democracy. * * * It remained as completely under the control of Communists when the name was changed as it had been before."

The Attorney General cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Attorney General cited the group previously as established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism "in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union. * * * The American League for Peace and Democracy * * * was designed to conceal Communist control, in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, pp. 7442–7473). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 69–71), cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as "the largest of the Communist-front movements in the United States."

A letter head of the organization, Commonwealth College, dated January 1, 1940, listed A. Philip Randolph as a member of the National Advisory Committee. He endorsed the reorganization plan of Commonwealth College, as shown by the August 15. 1937, issue of Fortnightly, a publication of the college (p. 3).

The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited Commonwealth College as a Communist enterprise in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 76 and 167). The Attorney General cited the Commonwealth College as Communist in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

An undated leaflet of the League for Mutual Aid listed A. Philip Randolph as a member of the executive committee of that organization. He was a guest of honor at the 17the annual dinner of the League for Mutual Aid held February 1, 1937, as shown by New Masses, January 26, 1937 (p. 37).

The League for Mutual Aid was cited as a Communist enterprise by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 76).

A. Philip Randolph was a sponsor of the Medical Bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy, as shown by letterheads of the organization dated July 6, 1938, and February 2, 1939. The Daily Worker of June 2, 1938 (p. 5), reported that A. Philip Randolph was a supporter of a meeting of the Medical Bureau * * *.

"In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for in support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations." Among these was the Medical Bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy. (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 82.)

New Masses for October 26, 1937 (p. 11), reported that A. Philip Randolph was chairman of the National Negro Congress. A. Philip Randolph was president of the National Negro Congress, as shown by the Daily Worker of January 1, 1938 (p. 4), January 13, 1938 (p. 3), April 19, 1938 (p. 3), and the pamphlet, Second National Negro Congress, October 1937. He was president of the Third National Negro Congress, as reported by the June 1940 issue of the Communist (p. 548). The official proceedings of the 1936 National Negro Congress (p. 41), listed A. Philip Randolph as a member of the national executive council of the organization. He spoke at a gathering of the congress, as reported by the Daily Worker of March 8, 1938 (p. 3). The Daily Worker of February 15, 1938 (p. 7), reported that A. Philip Randolph contributed to the official proceedings of the Second National Negro Congress.

The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front group (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes * * *."

A. Philip Randolph was a consultant of the Panel on Citizenship and Civil Liberties of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, as shown by an official report of the organization, dated April 19–21, 1942. The call to the second conference, Southern Conference for Human Welfare, April 14–16, 1940, listed A. Philip Randolph as a sponsor of that conference.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p 147), cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist front which received money from the Robert Marshall Foundation, one of the principal sources of funds by which many Communist fronts operate. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 12, 1947, cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist-front organization "which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South" although its "professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States."

The Daily Worker, issues of March 28, 1938 (p. 3) and April 4, 1938 (p. 3), listed A. Philip Randolph as a sponsor of the World Youth Congress. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 183), cited the World Youth Congress as a Communist conference held in the summer of 1938 at Vassar College.

A. Philip Randolph signed a petition of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy to lift the arms embargo as shown by the Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 4). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 82), cited the American Friends of Spanish Democracy as follows: "In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations * * * such as * * * American Friends of Spanish Democracy."

A. Philip Randolph is listed as a sponsor on a letterhead of the American Relief Ship for Spain dated September 3, 1938. The American Relief Ship for Spain was cited as "one of the several Communist Party front enterprises which raised funds for Loyalist Spain (or rather raised funds for the Communist end of that civil war)." (Special Committee on Un-American Activities Report, March 29, 1944, p. 102.)

The proceedings of the Congress of Youth of the American Youth Congress, July 1–5, 1939 (p. 3), listed A. Philip Randolph as a signer of the call to the congress.

A. Phillip Randolph was a sponsor of the Conference on Pan-American Democracy (letterhead, November 16, 1938). The booklet, These American Say, published by the Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo, named him as a representative individual. He was a sponsor of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights (program of conference, February 12, 1940).

The Conference on Pan-American Democracy (known also as Council for Pan-American Democracy) was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 161 and 164), cited the organization as a Communist front which defended Carlos Luiz Prestes, a Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 137 and 138), cited the Coordinating Committee To Lift the (Spanish) Embargo as one of a number of front organizations set up during the Spanish civil war by the Communist Party in the United States and through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation.

The Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights was cited as a Communist front which was succeeded by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (special committee report, March 29, 1944, pp. 96 and 129). The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights among a "maze of organizations" which were "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general, but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law."

A. Philip Randolph was a sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign, as shown by the back cover of a pamphlet, Children in Concentration Camps. He signed the call to a United May Day conference, according to the Daily Worker of March 17, 1937 (p. 4). An undated letterhead of the United May Day Committee listed him as chairman.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Spanish Refugee Campaign as a Communist-front organization (report, January 3, 1940, p. 9).

The United May Day conference was cited as "engineered by the Communist Party for its 1937 May Day demonstrations" and also organized by the party in 1938 (special committee report, March 29, 1944, pp. 124 and 139).

The Attorney General cited the United May Day Committee as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U. S. A., which seeks "to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means." (Letter released December 4, 1947; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.)

The Daily Worker of January 23, 1937 (p. 3), announced that A. Philip Randolph was scheduled to speak at the Southern Negro Youth Congress, Richmond, Va., February 12–14. "The People Versus H. C. L." listed him as a sponsor of the Consumers National Federation. He was shown as a sponsor of the Public Use of Arts Committee on an undated letterhead of that organization.

The Southern Negro Youth Congress was cited as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U. S. A., which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means. (Attorney General, letter released December 4, 1947; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on April 1, 1954, consolidated list.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1940 (p. 9), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 17, 1947 (p. 14), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as "surreptitiously controlled" by the Young Communist League.

The Consumers National Federation was cited as a Communist-front group by the special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155).

Public Use of the Arts Committee was cited as a Communist front by the special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 112).

Subject: T. G. Nutter, national vice president, member of national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The call to the National Negro Congress, Chicago, Ill., February 14, 1936, listed T. G. Nutter, Charleston, W. Va., as an endorser.

The National Negro Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General, April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Attorney General cited the group previously as a Communist front as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 88, part 6, page 7447. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in the report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes."

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: L. Pearl Mitchell, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Daily Worker of April 18, 1936 (p. 3), named L. Pearl Mitchell, identified as national director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, as chairman of a committee for a benefit dance which was held by the Joint Scottsboro Defense Committee, Cleveland, Ohio, for the purpose of raising money to be sent to New York.

The Scottsboro Defense Committee was cited as a Communist front by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in its reports of January 3, 1939 (p. 82); and March 29, 1944 (p. 177).

Miss L. Pearl Mitchell, of Cleveland, Ohio, was one of the endorsers of the National Negro Congress, as shown by the call for National Negro Congress, Chicago, Ill., February 14, 1936.

The National Negro Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included in the Attorney General's consolidated list of April 1, 1954.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities stated that "the officers of the National Negro Congress are outspoken Communist sympathizers, and a majority of those on the executive board are outright Communists" (special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, January 3, 1939, p. 81; also cited, reports, January 3, 1940, p. 9; June 25, 1942, p. 20; March 29, 1944, p. 180; and included in the Attorney General's consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Eric Johnston, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

On March 27, 1947, Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Association of America, appeared before this committee as a witness in public hearings on H. R. 1884 and H. R. 2122, bills to curb or outlaw the Communist Party of the United States (Committee on Un-American Activities, hearings and reports, vol. 1, pp. 288–307).

On October 27, 1947, Eric Allen Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, again appeared as a witness before the committee in public hearings regarding Communist infiltration of the motion-picture industry (committee hearings and reports, vol. 1, pp. 305–328).

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Bishop W. J. Walls, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

As shown in Soviet Russia Today for December 1942 (p. 42), W. J. Walls was a sponsor of the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship. He was named as a sponsor of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship on a letterhead of the group dated March 13, 1946, and a memorandum issued by the organization March 18, 1946.

The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954); the special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Council * * * (in a report dated March 29, 1944) as having been "in recent months, the principal front" of the Communist Party.

Bishop W. J. Walls, Chicago, Ill. supported the National Negro Congress, as shown in the Daily Worker of February 3, 1936 (p. 2). The National Negro Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954); the Attorney General had previously cited the National Negro Congress as "sponsored and supported by the Communist Party" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447). The special committee cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes" (report of January 3, 1939; also cited in reports of January 3, 1940; January 3, 1941; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944).

A petition to the United Nations, drafted and circulated by the Council on African Affairs, contained the signature of Bishop W. J. Walls, according to the Daily Worker of June 5, 1950 (p. 4). The Attorney General cited the council as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

Bishop Walls also signed a statement of the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt (anti-Communist) Bill, according to the Daily Worker of April 3, 1950 (p. 4). The national committee * * * was cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as "a registered lobbying organization which has carried out the objectives of the Communist Party in its fight against antisubversive legislation" (report of the Committee on Un-American Activities on the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill, released December 7, 1950).

Identified as secretary of the board of bishops, A. M. E. Zion Church, Bishop W. J. Walls was named as having endorsed the World Peace Appeal (undated leaflet received by the committee September 11, 1950), and the Daily Worker of August 14, 1950 (p. 2). The World Peace Appeal was cited as a petition campaign launched by the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress at its meeting in Stockholm, March 16–19, 1950; as having "received the enthusiastic approval of every section of the international Communist hierarchy"; as having been lauded in the Communist press, putting "every individual Communist on notice that he 'has the duty to rise to this appeal'"; and as having "received the official endorsement of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. * * *" (report of the Committee on Un-American Activities on the Communist Peace Offensive, April 1, 1951).

Bishop Walls was one of the sponsors of the American Sponsoring Committee for Representation at the World Peace Congress, as shown on a mimeographed letter of December 1, 1950; he was a delegate to the World Peace Congress, as shown in the Daily Worker of November 7, 1950 (p. 2); he signed a protest made by the American Sponsoring Committee for Representation at the World Peace Congress (Daily People's World of November 20, 1950, p. 2). The protest was made against exclusion by the British Government of more than 50 Americans, five-sixths of the United States delegation to the World Peace Congress. In the latter two sources, he was identified as secretary of the board of bishops of A. M. E. Zion Church.

The World Peace Congress was cited as a Communist front among the "peace conferences" which "have been organized under Communist initiative in various countries throughout the world as part of a campaign against the North Atlantic Defense Pact" (report of the Committee on Un-American Activities dated April 1, 1951).

According to the Daily Worker of October 28, 1949 (p. 2), Bishop W. J. Walls, of Chicago, endorsed Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., Communist, and urged his reelection to the New York City Council. Benjamin J. Davis was 1 of the 11 leaders of the Communist Party on trial.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: John Haynes Holmes, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Rev. John Haynes Holmes was shown to be a member of the advisory board of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born on a letterhead of the organization dated April 27, 1938, on a letterhead dated January 1940, and in the call to the third annual conference. The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States (letters to Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" (report, March 29, 1944, p. 155; also cited in report, June 25, 1942, p. 13).

In a bulletin, Spot News (p. 1), John Haynes Holmes was listed as a sponsor of the American Committee to Save Refugees, which was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, March 29, 1944 (pps. 49, 112, 129, 133, 138, 167, 180).

A letterhead dated November 18, 1936, showed John Haynes Holmes to be a member of the general committee of the medical bureau, American Friends of Spanish Democracy. "New Masses" (January 5, 1937, p. 31) also listed John Haynes Holmes as a member of the general committee of that organization. "In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations * * * such as * * * American Friends of Spanish Democracy" (special committee on Un-American Activities, report, March 29, 1944, p. 82).

The Daily Worker (January 11, 1937, p. 2) reported that John Haynes Holmes was a sponsor of the New York City Conference Against War and Fascism. The Daily Worker (February 23, 1938, p. 2) reported that he signed a letter which was sponsored by the American League for Peace and Democracy. A contribution from him appeared in Fight (September 1935, p. 2), a magazine published by the American League Against War and Fascism; he was identified as minister, Community Church, New York. The following is quoted from an editorial comment on the article:

"In a recent sermon Dr. Holmes made an eloquent appeal for unity of Christians and Communists in opposition to the forces of reaction driving toward war and fascism, and in struggle for the achievement of a better world based on brotherhood and cooperation among men.

"If churchmen will unite with Communists, Socialists, trade unionists and everyone else opposed to war and fascism, our forces will be tremendously strengthened, and war and fascism will not be inevitable. Already the American League Against War and Fascism has brought together in its ranks people of diverse political and religious beliefs, liberals, radicals and revolutionists, of all races and creeds * * *.

"The American League Against War and Fascism was organized at the First United States Congress Against War which was held in New York City, September 29 to October 1, 1933. Four years later at Pittsburgh, November 26–28, 1937, the name of the organization was changed to the American League for Peace and Democracy. There was, however, no fundamental change in the character of the organization. It remained as completely under the control of Communists when the name was changed as it had been before" (special committee report, March 29, 1944, p. 53; also cited in reports, January 3, 1939, pp. 69 and 121; January 3, 1940, p. 10; June 25, 1942, p. 14). The Attorney General of the United States cited the league as subversive and Communist (letters to Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The Attorney General cited it as a "Communist-front organization" in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942 (p. 10) and said it was "established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7442).

The Daily Worker (September 24, 1940, p. 5) reported that an open letter sponsored by the Communist Party and the American Civil Liberties Union, demanding discharge of Communist Party defendants in Fulton and Livingston counties, was signed by John Haynes Holmes.

The Daily Worker of February 13, 1937 (p. 2), reported that "aroused by the Fascist tactics displayed by the Brazilian Government in its treatment of hundreds of political prisoners held without trial since November 1935, outstanding among them Luiz Carlos Prestes, leader of the liberation movement of the Brazilian people, and Arthur Ewert, ex-deputy in the German Reichstag, outstanding Americans have signed their names to a cable of protest forwarded to President Vargas of Brazil." Among those named as signers was Dr. John Haynes Holmes, Community Church. A letterhead dated November 16, 1938, of the conference on Pan American Democracy, listed John Haynes Holmes as a sponsor. The Attorney General cited this organization as subversive and Communist (letters to Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as a Communist front which defended Carlos Luiz Prestes, a Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International (report, March 29, 1944, pp. 161 and 164; also cited in report, June 25, 1942, p. 18).

The Daily Worker of February 13, 1939 (p. 2), reported that Dr. John Haynes Holmes was a member of the Descendants of the American Revolution. The Daily Worker (January 21, 1938, p. 2), also referred to him as a sponsor and as a member of the advisory board of that organization. A pamphlet, Descendants of the American Revolution (back page), listed him as a member of the advisory board of the organization. The special committee (report, June 25, 1942, pp. 18 and 19) cited the Descendants of the American Revolution as "a Communist-front organization set up as a radical imitation of the Daughters of the American Revolution. The descendants have uniformly adhered to the line of the Communist Party. * * * The educational director * * * is one Howard Solzam, an instructor at the Communist Party's Workers School in New York."

A program of the conference (February 12, 1940), named John Haynes Holmes as a sponsor of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights. This conference was cited by the special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front which was succeeded by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (report, March 29, 1944, pp. 96 and 129). It was also cited by the congressional Committee on Un-American Activities (report No. 1115, September 2, 1947, p. 3).

An open letter to the United States Senate, initiated and distributed by the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, in protest of the Dempsey deportation bill and the McCormack rider attached to the Walter espionage bill, was signed by the Reverend John Haynes Holmes (photostat of open letter). "It will be remembered that during the days of the infamous Soviet-Nazi Pact, the Communists built protective organizations known as the National Emergency Conference, the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, which culminated in the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties" (Committee on Un-American Activities, report No. 1115, September 2, 1947, p. 12). The special committee cited the National Emergency Conference * * * as a Communist front in the report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 48 and 102).

The Daily Worker of February 8, 1939 (p. 7), reported that John Haynes Holmes was contributor to a booklet published by the League of American Writers. The league was cited as a Communist-front organization in three reports of the special committee (report, January 3, 1940, p. 9; June 25, 1942, p. 19; March 29, 1944, p. 48). It was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (letters to Loyalty Review Board, released June 1, and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954). Previously, the Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7445) stated that the overt activities of the league "leave little doubt of its Communist control."

An undated letterhead listed John Haynes Holmes as a sponsor of the New York Tom Mooney Committee, which was cited as a Communist front by the special committee (report, March 29, 1944, p. 154).

An undated leaflet published by the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder named Dr. John Haynes Holmes, Community Church, New York City, among those who appealed to President Roosevelt for justice in the Browder case. The Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder was cited as Communist by the United States Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447; letter to Loyalty Review Board, released April 27, 1949; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954). "When Earl Browder (then general secretary, Communist Party) was in Atlanta Penitentiary serving a sentence involving his fraudulent passports, the Communist Party's front which agitated for his release was known as the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder * * * (special committee report, March 29, 1944).

Soviet Russia Today for December 1933 (p. 17) listed John Haynes Holmes among the endorsers of the National Committee, Friends of the Soviet Union. A pamphlet issued by the Friends of the Soviet Union entitled "Welcome! 'Land of Soviets' Moscow-New York 1929" listed John Haynes Holmes as a member of the Reception Committee for the Soviet Flyers. The Attorney General cited Friends of the Soviet Union as Communist (letters to Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The special committee cited it as "one of the most open Communist fronts in the United States" whose purpose "is to propagandize for and defend Russia and its system of government" (report, January 3, 1939, p. 78).

Rev. John Haynes Holmes, New York, N. Y., was shown to be a sponsor of the Mid-Century Conference for Peace on the call to that conference. The conference was cited by this committee at a meeting held in Chicago, May 29 and 30, 1950, by the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact and as having been "aimed at assembling as many gullible persons as possible under Communist direction and turning them into

a vast sounding board for Communist propaganda" (report 378, April 25, 1951, p. 58).

A letterhead dated March 16, 1937, listed John Haynes Holmes as a member of the National People's Committee Against Hearst, cited by the special Committee on Un-American Activities as a subsidiary organization of the American League for Peace and Democracy, which was described on page 2 of this report (report, June 25, 1942, p. 16).

A letterhead dated March 20, 1926, listed Rev. John Haynes Holmes as a member of the advisory board of Russian Reconstruction Farms, Inc., cited by the special committee as a Communist enterprise which was directed by Harold Ware, son of the well-known Communist Ella Reeve Bloor (report, March 29, 1944, p. 76).

New Masses for March 31, 1936 (p. 2) named John Haynes Holmes as a member of the League for Mutual Aid, cited as a Communist enterprise by the special committee (report, March 29, 1944, p. 76).

According to the Daily Worker of February 16, 1948 (p. 16) Rev. John Haynes Holmes signed a statement to the mayor and city council in behalf of Simon Gerson, a Communist. An advertisement in the New York Times (February 19, 1948, p. 13), listed him as a supporter of the Citizens Committee To Defend Representative Government, supporting the seating of Gerson.

The following was reported in the Daily Worker on September 22, 1948 (p. 5): "Professor Ralph Sarton Perry of Harvard University released yesterday the names of 93 prominent educators, churchmen, and inidviduals in other cultural fields, who have formed a committee of welcome for the Very Reverend Hewlett Johnson, D. D., dean of Canterbury Cathedral. Dean Johnson had been invited to visit the United States by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship for a countrywide tour under its auspices. A visa was refused him on the ground that the sponsoring organization was on the Attorney General's list. The Committee of Welcome had extended to Dean Johnson an invitation to come to the United States under its independent auspice in November and December of this year and to speak at public gatherings." The article named Dr. John Haynes Holmes, minister, the Community Church, New York, among the members of the committee.

The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (letters to Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The special committee cited the National Council * * * as "the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian" (report, March 29, 1944, p. 156).

The Daily Worker of February 19, 1951 (p. 2) reported that Rev. John Haynes Holmes was a signer of a statement addressed to the Attorney General, urging withdrawal of contempt of Congress proceedings against a number of persons who had been indicted for refusing to answer questions before congressional committees.

The Daily People's World of August 1, 1951 (p. 2) reported that Rev. John Haynes Holmes endorsed a statement attacking the Smith Act, which was anti-Communist legislation. It was reported in the Daily Worker of January 15, 1953 (p. 8) that Rev. John Haynes Holmes, minister-emeritus, the Community Church of New York, signed a letter to President Truman asking for amnesty for 11 leaders of the Communist Party arrested under the Smith Act.

In testimony before this committee on July 7, 1953, Benjamin Gitlow, former member of the Communist Party, said: "Before the creation of the front organizations, the ministers who carried out the instructions of the Communist Party or collaborated with it were limited in numbers. The outstanding ones among them were * * * Rev. John Haynes Holmes * * *" (Communist Activities in the New York Area, p. 2077).

The Daily Worker of January 1, 1953 (p. 1), reported that Rev. John Haynes Holmes signed a petition for clemency for the Rosenbergs. The same newspaper on January 13, 1953 (p. 2) published a list of "the clergymen of various faiths and other religious leaders who have urged President Truman to use his power of clemency to save the lives of Ethel and Julius Rosenberg." The name of Dr. John Haynes Holmes, New York, appeared on the list. The Rosenbergs had been convicted of conspiracy to commit espionage and sentenced to death.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Mary McLeod Bethune, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Washington Post and Times Herald, May 19, 1955 (p. 20), reported that Mary McLeod Bethune, founder of the National Council of Negro Women and president emeritus, Bethune-Cookman College, died on May 18, 1955, at her home in Daytona Beach, Fla., at the age of 79.

The name of Mary McLeod Bethune appeared on the honor roll of Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, as published in the Sunday Worker of March 9, 1947 (p. 7); Elizabeth Gurley Flynn is one of the few outstanding women leaders of the Communist Party in this country.

A photostat of a letterhead of the American Committee for Yugoslav Relief dated August 6, 1945, listed Mrs. Mary McLeod Bethune as a member of the Sponsors Committee of the organization.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the American Committee for Yugoslav Relief, Inc., as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the American Slav Congress, June 26, 1949 (p. 78), cited the American Committee for Yugoslav Relief, Inc., as a Communist front which "was actively supported by the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party, United States of America."

A pamphlet entitled "7½ Million * * *" (p. 34), released by the American League for Peace and Democracy, lists the name of Mrs. Bethune as a member of the national committee of that organization; a letterhead of the organization, dated July 12, 1939, and a photostat of a letterhead of the Baltimore division of the group dated May 18, 1939 furnished the same information. "Fight" magazine for March 1939 (p. 3), and letterheads of the league dated March 24, 1939, and April 6, 1939 (photostat), name Mrs. Bethune as vice chairman of the league.

The Attorney General cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism "in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union * * *." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7442). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 69–71), cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as "the largest of the Communist-front movements in the United States. * * * The league contends publicly that it is not a Communist-front movement, yet at the very beginning Communists dominated it. Earl Browder was its vice president."

Mrs. Bethune was a sponsor of the Win-the-Peace Conference, as shown on a letterhead of that group dated February 28, 1946, the Daily Worker of March 5, 1946, and "A Call to a Win-the-Peace Conference" in the National Press Building, Washington, D. C., April 5–7, 1946; she was vice chairman of the national committee, New York Committee to Win the Peace, according to a letterhead of that group dated June 1, 1946, and the New York Committee Call to Win-the-Peace Conference, June 28–29, 1946.

The National Committee to Win the Peace was organized at the Win-the-Peace Conference in Washington, D. C., April 5–7, 1946, and was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

Letterheads of the Civil Rights Congress, dated March 4, 1948, and May 7, 1948, list the name of Mrs. Bethune as vice chairman of the congress; she signed the call to the national conference which was held in Chicago, as shown in the Daily Worker of October 21, 1947 (p. 5); and was one of the sponsors of a meeting of the group, according to the Daily Worker of Janauary 19, 1949 (p. 10), in which source she was identified as president, National Council of Negro Women.

The Attorney General cited Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (pp. 2 and 19), cited the Civil Rights Congress as an organization formed in April 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties); "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party," and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it."

In a report on the American Slav Congress, released by this committee April 26, 1950, the organization was cited as "a Moscow inspired and directed federation of Communist-dominated organizations seeking by methods of propaganda and pressure to subvert the 10 million people in this country of Slavic birth or descent." The Attorney General cited the American Slav Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. Mrs. Bethune was one of the sponsors of a testimonial dinner which was held in New York City, October 12, 1947, under the auspices of the American Slav Congress (invitation issued by the congress; and the printed program, p. 2).

The Daily People's World of April 20, 1944 (p. 3), reported that Mrs. Bethune was one of the sponsors of the American Youth for Democracy club; on a program of the dinner celebrating the first anniversary of the American Youth for Democracy, October 16, 1944, Mrs. Bethune was named also as a sponsor of the group (see program, Salute to Young America Committee).

The Attorney General cited the American Youth for Democracy as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Special Committee

on Un-American Activities cited the American Youth for Democracy as the new name under which the Young Communist League operates and which also largely absorbed the American Youth Congress (Report, March 29, 1944, p. 102). The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 17, 1947, cited the American Youth for Democracy as a front formed in October 1943 to succeed the Young Communist League and for the purpose of exploiting to the advantage of a foreign power the idealism, inexperience, and craving to join which is characteristic of American college youth. Its "high-sounding slogans" cover "a determined effort to disaffect our youth and to turn them against religion, the American home, against the college authorities, and against the American Government itself."

Mrs. Bethune signed the call to the Congress of Youth which was the fifth national gathering of the American Youth Congress, held in New York City, July 1-5, 1939 (from the proceedings of the congress, p. 2).

The Attorney General cited the American Youth Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 7, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as "controlled by Communists and manipulated by them to influence the thought of American youth" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7444; also cited in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 25, 1942 (p. 16), cited the American Youth Congress as "one of the principal fronts of the Communist Party."

Mrs. Bethune was a member of the advisory board of the Southern Negro Youth Congress (letterheads of the organization dated June 12, 1947, and August 11, 1947; and a page from a leaflet published by the organization).

The Southern Negro Youth Congress has been cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of January 3, 1940 (p. 9); and as "surreptitiously controlled" by the Young Communist League (Committee on Un-American Activities, report 271, released April 17, 1947, p. 14). The Attorney General cited the group as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, United States of America, which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means (letterhead of December 4, 1947; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list).

A pamphlet of the Council on African Affairs entitled "Seeing Is Believing," which was published in 1947, named Mrs. Bethune as a member of the council; she participated in a conference of the council, according to the pamphlet, "For a New Africa" (p. 36), also published by the organization. She sent greetings to the National Negro Congress, October 1937, as shown in the proceedings of the congress; she also participated in the Conference on Africa, held in New York City, April 14, 1944 (pamphlet of the proceedings of the conference which was held under the joint auspices of the Council on African Affairs and the National Negro Congress).

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Council on African Affairs as subversive and Communist in letters released on December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

The National Negro Congress was cited by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist front (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes * * *."

The Daily Worker of February 8, 1939 (p. 2), published an appeal of the Negro People's Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy to lift the embargo on arms to Loyalist Spain; Mrs. Bethune was shown as one of those who signed the appeal. The special committee cited the Negro People's Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy as a Communist-front organization in report 1311 of March 29, 1944. Mrs. Bethune issued an individual statement which was printed in the booklet, "These Americans say: 'Lift the Embargo Against Republican Spain,'" which was compiled and published by the Coordinating Committee to Lift the (Spanish) Embargo, urging that "in the name of true neutrality, in the cause of world peace and democracy, lift the embargo (on the sale of arms to Spain)"; she sponsored the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign, as was shown in the pamphlet, "Children in Concentration Camps." The Coordinating Committee To Lift the (Spanish) Embargo was cited as one of a number of front organizations, set up during the Spanish Civil War by the Communist Party in the United States and through which the Party carried on a great deal of agitation (special committee in report 1311 of March 29, 1944). The Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign was cited as a Communist-front organization by the special committee in a report of January 3, 1940.

Mrs. Bethune was a sponsor of the National Emergency Conference (letterhead of the organization dated May 19, 1939); and a member of the board of sponsors of the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights (press release of the group dated February 23, 1940). She signed the 1943 message of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, addressed to the United States House of Representatives, as shown on a leaflet attached to an undated letterhead of that organization. Mrs. Bethune was a sponsor of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, as shown on the "Call to a Conference on Civil Rights, April 20-21, 1940" (p. 4), and on a letterhead of the group dated April 26, 1940.

"It will be remembered that during the days of the infamous Soviet-Nazi pact, the Communists built protective organizations known as the National Emergency Conference, the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, which culminated in the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties" (report 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities, released September 2, 1947); the three organizations were also cited by the special committee in report 1311 of March 29, 1944. The Attorney General cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program. (It) was established as a result of a conference on constitutional liberties held in Washington, D. C., June 7-9, 1940" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The Attorney General also cited the organization as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

The Washington Committee for Democratic Action was cited as an affiliate or local chapter of the National Federation "The program of the Washington Committee followed that of the National Federation. National Communist leaders have addressed its meetings, and conferences sponsored by it have been attended by representatives of prominent Communist-front organizations" (Attorney General, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447); the Attorney General also cited the group as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The special committee found that "when the American League for Peace and Democracy was dissolved in February 1940, its successor in Washington was the Washington Committee for Democratic Action. The latter was affiliated with the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties" (reports of June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944).

Mrs. Bethune was one of the sponsors of the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, as shown in Soviet Russia Today for December 1942 (p. 42); she spoke as a member of the women's panel of the congress, held in New York City, November 6, 7, 8, 1943, as shown by a photostat of the program. She participated in a meeting paying tribute to women of the United States of America and the U. S. S. R. held in Carnegie Hall, New York City, March 6, 1944, under the auspices of the committee of women, National Committee of American-Soviet Friendship ("Soviet Russia Today," March 1944, p. 35; and "New Masses" for February 29, 1944, p. 29); she was named as a sponsor and a member of the committee of women of the national council * * *, on the call to a conference of women of the United States of America and the U. S. S. R. in the postwar world on November 18, 1944, in the Commodore Hotel, New York City; a letterhead of the committee of women, national council * * * dated March 1, 1948, contains the name of Mrs. Bethune in the list of members; she was a member of the board of directors of the national council, as shown on letterheads of that organization dated February 8, 1946, and March 13, 1946, and a photostat of a letterhead dated January 10, 1945. An invitation to a luncheon, "Women of the United Nations," held under auspices of the committee of women of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, December 12, 1946, New York City, listed Mrs. Mary McLeod Bethune as a member. She was shown as a member of the national council on a report to the membership of the board and officers of the national council at the annual membership meeting, April 23, 1952.

In its report of March 29, 1944, the special committee cited the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as having been "in recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian." The Attorney General cited the national council as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, list.

A letter of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, opposing alien registration, carried the signature of Mary McLeod Bethune, as shown in the Daily Worker of November 23, 1939 (p. 3, columns 7-8); she was one of the sponsors of the fourth annual conference of the organization which was held in Washington, D. C., March 2-3, 1940 (as shown on a letterhead of the conference); a booklet entitled "The Registration of Aliens" which was prepared and published by the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, lists Mrs. Bethune as one of the sponsors of that organization.

The Attorney General cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States."

Mrs. Bethune was one of the sponsors of the League of Young Southerners which is the youth division of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, as shown on a letterhead dated August 13, 1940; she was named in The Southern Patriot, for December 1946, as a member of the board of representatives (1947–48) of the Southern Conference; she was a member of the executive board, as shown on a leaflet of the conference entitled "The South Is Closer Than You Think" (received about February 1947).

The Southern Conference for Human Welfare was cited as a Communist-front organization which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South although its professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States (Committee on Un-American Activities in report 592 of June 12, 1947). The special committee also cited the group as a Communist-front which received money from the Robert Marshall Foundation, one of the principal sources of the funds by which many Communist fronts operate (report of March 29, 1944).

Mrs. Bethune received the New Masses award for greater interracial understanding at a dinner in her honor at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, January 14, 1946 (Daily Worker, January 7, 1946, p. 11, columns 1–2); she received a similar award for contributions made to promote democracy and interracial unity at the New Masses Second Annual Awards Dinner, as shown in New Masses for November 18, 1947 (p. 7).

New Masses was cited as a nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party * * * whose ownership was vested in the American Fund for Public Service (special committee report 1311 of March 29, 1944; also cited in committee reports of January 3, 1939, and June 25, 1942). It was cited also by the Attorney General as a Communist periodical (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447).

Mary McLeod Bethune was an initiating sponsor of the Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions as shown by the Daily Worker of December 24, 1944 (p. 14), and a letterhead of the group dated November 26, 1946.

The Committee on Un-American Activities ties, in its Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, April 19, 1949 (p. 2), cited the Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions as a Communist-front organization.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Oscar Hammerstein II, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Oscar Hammerstein II signed a Call Upon the Film Industry To Revoke the Blacklist, released by the Theater Division of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, as shown in an advertisement that appeared in Variety for December 1, 1948 (p. 21).

The National Council of the Arts was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Committee on Un-American Activities in House Report 1954 dated April 26, 1950.

Mr. Hammerstein was one of the initiating sponsors of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, as shown in the Daily Worker of December 24, 1944 (p. 14); the name of one Oscar Hammerstein appeared on a list of the initiating sponsors of the same organization, as shown on their letterhead of November 26, 1946. The Independent Citizens Committee of Arts, Sciences, and Professions was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Committee on Un-American Activities in a Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, released April 19, 1949.

As shown in the Daily People's World of October 13, 1943 (p. 5), Oscar Hammerstein, II, was one of those who endorsed the Writers' Congress which was held October 1, 2, and 3, 1943, under the joint auspices of the University of California and the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization. As shown in the program of the Writers' Congress, he was a member of the Seminar on Song Writing in War. The Hollywood Writers' Mobilization was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated pursuant to Executive Order 10450, Attorney General Consolidated List, April 1, 1954).

A letterhead dated February 28, 1946, of the Win-the-Peace Conference which was held in Washington, D. C., April 5–7, 1946, named Oscar Hammerstein II, as one of the sponsors of that conference; the same information also appeared in the Call to a Win-the-Peace Conference. The National Committee To Win the Peace was formed at the Win-the-Peace Conference. The National Committee To Win the Peace was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated pursuant to Executive Order 10450, Attorney General consolidated list, April 1, 1954).

One Oscar Hammerstein (II not shown) was a sponsor of the United Nations in America dinner held under the auspices of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born at the Hotel Biltmore, New York City, April 17, 1943, as shown on the invitation to the dinner. The United States Attorney General cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; also redesignated pursuant to Executive Order 10450, Attorney General consolidated list, April 1, 1954). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in a report dated March 29, 1944, cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States."

In the Daily People's World of October 2, 1944 (p. 5), Oscar Hammerstein (II not shown) was named as an honorary member of the Association of Young Writers and Artists, an organization affiliated with the Southern Negro Youth Congress.

The Southern Negro Youth Congress was cited as a Communist-front organization by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in a report dated January 3, 1940; the organization was cited as being subversive and "among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, United States of America, which seek to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means" (U. S. Attorney General in press release of December 4, 1947; also redesignated pursuant to Executive Order 10450, Attorney General consolidated list, April 1, 1954). The group was cited as being "surreptitiously controlled" by the Young Communist League (Committee on Un-American Activities in report 271 of April 17, 1947).

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: William Lloyd Imes, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

William Lloyd Imes was one of those who signed a statement on December 14, 1939 (the day before the 148th anniversary of the Bill of Rights), "warning against denying to the Communists, or to any other minority group, the full freedom guaranteed by the Bill of Rights" (letter signed by Dashiell Hammett dated January 1940, attached to the statement).

A pamphlet entitled "The People vs. H. C. L." which was dated December 11–12, 1937, named William Lloyd Imes as one of the sponsors of the Consumers National Federation, publishers of the pamphlet.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the Consumers' National Federation as a Communist-front organization.

He supported the National Negro Congress (Daily Worker, February 3, 1936, p. 2); spoke at the Second National Negro Congress in October 1937 (program of the congress); and supported a conference of the congress to push passage of the antilynch bill (Daily Worker, March 17, 1938, p. 4).

The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations redesignated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist front (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes * * *."

William Lloyd Imes sponsored a dinner-formum called by the Protestant Digest Associates on the subject, Protestantism Answers Hate, which was held in New York City, February 25, 1941.

Protestant Digest was cited as "a magazine which has faithfully propagated the Communist Party line under the guise of being a religious journal" (special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, March 29, 1944, p. 48).

He signed a petition of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, as shown on a mimeographed sheet attached to a letterhead dated January 17, 1940; and sponsored a citizens rally of the same organization, on April 13, 1940, in New York City (according to a leaflet announcing the rally).

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 25, 1942 (p. 13), cited the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom as a Communist front which defended Communist teachers.

William Lloyd Imes sponsored the Fourth Annual Conference of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, as shown on a letterhead of the conference which was held in Washington, D. C., March 2 to 3, 1940.

The Attorney General cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the American Committe for Protection of Foreign Born as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States."

Dr. Imes contributed to Fight magazine, official organ of the American League Against War and Fascism (Fight for August 1935, p. 4); he was chairman of a rally of the American League which was held in Harlem (Fight for September 1935, p. 14); he spoke at the National People's Committee Against Hearst of the American League (Daily Worker October 21, 1936, p. 4); he supported a statement of the League, addressed to the United States Congress (Daily Worker, February 27, 1937, p. 2); he was a member of the National People's Committee Against Hearst (letterhead of March 16, 1937); he spoke in New York City at a joint meeting of the American League and American Friends of the Chinese People (Daily Worker, September 23, 1937, p. 2); and was one of the sponsors of the China Aid Council of the American League, as shown on a letterhead of the council dated May 18, 1938. As shown by the Daily Worker of April 6, 1937 (p. 5), Rev. William Lloyd Imes, pastor, St. James Presbyterian Church, was guest of honor at a dinner of the American League Against War and Fascism, April 6, 1937, New York City.

The Attorney General cited the American League Against War and Fascism as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a "Communist-front organization" (in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10); and "established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7442). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 53), cited the American League Against War and Fascism as "completely under the control of Communists."

A letterhead dated November 3, 1937, lists William Lloyd Imes as a member of the national executive committee, People's Congress for Democracy and Peace; he sponsored the Boycott Japanese Goods Conference of the American League for Peace and Democracy, February 5, 1938 (Daily Worker, Jan. 11, 1938, p. 2); he signed a letter of the American League, as was shown in the Daily Worker of February 23, 1938 (p. 2); he signed a statement of the league concerning the international situation (New Masses, Mar. 15, 1938, p. 19); a letterhead of the New York City Division of the American League named him as a member of the advisory board as of that date (September 22, 1938); a letterhead of the City Executive Committee, New York City Division, American League for Peace and Democracy, dated September 26, 1938, contained the name of the Reverend William Lloyd Imes in the list of members of the advisory board; he endorsed the American Congress for Peace and Democracy, January 6–8, 1939, in New York City, as shown on a letterhead dated December 7, 1938. A letterhead of the New York City Division, American League for Peace and Democracy, dated March 21, 1939, listed him as a member of the advisory board of the league. A letterhead of the Baltimore Division, American League for Peace and Democracy, dated May 18, 1939, contained the name of Dr. Imes in the list of members of the national committee; a letterhead of the league, dated July 12, 1939, furnished the same information, and also a pamphlet entitled "7½ Million * * *," which was published by the league.

The Attorney General cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Attorney General cited the organization previously as established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism "in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7442). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 69–71), cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as "the largest of the Communist-front movements in the United States."

The Daily Worker of August 13, 1940 (p. 5), named Dr. Imes as one who endorsed the Emergency Peace Mobilization; he was one of the sponsors of the Greater New York Committee of the Emergency Peace Mobilization, as shown on an undated letterhead.

The Attorney General cited the Emergency Peace Mobilization as follows: "The American Peace Mobilization was formally founded at a meeting in Chicago at the end of August 1940, known as the Emergency Peace Mobilization" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7443). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944, cited the Emergency Peace Mobilization as a Communist front which came forth, after Stalin signed his pact with Hitler, to oppose the national defense program, lend-lease, conscription, and other American warmongering efforts. It immediately preceded the American Peace Mobilization in 1940.

Dr. Imes sponsored the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, as shown on the call to the conference, June 7, 1940; he signed a letter of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, addressed to Attorney General Jackson, in defense of ballot rights of minority parties (Daily Worker, Sept. 24, 1940, p. 1); he signed a statement of the federation, opposing use of injunctions in labor disputes, according to an advertisement which appeared in the New York Times of April 1, 1946, in which source he was identified as president of Knoxville College.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America as "an important part of the solar system of the Communist Party's front organizations" (Report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 102). The Attorney General cited the conference as one as a result of which was established the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446).

The Attorney General cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesigned April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Attorney General cited the organization previously as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program * * *" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties at "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party."

Dr. Imes signed on open letter of the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights (Daily Worker, May 13, 1940, pp. 1 and 5); he was one of the sponsors of the Conference on Pan-American Democracy, as shown on a letterhead of that group dated November 16, 1938.

The National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights was cited as a Communist front organization by the special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 48 and 102). The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 12), cited the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights as follows: "It will be remembered that during the days of the infamous Soviet-Nazi pact, the Communists built protective organizations known as the National Emergency Conference, the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, which culminated in the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties."

The Conference on Pan-American Democracy (known also as Council for Pan-American Democracy) was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 161 and 164), cited the Conference on Pan-American Democracy as a Communist front which defended Carlos Luiz Prestes, a Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International.

Dr. Imes was one of the sponsors of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights, as shown on the program of the conference, February 12, 1940. He spoke before the American Youth Congress (Daily Worker, Jan. 29, 1938, p. 3); and endorsed the American Youth Act, as shown on a press release of the American Youth Congress.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its March 29, 1944, report (pp. 96 and 129), cited the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights as a Communist front which was succeeded by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. The organization was cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities (report, Sept. 2, 1947, p. 3), as among a "maze of organizations" which were "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law."

The American Youth Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The group was cited previously by the Attorney General as "originated in 1934 and * * * has been controlled by Communists and manipulated by them to influence the thought of American youth" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7444). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 25, 1942 (p. 16), cited the American Youth Congress as "one of the principal fronts of the Communist Party" and "prominently identified with the White House picket line * * *."

According to the proceedings and report, and to "Equal Justice" for July 1939, he sent greetings to the National Conference of the International Labor Defense. He signed a letter to President Roosevelt, defending the publication, New Masses (issue of April 2, 1940, p. 21).

The Attorney General cited the International Labor Defense as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The group was cited previously by the Attorney General as the "legal arm of the Communist Party" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 75–78), cited the International Labor Defense as "the legal defense arm of the Communist Party of the United States."

New Masses was cited as a "Communist periodical" by the Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7448). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 48 and 75), cited New Masses as a "nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party * * *."

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Ira W. Jayne, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Ira Waite Jayne was a member of the National Lawyers Guild in 1939, as shown by a list of the membership for that year which was made available to the special Committee on Un-American Activities; Ira W. Jayne was national vice president of the guild, as shown by a letterhead of that organization, dated May 10, 1946; Judge Ira W. Jayne was a member of the arrangements committee for the 5th annual convention of the guild, which was held at the Book-Cadillac Hotel in Detroit, Mich., May 29–June 1, 1941 (Convention News for May 1941 (p. 3) published by the National Lawyers Guild for the 5th annual convention); Judge Ira W. Jayne was toastmaster at a banquet at the same convention (convention program printed in Convention News, May 1941 (p. 2) published by the National Lawyers Guild for the 5th annual convention).

Ira Waite Jayne was vice president of the National Lawyers Guid, as shown by a letterhead dated June 11, 1947; by the program of the National Lawyers Guild on Legislative Investigation or Thought Control Agency, dated October 20, 1947 (p. 4); the Daily Worker, February 24, 1948 (p. 3); and a letterhead of the guild dated March 8, 1948.

Ira W. Jayne is listed as a member of the executive board of the Detroit chapter of the National Lawyers Guild and its national vice president, on a letterhead dated March 19, 1948; Ira Waite Jayne was listed as vice president of the guild on the letterhead of the organization dated May 7, 1948—a letter sent to Members of Congress by Robert J. Silberstein, executive secretary of the guild, attacking the Mundt-Nixon anti-Communist bill.

The National Lawyers Guild was cited as a Communist front by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149); the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the guild as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents" (report on the National Lawyers Guild, H. Rept. No. 3123, September 17, 1950).

The Daily Worker, March 14, 1936 (p. 4) named Ira Jayne as treasurer of the Scottsboro Defense Committee in Detroit, Mich.

The Scottsboro Defense Committee was cited as a Communist front by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in reports dated January 3, 1939 (p. 82) and March 29, 1944 (p. 177).

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Dr. W. Montague Cobb, member of national board of directors, chairman of the national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

According to the Bookshopper for July 1948 (p. 2), Montague Cobb, professor, Howard University, lectured at a membership meeting in January 1948 of the Washington Cooperative Bookshop, 916 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

The Attorney General of the United States found that "evidence of Communist penetration or control [of the Washington Cooperative Bookshop] is reflected in the following: Among its stock the establishment has offered prominently for sale books and literature identified with the Communist Party and certain of its affiliates and front organizations * * * certain of the officers and employees of the bookshop, including its manager and executive secretary, have been in close contact with local officials of the Communist Party of the District of Columbia" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447); subsequently, it was cited by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954). The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as a Communist front (report 1311 of March 29, 1944).

Dr. W. Montague Cobb, identified as professor of anatomy, Howard University, spoke at the 1947 convention of the Association of Internes and Medical Students, according to their official organ, the Interne (January 1948, p. 61); the same publication (February 1950, p. 27) reported that he had spoken at a convention of the organization; the printed program of the 16th Convention of the Association of Internes and Medical Students which was held in December 1950, revealed that he had spoken at the convention.

The Association of Internes and Medical Students was cited as an organization which "has long been a faithful follower of the Communist Party line," and which supported the International Union of Students' Second World Student Congress in Prague in August 1950 (report of the Committee on Un-American Activities on the Communist Peace Offensive, dated April 1, 1951).

An advertisement which appeared in the Washington Post of May 18, 1948 (p. 15), disclosed the name of Dr. W. Montague Cobb as having signed a statement against the Mundt (anti-Communist) bill.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Westley W. Law, Savannah, Ga., national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

An undated press release, General Youth Statement (p. 3), listed W. W. Law, Savannah, Ga., as an endorser of the Youth Statement of the Mid-Century Conference for Peace (May 29–30, 1950).

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Communist Peace Offensive, April 1, 1951 (p. 58), cited the Mid-Century Conference for Peace at a meeting held in Chicago, May 29 and 30, 1950, by the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact and as having been "aimed at assembling as many gullible persons as possible under Communist direction and turning them into a vast sounding board for Communist propaganda."

The Daily Worker of June 23, 1949 (p. 2), reported that W. W. Law, past national chairman, National Association for Advancement of Colored People, youth division, Savannah, Ga., signed a statement against the North Atlantic Pact.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Dr. J. M. Tinsley, national board of directors, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

As shown by the official proceedings of the National Negro Congress, 1936 (pp. 5, 41), Dr. J. M. Tinsley, Virginia, was a member of the presiding committee and a member of the national executive council of the organization. J. M. Tinsley, Richmond, was treasurer of the National Negro Congress (Daily Worker, Apr. 7, 1936, p. 3).

The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations designated previously pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front group (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes * * *."

J. M. Tinsley endorsed the Southern Negro Youth Congress (Daily Worker, Feb. 25, 1938, p. 3).

The Southern Negro Youth Congress was cited by the Attorney General as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U. S. A., which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means (letter released Dec. 4, 1947; redesignated Apr. 27, 1953, and included on Apr. 1, 1954, consolidated list). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1940 (p. 9), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 17, 1947 (p. 14), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as "surreptitiously controlled" by the Young Communist League.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: William H. Hastie, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

In 1940, William H. Hastie represented the Abolish Peonage Committee of the International Labor Defense at a conference with the Department of Justice in Washington, D. C., as shown in Equal Justice for April 1940 (p. 3), and in the winter (1941) issue of the same publication (p. 28).

The International Labor Defense was cited by the Attorney General as "subversive" and "Communist" and as the "legal arm of the Communist Party" in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948 and included on a consolidated list on April 1, 1954, and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 88, part 6, page 7687, respectively. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (pp. 1 and 2), cited the International Labor Defense as "part of an

international network of organizations for the defense of Communist lawbreakers."

William H. Hastie was one of the sponsors of the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, at which the national federation for Constitutional Liberties was launched (program leaflet, Call to a Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, June 7, 1940, p. 4). He signed a statement sponsored by the national federation, hailing the War Department's order on commissions for Communists; he was identified in this connection as dean, Howard University Law School (the Worker for Mar. 18, 1945, p. 2); his photograph appeared in this issue of the Worker (Sunday edition of the Communist Daily Worker), along with the text of the statement and a list of those who signed it.

The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was cited by the Attorney General as "subversive" and "Communist" and as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program" in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 88, part 6, page 7446, and included on the Attorney General's consolidated list of April 1, 1954. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party."

A 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers Guild contains the name of William H. Hastie, identified as a judge whose address was St. Thomas, Virgin Islands; in 1930, he was a candidate for delegate to the national convention of the guild, administrative slate, Washington, D. C., chapter (election campaign letter, May 18, 1940); he was a member of the convention resolutions committee (Convention News, May 1941, p. 2), and identified in this source as being from Washington, D. C. A letterhead of the guild, dated June 11, 1947, listed the name of the Honorable William H. Hastie, Virgin Islands, as vice president of the guild. A printed program of the guild, entitled "Legislative Investigation? or Thought Control Agency," dated October 20, 1947, also listed the name of the Honorable William H. Hastie, Governor, Virgin Islands, as vice president of the guild; he was also vice president in 1948 (Daily Worker for February 24, 1948, p. 3; letterhead of the guild dated March 8, 1948; and a letterhead dated May 7, 1948). The Daily Worker of November 30, 1942 (p. 1), printed the text of a report adopted by the national executive board of the National Lawyers Guild; the report was submitted by Thurgood Marshall, special counsel of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and William H. Hastie, dean of Howard University Law School.

The National Lawyers Guild was cited as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents" (Committee on Un-American Activities, report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 21, 1950).

One William Hastie, Washington, D. C., endorsed the call for National Negro Congress, February 14, 1936, in Chicago, Ill. According to the Official Proceedings of the National Negro Congress, 1936 (p. 5), he was a member of the presiding committee of this congress. Also in this same publication on page 40, he is listed as a member of the national executive council for the congress. In a report on the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, released by the Committee on Un-American Activities June 16, 1947, William H. Hastie was listed as one of the sponsors of the conference (report No. 592, p. 15). He presided at a dinner meeting of the southern conference, May 22, 1946, as reported in the Washington Evening Star of May 23, 1946 (p. A-4); a leaflet entitled "Look Southward Angel!" revealed the name of William H. Hastie as vice president, Washington committee, Southern Conference for Human Welfare. In the official report of a conference of the group, held in Nashville, Tenn., April 19–21, 1942, the name of William H. Hastie appeared as consultant, "Panel III Youth and Training: Civilian and Military"; he was identified as civilian aide to the Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as "subversive" and "Communist" and as "sponsored and supported by the Communist Party" in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447), and included on the Attorney General's consolidated list of April 1, 1954. The special committee, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes * * *."

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 12, 1947, cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist-front organization "which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South" although its "professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States."

William H. Hastie was one of the sponsors of a conference on civil rights, April 20–21, 1940, held under the auspices of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action (call to the conference, p. 4). Attorney General Francis Biddle cited the Washington Committee for Democratic Action as an affiliate or local chapter of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7448). On April 1, 1954, he included it on his consolidated list.

The Communist Daily Worker of May 10, 1948 (p. 6), reported that William H. Hastie, governor of the Virgin Islands, "charged that the United States Government practically robs the island government of its own sorely needed internal revenue taxes, which are dumped into the United States Treasury."

In the Daily Worker of July 15, 1949 (p. 3), it was reported that "Gov. William H. Hastie of the Virgin Islands defends 'radicals of every persuasion' before the 40th annual convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People currently meeting in Los Angeles; Hastie, first Negro governor of an island possession, lambasted local, State, and Federal authorities who pretend to be neutral in matters between aggrieved minorities and those who seek to maintain the inequalities of our society."

The Daily People's World of August 5, 1949 (p. 3), reported that Gov. William Hastie, of the Virgin Islands, had been recommended for appointment to the Supreme Court of the United States by Carey McWilliams, a well-known lawyer on the west coast who has defended Communists.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Earl G. Harrison, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Communist Daily Worker of October 29, 1943 (p. 4) reported that Earl G. Harrison had spoken before the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. An invitation issued by Donald Ogden Stewart to attend a "United Nations in America" dinner in New York City, April 17, 1943, arranged under the auspices of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, showed that the "Honorabe Earl G. Harrison, United States Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization will be presented with the Annual Award by the Honorable Vito Marcantonio on behalf of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born."

The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born was cited as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" (special Committee on Un-American Activities, report 1311, of March 29, 1944). It was also cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General in lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948). The organization was included on the Attorney General's consolidated list released April 1, 1954.

Reference to Earl G. Harrison was made on the floor of the Senate, June 19, 1948 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 94, pt. 7, p. 9023).

Earl G. Harrison signed a statement reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 11, pages A2450–A2460), at the request of the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY of Montana. The statement was "made by 87 leading American liberals, setting forth what they consider to be a standard of political conduct for those who believe in liberalism or progressivism as a middle way between the extremes of reaction and communism—the true highway toward the fullest achievement of American democracy. This statement of liberalism accuses the American Communist Party and its sympathizers of an un-American lack of forthrightness, and announces the refusal to associate with American Communists as a proper and responsible requirement for anyone who is to be of practical help to the cause of liberalism in the United States. The statement of these 87 liberal leaders draws a proper distinction between association with American Communists and their sympathizers, on the one hand, and, on the other, an objective attitude toward the problems of Russia and a hope for peaceful relations with that country * * *."

The article was accompanied by a list of individuals who had signed the statement, in which source Mr. Harrison was identified as Dean of the Law School, University of Pennsylvania.

The Daily Worker of June 26, 1952 (p. 8) printed an article datelined Cape May, N. J., June 25, which stated that "Witchhunts threaten liberty in America, Earl G. Harrison, former dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, warned here, in an address to some 2,500 Quakers at the Friends General Confernece. Harrison said: 'Investigations, witchhunts, and guilt by association without the fairness of trial are all part of our feverish zeal to wipe out any suspected subversive threat to democracy—a zeal that is itself the greatest blow to liberty.'"

FEBRUARY 14, 1956.

Subject: Dr. Harry J. Greene, Philadelphia, Pa., national board of directors, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily

a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

On the call to a Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America at Washington, D. C., June 7-9, 1940, the name of Dr. Harry J. Greene of Philadelphia, Pa., appears in a list of the sponsors; he was one of the sponsors of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, as shown on their letterheads dated September 10 and November 6, 1940, in which sources he is shown as being from Philadelphia.

The printed program of a National Action Conference for Civil Rights which was scheduled to be held in Washington, D. C., April 19-20, 1941, named Dr. Harry J. Greene, Philadelphia, as one of the sponsors of that conference, called by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (formed as a result of the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, June 7-9, 1940), as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations * * * by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their programs"; and as subversive and Communist. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446; and press releases of Dec. 4, 1947, and Sept. 21, 1948, respectively; also included on consolidated list released Apr. 1, 1954.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party" (report of Mar. 29, 1944; also cited in reports of June 25, 1942, and Jan. 2, 1943). The Committee on Un-American Activities also cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties in a report released September 2, 1947.

Dr. Harry J. Greene was chairman of a discussion group on "Denial of Citizenship Rights" at the Second National Negro Congress, October 15-17, 1937, in Philadelphia, as shown on the printed program of that congress (p. 19), in which source he is identified as being from Philadelphia, Pa., and president of the Philadelphia branch, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. A booklet of the National Negro Congress entitled "We Are Rising" (April 1939, p. 2) named one Harry Green as vice president, Philadelphia council of the congress.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes" (report of Jan. 3, 1939; also cited in reports of Jan. 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and Mar. 29, 1944). The Attorney General cited the Congress as "an important sector of the democratic front, sponsored and supported by the Communist Party" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447); later, the Attorney General cited the congress as subversive and Communist (press releases of Dec. 4, 1947, and Sept. 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list released Apr. 1, 1954).

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Roscoe Dunjee, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Daily Worker for April 16, 1947 (p. 2), reported that Roscoe Dunjee, attorney, Oklahoma City, Okla., was one of the signers of a statement defending the Communist Party. He was one of the signers of a statement condemning "punitive measures directed against the Communist Party" as shown by the April 20, 1947 issue of the Worker (p. 8). The Daily Worker for April 27, 1947 (p. 24), shows Roscoe Dunjee as one of the signers of a statement against the ban on the Communist Party. Roscoe C. Dunjee, publisher of the Black Dispatch, Oklahoma City, was a sponsor of a statement attacking the arrest of the Communist Party leaders, according to the Daily Worker, August 23, 1948 (p. 3). He sponsored the "Statement by Negro Americans" in behalf of the arrested Communist leaders as shown by the August 29, 1948, issue of the Worker (p. 11). The Daily Worker for March 7, 1950 (p. 4), reported that Roscoe Dunjee attacked Judge Medina in the case of the Communist leaders.

Roscoe Dunjee was a member of the initiating committee, of the Congress on Civil Rights held in Detroit, Mich., April 27 and 28, 1946, as shown by the summons to the congress. The Daily Worker of April 16, 1947 (p. 2), deported that Roscoe Dunjee, of Oklahoma City, Okla., was one of the signers of a statement released by the Civil Rights Congress defending the Communist Party. The Civil Rights Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States (letters to the Loyalty Review Board, 1947 and 1948; included in consolidated list released Apr. 1, 1954.) The Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as being "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it" (report No. 1115, Sept. 2, 1947, pp. 2 and 19).

The pamphlet Seeing Is Believing, 1947, and the testimony of Walter S. Steele, public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 21, 1947 (p. 135), show Roscoe Dunjee as a member of the Council on African Affairs, Inc. The Council on African Affairs was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General (letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. He redesignated the organization on April 27, 1953; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954.)

Roscoe Dunjee was a sponsor of the Win the Peace Conference of the National Committee to Win the Peace, as shown by the Daily Worker March 5, 1946, a letterhead of the organization dated February 28, 1946, and the call to a win-the-peace conference, National Press Building, Washington, D. C., April 5-7, 1946. The National Committee To Win the Peace was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General (letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released in 1947 and 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954).

The Daily Worker for October 19, 1948 (p. 7), reported that Roscoe Dunjee was one of those who signed a statement released by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. The council was cited as a Communist front by this committee in its review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace (April 26, 1950—original release date April 19, 1949, p. 2).

Roscoe Dunjee was a signer of the call to the Second Southern Conference for Human Welfare, Chattanooga, Tenn., April 14-16, 1940. A letterhead of the conference, dated June 4, 1947, shows Roscoe Dunjee as vice president and a member of the national committee of that organization. He was also shown as vice president of the organization in an undated leaflet, The South Is Closer Than You Think, and the testimony of Walter S. Steele, public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 21, 1947, page 139. The Southern Conference for Human Welfare was cited as a Communist front which received money from the Robert Marshall Foundation, one of the principal sources of funds by which many Communist fronts operate. (Specal Committee on Un-American Activities, report, March 29, 1944, p. 147.) In its report of June 12, 1947, the Committee on Un-American Activities described the conference as a Communst-front organization "which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South," although its "professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States."

The New York Times of October 9, 1944 (p. 12), reported that Roscoe Dunjee was one of the signers of an open letter to Gov. Thomas E. Dewey for the pardon of Morris U. Schappes, which was sponsored by the Schappes Defense Committee. The Schappes Defense Committee was cited as a Communist organization by the United States Attorney General (letter to the Loyalty Review Board, released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953). The special Committee on Un-American Activities described the Schappes Defense Committee as "a front organization with a strictly Communist objective, namely, the defense of a self-admitted Communist who was convicted of perjury in the courts of New York." Morris U. Schappes "was on the teaching staff of the College of the City of New York for a period of 13 years. In 1956 his superior on the college faculty refused to recommend him for reappointment. This action led to prolonged agitation by the Communist Party" (report, March 29, 1944, p. 71).

Roscoe Dunjee was a member of the advisory board of the Southern Negro Youth Congress according to a letterhead of that organization dated June 12, 1947, the testimony of Walter S. Steele, public hearings, Committeee on Un-American Activities, July 21, 1947 (p. 97), a letterhead dated August 11, 1947, and a page from a leaflet published by the organization. The Southern Negro Youth Congress was cited as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U. S. A., "which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means" (U. S. Attorney General, letter to Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947; redesignated April 27, 1953; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The Committee on Un-American Activities said it was "surreptitiously controlled" by the Young Communist League (report No. 271, April 17, 1947, p. 14). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities also cited the organization as a Communist front (report, January 3, 1940, p. 9).

According to the Daily Worker for April 1, 1945 (p. 6m), Roscoe Dunjee was asked what he thought of New York's new anti-discrimination law, and was quoted as replying: "It shows a trend in the direction which the United States as a nation must take if we rise to the level of Russian morality * * *"

Photographs of Roscoe Dunjee are found in the Daily Worker, issues of December 9, 1941 (p. 7), and April 1, 1945 (p. 6m).

Roscoe Dunjee, editor of the Black Dispatch, Oklahoma City, Okla., was quoted in the March 28, 1944, issue of New Masses (p. 15), as follows:

"I attended a Lincoln and Douglas meeting held under the auspices of the Communist Party, February 12 * * * Most assuredly Americans should stop and listen to what Communists have to say. The Russian experiment as expressed today in Soviet life is too effective for anyone to attempt to overlook this. As president of the state conference of branches of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, I have every year for the past 10 invited the Communist to address our meeting. Alan Shaw, secretary of the Communist Party in Oklahoma, addressed our State conference at Tulsa last November * * * personally I endorse the idea of an international State * * * as espoused by the Communist Party."

The following is quoted from the Daily Worker of April 8, 1952 (p. 2):

"Roscoe Dunjee, editor of the Oklahoma Black-Dispatch, leading Negro newspaper in the Southwest, has hailed in a long editorial the victory won by William L. Patterson, head of the Civil Rights Congress, in securing acquittal on a contempt of Congress charge."

(Note citation of Civil Rights Congress on p. 1 of this report.)

Roscoe C. Dunjee, Oklahoma City, was listed as 1 of 4 sponsors of a statement which appeared in the Sunday Worker, August 29, 1948 (p. 11), from which the following is quoted:

"THE FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE

"(Statement by Negro Americans to the President and Attorney General of the United States)

"We, the undersigned Negro Americans, strongly condemn your hysteria-breeding arrests of national leaders of the Communist Party, and call upon you to take positive action to protect civil rights instead of persecuting political minorities.

"We raise here no defense of the principles of the Communist Party. Our concern is to defend the right of political and other minorities, especially the Negro people, to fight for the kind of society which they consider necessary to give full expression to the principles of American democracy * * *

"The obvious purpose of these Gestapo-like arrests of Communist leaders is to frighten people away from the Wallace movement and progressive people's organizations generally, practically all of which have been slandered as Communist or subversive * * *

"We call upon our Government to halt its Fascist-like attacks upon opposition minorities, and to act for the protection of minority rights * * *"

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Dr. S. Ralph Harlow, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The program of the fifth national conference of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, Atlantic City, N. J., March 29–30, 1941, listed S. Ralph Harlow as a sponsor.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States."

S. Ralph Harlow was an endorser of the Committee for Citizenship Rights as shown by a letterhead dated January 10, 1942. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 95), cited the Committee for Citizenship Rights as an organization which defended the "interests of the Communist Party." The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the Committee for Citizenship Rights as among a "maze of organizations" which were "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law."

Prof. S. Ralph Harlow signed a statement calling for international agreement to ban use of atomic weapons attached to a press release of the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, December 14, 1949 (p .9). He was identified in this instance as associated with Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Communist Peace Offensive, April 1, 1951 (p. 54), cited the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact as an organization which was formed as a result of the Conference for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, and which was located, according to a letterhead of September 16, 1950, at 30 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.; and to further the cause of Communists in the United States doing their part in the Moscow campaign.

As shown by Soviet Russia Today of November 1937 (p. 79), S. Ralph Harlow was a signer of the Golden Book of American Firendship with the Soviet Union, cited as a "Communist enterprise" signed hundreds of well-known Communists and fellow travelers.

"January 23–25, 1948, New York City," conference call of the National Conference on American Policy in China and the Far East, listed Dr. S. Ralph Harlow, Smith College, as a sponsor of the conference. The Attorney General cited the National Conference on American Policy in China and the Far East as Communist, and a conference called by the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy in a letter released July 25, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

A news release of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties dated December 26, 1941, listed S. Ralph Harlow as a signer. He signed the organization's 1943 message to the House of Representatives (leaflet, attached to undated letterhead); and the group's statement supporting the War Department's order on granting commissions to members of the Armed Forces who have been members of or sympathetic to the views of the Communist Party (undated leaflet, "the only sound policy for a democracy * * *" and Daily Worker, March 19, 1945, p. 4).

The Attorney General cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as among a maze of organizations which were spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law.

As shown by the Daily Worker of September 17, 1940 (pp. 1, 5), S. Ralph Harlow signed a telegram of the New York Conference for Inalienable Rights to President Roosevelt and Attorney General Jackson in behalf of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union defendants. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the New York Conference for Inalienable Rights as a Communist-front group.

S. Ralph Harlow sponsored the call for the Protestantism Answers Hate dinner-forum held under auspices of the Protestant Digest, New York, February 25, 1941, as shown by a leaflet. He was identified in this instance as professor of sociology, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 48), cited the Protestant Digest as "a magazine which has faithfully propagated the Communist Party line under the guise of being a religious journal."

According to the New York Times, October 9, 1944 (p. 12), S. Ralph Harlow, chairman, department of religion, Smith College, Northampton, Mass., signed an open letter of the Schappes defense committee to Gov. Thomas E. Dewey asking a pardon for Morris Schappes.

The Schappes defense committee was cited as Communist by the Attorney General in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as "a front organization with a strictly Communist objective, namely, the defense of a self-admitted Communist who was convicted of perjury in the courts of New York." (Report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 71).

Prof. S. Ralph Harlow endorsed the World Peace Appeal as shown by an undated leaflet, Prominent Americans Call for * * * (received Sept. 11, 1950), and the Daily Worker, August 14, 1950 (p. 2).

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Communist Peace Offensive, April 1, 1951 (p. 34), cited the World Peace Appeal as a petition campaign launched by the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress at its meeting in Stockholm, March 16–19, 1950; as having "received the enthusiastic approval of every section of the international Communist hierarchy"; as having been lauded in the Communist press, putting "every individual Communist on notice that he 'has duty to rise to this appeal' "; and as having "received the official endorsement of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R., which has been echoed by the governing bodies of every Communist satellite country, and by all Communist parties throughout the world."

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Robert C. Weaver, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Robert C. Weaver, identified from Washington, D. C., and as economic adviser to the Secretary of Interior, was discussion leader of a panel on "The Federal Housing Program and the Negro" at the Second National Negro Congress as shown by the program of that congress which was held in Philadelphia, October 15–17, 1937.

The National Negro Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The special committee in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes." The Attorney General had cited the group previously as follows: "From the record of its activities and the composition of its governing bodies, there can be little

doubt that it has served what James M. Ford, Communist vice presidential candidate elected to the executive committee in 1937, predicted: 'An important sector of the democratic front,' sponsored and supported by the Communist Party" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447).

The Daily Worker of February 8, 1939 (p. 2), listed Robert C. Weaver, identified as Assistant Housing Administrator of the Department of Interior, as one of the signers of the Negro People's Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy letter to lift the Spanish embargo. The special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 180), cited the Negro People's Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy as a Communist-front organization.

Robert C. Weaver, Washington, D. C., contributed financially to Social Work Today as shown by the January 1941 issue of that publication (pp. 16–18). Social Work Today was cited as a Communist magazine by the special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 129).

R. C. Weaver, 1206 Kenyon Street, Washington, D. C., was listed as a member of the Washington Book Shop on a 1941 membership list of the organization subpenaed by this committee. The Washington Book Shop Association was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The Attorney General cited the organization previously as showing "evidence of Communist penetration or control" according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 88, part 6, page 7447. The Special Committee report of March 29, 1944 (p. 150), cited the organization as a Communist-front organization.

Robert C. Weaver was the author of The Negro Ghetto which was reviewed by Herbert Aptheker in the August 1948 issue of Masses and Mainstream (p. 85). The Congressional committee, in its report on the Congress of American Women, April 26, 1950 (p. 75), cited Masses and Mainstream as successor to New Masses, a Communist magazine.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Lewis Gannett, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

On December 18, 1934, the Daily Worker (p. 5) reported the following: "A reception to mark the 10 anniversary of International Publishers took place * * * December 14, in * * * the new school for social research * * * Scores of prominent writers, artists, and editors were present to pay tribute to International Publishers' decade of achievement * * * Among those present were * * * Lewis Gannett, book-review columnist of the New York Herald Tribune * * *"

The Attorney General of the United States cited International Publishers as "The (Communist) Party's publishing house," headed by Alexander Trachtenberg (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7445); and as the "publishing agency of the Communist Party" (brief for the United States in the case of William Schneiderman, p. 145). The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited International Publishers as an "official publishing house of the Communist Party in the United States" (Reports of January 3, 1940, and June 25, 1942); the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as the "Official American Communist Party publishing house" (Report No. 1920 dated May 11, 1948).

Lewis Gannett, Harvard, was a member of the sponsoring committee of dinner sponsored by the American Student Union for "alumni of the student movement and present members" as shown in Student Advocate for February 1937 (p. 2). The American Student Union was cited as a Communist front which was "the result of a united front gathering of young Socialists and Communists" in 1935. The Young Communist League took credit for creation of the organization (Report of the special Committee on Un-American Activities dated Jan. 3, 1939; also cited in reports of Jan. 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1949).

A letterhead of the American League for Peace and Democracy dated April 6, 1939 contains the name of Lewis Gannett in a list of members of the Writers' and Artists' Committee of that organization; the same information is shown in public hearings before this committee July 21, 1953 (p. 3639). The American League was cited by the Attorney General as "designed to conceal Communist control, in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7443); and subsequently, as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The special committee cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as "a bold advocate of treason" (reports of January 3, 1939; Jan. 3, 1940; Jan. 3, 1941; June 25, 1942; and Jan. 2, 1943).

The special committee cited the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom as a Communist front which defended Communist teachers (report of June 25, 1942; also cited in report of March 29, 1944); a letterhead of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, dated May 26, 1940, contains the name of Lewis Gannett in a list of members of the organization's national executive committee.

A letterhead of the American Russian Institute for Cultural Relations With the Soviet Union, Inc., contains the name of Lewis Gannett in a list of members of its board of directors; the letterhead was dated July 14, 1938. The Attorney General cited the American Russian Institute as Communist (press release of April 27, 1949; also included on consolidated list dated April 1, 1954).

Lewis S. Gannett was a member of the board of directors of the American Fund for Public Service, as shown on a photostat of their letterhead dated September 8, 1930. The "American Fund for Public Service was established by Charles Garland, son of the wealthy James A. Garland. Young Garland, conditioned against wealth through radical acquaintances at Harvard, declined to accept his inheritance for his own personal use. Instead, he established, in 1922, the American Fund for Public Service with the sum of $900,000 which consisted largely of conservative securities. During the lush twenties, the fund grew to some $2 million.

"A self-perpetuating board of directors was set up for the purpose of handing out this easy money. Sidney Hillman was among them. Associated with Hillman as directors were Roger N. Baldwin, William Z. Foster, Lewis Gannett, * * *." (From report 1311 of the special committee dated March 29, 1944.)

An undated booklet of Friends of the Soviet Union contains the name of Lewis S. Gannett in a list of members of the Reception Committee for the Soviet Flyers, under auspices of that organization; he contributed a review of Maxim Gorki's "A Book of Short Stories to Soviet Russia Today (September 1939, p. 26). The Attorney General cited Friends of the Soviet Union as Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list released April 1, 1954); the special committee cited the organization as "one of the most open Communist fronts in the United States" (report of January 3, 1939; also cited in reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944). Soviet Russia Today was published by Friends of the Soviet Union.

Soviet Russia Today for November 1937 (p. 79) published a list of individuals who signed the Golden Book of American Friendship With the Soviet Union under this statement: "I hereby inscribe my name in greeting to the people of the Soviet Union on the 20th anniversary of the establishment of the Soviet Republic." The Golden Book of American Friendship With the Soviet Union was cited as a "Communist enterprise" signed by hundreds of well-known Communists and fellow travelers (Report 1311 of the special committee dated March 29, 1944).

The Daily Worker of January 18, 1939 (p. 7) reported that Lewis Gannett was a committee sponsor of the League of American Writers, cited as a Communist-front organization by the special committee (reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944). The Attorney General cited it as being under "Communist control" and as subversive and Communist (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7445; and press releases of June 1, and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

New Masses for March 16, 1937 (p. 26) named Lewis Gannett as one of the sponsors of a send-off dinner for the ambulance corps under the auspices of the American Artists and Writers Committee, Medical Bureau, American Friends of Spanish Democracy; an undated letterhead of the Writers' and Artists' Committee for Medical Aid to Spain also contains his name in a list of sponsors; the letterhead also carries the notation "Affiliated with the Medical Bureau to Aid Spanish Democracy"; he signed a petition of American Friends of Spanish Democracy to lift the arms embargo, as shown in the Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 4).

During 1937 and 1938, the Communist Party campaigned for support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, "recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations * * * such as * * * American Friends of Spanish Democracy" (report 1311 of the special committee dated March 29, 1944).

Another such organization which was cited by the special committee (see last paragraph above) was the Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy; their letterhead of July 6, 1938, contained the name of Lewis Gannett in a list of members of the Writers' and Artists' committee.

The Liberator for September 1921 (p. 11) contained Lewis Gannett's interview with "Bill Haywood in Moscow"; he also contributed an article to the July 1922 issue of the same publication (p. 30). The special committee cited the Liberator as a "Communist magazine" (report of June 25, 1942).

Lewis Gannett contributed articles to New Masses for February 16, 1937 (p. 21) and August 10, 1943 (p. 20); he signed New Masses' Letter to the President of the United States, as shown in New Masses of April 2, 1940 (p. 21), which source identified him as literary editor, New York Herald Tribune. New Masses has been cited by the Attorney General as a "Communist periodical" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7448); the special committee cited it as the "nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party * * * whose ownership was vested in the American Fund for Public Service" (report of March 29, 1944; also cited in reports of January 3, 1939 and June 25, 1942).

A letterhead of the All-American Anti-Imperialist League, dated April 11, 1928, contains the name of Lewis S. Gannett in a list of members of that organization's national committee. The Attorney General cited the All-American Anti-Imperialist League as a "Communist-front organization" (in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10); the special committee cited the group as a Communist front (report of March 29, 1944).

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Dr. Buell G. Gallagher, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

According to the Communist publication, the Daily Worker of April 13, 1936 (p. 3), Buell G. Gallagher, identified as President of Talladega College, endorsed a peace strike of 500,000 students who planned a demonstration for April 22, 1936. The strike was sponsored by the American Student Union which was cited as a Communist-front organization by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in reports dated January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944.

The Daily People's World, the Communist journal on the West Coast, listed Dr. Buel Gallagher as a member of the Draft Cross Committee, in connection with a move to draft Mayor Laurence L. Cross, of Berkeley, Calif., as candidate for Congress from the seventh district of California. (See Daily People's World of January 28, 1948, p. 3.) In the February 17, 1948, issue of the Daily People's World (p. 3), we find that "the committee originally formed to draft Mayor Laurence Cross for Congress has resolved to stay together in support of the candidacy of Dr. Buell G. Gallagher in the 7th District." According to Judge Louis J. Hardie, committee chairman, "In Dr. Gallagher, we feel that we have found a congressional candidate who possesses those qualities of intelligence, integrity, and idealism which we admire in Dr. Cross. His deep acquaintance with social and economic problems and his broad experience in community activities insure the voters of the 7th District a candidate who will honestly and ably serve them in the 81st Congress" (ibid).

In the March 10, 1948, issue of the Daily People's World, we note that the "Alameda County CIO Council voted endorsement last night for Dr. Buell Gallagher, pro-Wallace candidate for Congress in the 7th District. Dr. Gallagher, endorsed previously by the AFL Central Labor Council and Building Trades Council, will run in the Democratic primary in June against Dyke Brown, the Truman candidate. Congressman from the 7th district now is Republic John J. Allen, who voted for the Taft-Hartley Law" (p. 3).

Under date of February 10, 1951, Dr. Gallagher addressed a letter to the chairman of this committee detailing an analysis of the information reflected in the public files of the committee, and stating, "at no time have I ever been a member of, or sympathizer with, the Communist Party; nor a member of, or sympathizer with, any organization which I knew or believed to be a front for communism." The chairman, in a letter to Dr. Gallagher dated March 3, 1951, advised him that his analysis would be made a part of the committee records and quoted in any future releases.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Judge Hubert T. Delany (also spelled Delaney), national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Hubert T. Delaney was a member of the Council on African Affairs, as shown in the following sources: Pamphlets entitled "Africa in the War," "Seeing Is Believing" (1947), "For a New Africa" (p. 36), "8 Million Demand Freedom" (inside back cover); leaflets headed "The Job To Be Done" and "What of Africa's Place in Tomorrow's World" (June 26, 1944). New Africa for December 1943 (p. 4) and a letterhead of the council dated May 17, 1945, contained the same information. Mr. Walter S. Steele testified in public hearings before the Committee on Un-American Activities July 21, 1947 (p. 135), that Judge Delany was a member of the Council on African Affairs. According to the Daily Worker of March 29, 1948 (p. 7), Judge Hubert T. Delaney was a member of the executive board of the council. The Daily Worker of April 26, 1947 (p. 12), named him as having signed a statement issued by the council.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Council on African Affairs as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list released April 1, 1954).

A 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers Guild, which was made available to the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, contains the name of one Hubert T. Delany, 30 Broad Street, New York City. The name of Hubert T. Delany appeared on a letterhead of the Guild dated May 28, 1940, as director ex officio. The New York Guild Lawyer for September 1950 listed him as vice president of the New York chapter of the guild. A list of officers of the National Lawyers Guild (as of December 1949) contains the name of the Honorable Hubert T. Delaney in a list of members or the organization's executive board; he is so named in a list dated May 1950. Both of these lists were printed in a report on the National Lawyers Guild, prepared and published by the Committee on Un-American Activities September 17, 1950.

Convention News of May 1941 (pp. 2 and 4), issued by the fifth annual convention of the National Lawyers Guild which was held May 29-June 1, 1941, in Detroit, Mich., named Hubert T. Delany as a member of the convention resolutions committee; he was also named in the same source as a member of the national executive board, National Lawyers Guild. Judge Delaney presided at an annual convention of the guild in Chicago, Ill., in 1951 (Daily People's World, October 18, 1951, p. 2); he also spoke before the guild in 1951, as reported in the Daily Worker of April 10, 1951, page 5. In the latter three sources, he was identified with the domestic relations court of New York City.

The Daily Worker of October 7, 1952 (p. 3), reported that Judge Delany was to lead a workshop at the national conference on civil rights legislation and discrimination to be held in New York City, October 10–12, under the auspices of the National Lawyers Guild; a letterhead of the New York City chapter of the guild dated October 17, 1952, listed Hubert T. Delany as vice president. The Daily Worker of February 20, 1953 (p. 6), announced that he would speak at a panel session on civil rights and liberties, February 22, at the annual convention of the guild, February 20–23, in New York City. According to the Daily Worker of May 27, 1953 (p. 8), Hubert T. Delany was reelected vice president of the New York City chapter of the National Lawyers Guild at the annual membership meeting May 26. He was elected one of the vice presidents of the National Lawyers Guild, New York City chapter, for the years 1954–55, as reported in the Daily Worker of May 26, 1954 (p. 8).

The National Lawyers Guild was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in report No. 1311 dated March 29, 1944. In a report on the guild, prepared and released September 17, 1950, by the Committee on Un-American Activities, it was shown that the National Lawyers Guild "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

Hubert T. Delany was a member of the Lawyers' Committee of the American League for Peace and Democracy, as shown on their letterhead dated April 6, 1939. The American League for Peace and Democracy was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; consolidated list of April 1, 1954); he had previously cited the organization as "established in the United States * * * in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7443). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the American League as "the largest of the Communist-front movements in the United States" (report of January 3, 1940).

The catalog of the George Washington Carver School (winter term, 1947) contains the name of Judge Hubert T. Delany as a member of the board of directors of that school, cited by the Attorney General as "an adjunct in New York City of the Communist Party" (press release of December 4, 1947; included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

Hubert T. Delany was named as a representative individual who advocated lifting the arms embargo against Spain in a booklet entitled "These Americans Say," which was prepared and published by the coordinating committee to lift the embargo, cited as one of the number of groups set up during the Spanish civil war by the Communist party in the United States and through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation. (From a report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated March 29, 1944.)

A letterhead of the Lawyers Committee on American Relations with Spain dated March 5, 1938, and a prospectus and review of the organization both name him as a member of that group.

In a report dated March 29, 1944, the Special Committee on Un-American Activities had the following to say concerning the Lawyers' Committee on American Relations with Spain: "When it was the policy of the Communist Party to organize much of its main propaganda around the civil war in Spain, the lawyers' committee * * * supported this movement."

A letterhead of the medical bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy dated July 6, 1938, contains the name of Judge Delany in a list of members of that group.

During 1937 and 1938, the Communist Party wholeheartedly campaigned for support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and setting up so-called relief organizations such as the medical bureau and North

American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy. (From report No. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated March 29, 1944.)

Hubert T. Delaney was one of the sponsors of a testimonial dinner in honor of Ferdinand C. Smith, Communist Party member and national secretary of the National Maritime Union; identified as tax commissioner, New York City, Judge Delany was listed by Labor Defender (issue of October 1935) as one of the individuals who signed a petition for the freedom of Angelo Herndon, a Communist.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Norman Cousins, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

In an article which appeared in the Daily Worker of January 13, 1948, it was reported that "Thirty-five well known authors, editors, clergymen, and other public figures today called on the new Federal Employees Loyalty Review Board to prevent injustices to individuals in the Government loyalty check." Norman Cousins was one of those who signed the letter, addressed to Seth W. Richardson, board chairman. This article also appeared in the New York Times on the preceding day, January 12, 1948 (p. 10).

In a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities entitled "Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace," dated April 19, 1949, we find the following statement concerning a speech of Norman Cousins before that conference:

"In answer to this totalitarian philosophy of dragooning culture, Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, declared amid a great deal of hissing and boing, that 'Democracy must mean intellectual freedom, that it must protect the individual against the right of the state to draw political and cultural blueprints for its painters and writers and composers or to castigate them, or to enter into those matters of mind in which the individual is sovereign.'" (See p. 13 of the Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference.)

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Dr. Algernon D. Black, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Dr. Algernon D. Black was one of the sponsors of the Cultural and Scientic Conference for World Peace, arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, March 25–27, 1949 (conference program, p. 12, and conference call). The Daily Worker of February 21, 1949 (p. 2), announced that he was a member of the program committee of that conference. Speaking of Peace, edited report of the conference, March 25, 26, 27, 1949, listed Algernon Black as a speaker on A Warning Against Sectarian Prejudice, and gave biographical data concerning him (pp. 121, 139).

In 1948 and 1949, Dr. Black signed statements of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions (Daily Worker, Dec. 29, 1948, p. 2; letterhead received in January 1949; New York Star of January 4, 1949, p. 9, an advertisement). He spoke before the group in February 1949 (Daily Worker, Feb. 28, 1949, p. 2).

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions and held in New York City on March 25, 26, and 27, 1949, April 26, 1950, cited the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions as a Communist-front organization. In this same report the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the scientific and cultural conference as actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations.

The call to a national conference on American policy in China and the Far East, held in January 1948, included the name of Dr. Algernon Black in the list of sponsors (Call, January 23–25, 1948, New York City); the conference was called by the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy. In the December 1949–January 1950 issue of Far East Spotlight, which is the official organ of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, Dr. Black answered a questionnaire issued by that committee, favoring recognition of the Chinese Communist government.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy as a Communist organization in a letter furnished the Loyalty Review Board and release to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

The Daily Worker of June 21, 1948, reported that Algernon D. Black had signed a statement of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, calling for a conference with the Soviet Union; he signed an appeal of the same organization to the United States Government to end the cold war and arrange a conference with the Soviet Union (leaflet entitled "End the Cold War—Get Together for Peace" which was dated December 1948); he signed a statement in praise of Henry Wallace's open letter to Stalin (May 1948), as shown in the pamphlet How To End the Cold War and Build the Peace (p. 9), prepared and released by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

The Attorney General cited the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 156), cited the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as "in recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian."

Dr. Black contributed an article to the pamphlet We Hold These Truths (p. 22), which was issued by the League of American Writers. He was named as a member of the executive committee of Film Audiences for Democracy in the June 1939 issue of Film Survey, official organ of Film Audiences, cited as a Communist-front organization by the special Committee on Un-American Activities (report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944, p. 150).

The Attorney General cited the League of American Writers as subversive and Communist in letters furnished the Loyalty Review Board and released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as "founded under Communist auspices in 1935 * * * in 1939 * * * began openly to follow the Communist Party line as dictated by the foreign policy of the Soviet Union." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7445). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its reports of January 3, 1940 (p. 9), June 25, 1942 (p. 19), and March 29, 1944 (p. 48), cited the League of American Writers as a Communist front organization.

A letterhead of the nonpartisan committee for the relection of Congressman Vito Marcantonio, dated October 3, 1936, listed the name of Algernon D. Black as a member of that committee. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 122), cited the nonpartisan committee for the reelection of Vito Marcantonio as a Communist-front organization.

Algernon Black was a member of the advisory board of the American Student Union, as shown in a pamphlet entitled "Presenting the American Student Union." The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated January 3, 1939 (p. 80), cited the American Student Union as a Communist-front organization.

A letterhead of the Veterans Against Discrimination of Civil Rights Congress of New York, dated May 11, 1946, listed the name of Algernon Black as one of the public sponsors of that organization. The Attorney General cited the Veterans Against Discimination of Civil Rights Congress of New York as subversive in a letter released December 4, 1947; included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

Mr. Black signed an open letter of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, as shown in the booklet 600 Prominent Americans (p. 16). The Attorney General cited the National Federation as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Attorney General cited the organization previously as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program." The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party." The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the National Federation as among a "maze of organizations" which were "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law."

The printed program of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights, February 12, 1940, reveals the name of Algernon D. Black as vice chairman of the group. A letterhead of the American Russian Institute, received July 26, 1949, contains the name of Dr. Black as a member of the interchurch committee of that instituite. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its reported dated March 29, 1944 (pp. 96 and 129), cited the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights as a Communist front organization. The Attorney General cited the American Russian Institute as a Communist organization in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

Dr. Black was a member of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy (letterheads dated March 13, 1931, and February 21, 1938); and described as a representative individual in a booklet entitled "These Americans Say" which was published by the Coordinating Committee to Lift the (Spanish) Embargo.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 82), cited the American Friends of Spanish Democracy as a Communist front organization. The Coordinating Committee to Lift the (Spanish) Embargo was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report dated March 29, 1944 (pp. 137 and 138), as one of a number of front organizations set up during the Spanish Civil War by the Communist Party in the United States and through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation.

In a pamphlet entitled "News You Don't Get" (dated November 15, 1938), Algernon Black was named as one of those who signed the call to a conference on pan-American democracy; a letterhead of the organization dated November 16, 1938, named him as one of the sponsors of the conference. The Attorney General cited the Conference on Pan-American Democracy as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (pp. 161 and 164), cited the Conference on Pan-American Democracy as a Communist front organization.

Algernon Black signed a declaration of the Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee honoring Dimitrov, as shown in the New York Times of December 22, 1943 (p. 40). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 112 and 156), cited the Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee as a Communist front organiztion.

Dr. Black signed an open letter in defense of Harry Bridges. (See Daily Worker of July 19, 1942, p. 4.) Letterheads of the Citizens Victory Committee for Harry Bridges dated June 8, 1943, and January 10, 1944, listed Algernon Black as a committee member or sponsor of that group. The open letter in defense of Harry Bridges was cited as a Communist front organization by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 87, 112, 129, 166). The citizens' committee for Harry Bridges was cited as Communist by the Attorney General in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 90 and 94), cited the citizens' committee for Harry Bridges as a Communist front organization.

The Daily Worker of March 29, 1951, (p. 9), reported that Dr. Algernon D. Black signed a letter of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born attacking the McCarran Act. Algernon D. Black was shown as a sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born in the Daily Worker, April 4, 1951 (p. 8), a leaflet: "Call—Mass Meeting and Conference," October 27, 1951, Dearborn, Mich., and a photostatic copy of an undated letterhead of the 20th anniversary national conference * * *, U. E. Hall, Chicago, Ill. (Dec. 8–9, 1951). The Daily Worker of August 10, 1950 (p. 5), reported that Dr. Algernon Black signed a statement of the American Committee against denaturalization.

The Attorney General cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States."

On June 13, 1949, the Daily Worker reported that Dr. Black was one of the sponsors of an organization formed to oppose the Mundt-Nixon anti-Communist bill; a press release of the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill, dated June 15, 1949, revealed the same information. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt bill dated January 2, 1951, cited that organization as "a registered lobbying organization which has carried out the objectives of the Communist Party in its fight against antisubversive legislation."

A letterhead of the Voice of Freedom Committee dated June 16, 1947, listed Algernon D. Black as a sponsor of that organization. An invitation to a dinner held under auspices of the group, January 21, 1948, listed him as a member of the dinner committee. He signed a petition of the organization as shown by a leaflet published by the Voice of Freedom Committee. The Attorney General included the Voice of Freedom Committee on his April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

Algernon D. Black, New York Ethical Culture Society, signed an open letter of the Conference on Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact to Senators and Congressmen urging defeat of President Truman's arms program, as shown by a letterhead dated August 21, 1949.

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Communist peace offensive, April 1, 1951 (p. 56), cited the Conference for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact as a meeting called by the Daily Worker in July 1949, to be held in Washington, D. C., and as having been instigated by Communists in the United States (who) did their part in the Moscow campaign.

The Daily Worker of December 10, 1952 (p. 4), listed Dr. Algernon D. Black as a signer of an appeal to President Truman requesting amnesty for leaders of the Communist Party convicted under the Smith Act.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Dr. Ralph Bunche, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Dr. Ralph Bunche was a member of the executive board of the Washington committee, Southern Conference for Human Welfare, as shown on their letterhead of June 4, 1947. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist-front organization in its report of March 29, 1944. In 1947 the Committee on Un-American Activities released a report on the conference, in which it was cited as a Communist-front organization which sought to "attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South," although its "professed interest in southern welfare" was "simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States" (Report No. 592 of June 12, 1947).

Ralph Bunche was a sponsor of the Conference on Civil Rights of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, April 20–21, 1940, as shown by the conference call, page 4. A letterhead of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action dated April 26, 1940, named Dr. Bunche as one of the sponsors of that group.

The Washington Committee for Democratic Action was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General, April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included in the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Attorney General had previously cited the group as an affiliate or local chapter of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7448). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as successor in Washington to the American League for Peace and Democracy and an affiliate of the national federation (reports of June 25, 1942, and Mar. 29, 1944).

Official proceedings of the National Negro Congress for 1936, pages 5 and 40, named Dr. Ralph Bunche, Washington, D. C., as a member of the presiding committee and a member of the national executive council of that organization.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Negro Congress as a Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes, and reported that "the officers of the National Negro Congress are outspoken Communist sympathizers, and a majority of those on the executive board are outright Communists" (report of January 3, 1939). The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as a Communist-front organization (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447; press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; consolidated list of cited organizations, dated April 1, 1954).

The Washington Post and Times Herald, May 29, 1954, p. 6, reported that "A Federal loyalty board announced today that it has unanimously cleared Dr. Ralph J. Bunche of any and all charges." the article quoted the official announcement as follows:

"The full board had its second meeting with Dr. Bunche yesterday following which it unanimously reached the conclusion that there is no doubt as to the loyalty of Dr. Bunche to the Government of the United States.

"This conclusion has been forwarded to the Secretary of State for transmittal to the Secretary General of the U. N. At the same time it has been informally transmitted to Dr. Bunche."

Reference to the loyalty board's clearance of Dr. Bunche is found also in the Washington Evening Star, May 28, 1954, p. A–1.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Dr. H. Claude Hudson, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Daily People's World of May 2, 1947 (p. 8), listed Dr. H. Claude Hudson as a sponsor of the Los Angeles chapter of the Civil Rights Congress.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (pp. 2 and 19), cited the Civil Rights Congress as an organization formed in April 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor

Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties); "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it."

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Carl R. Johnson, national board of directors, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

An undated leaflet, The Only Sound Policy for a Democracy, and the Daily Worker of March 19, 1945 (p. 4), listed Carl R. Johnson, lawyer, Kansas City, Mo., as a signer of a statement sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties supporting the War Department's order on granting commissions to members of the Armed Forces who have been members of or sympathetic to the views of the Communist Party.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party." The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties among a maze of organizations which were spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Alfred Baker Lewis, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or finding of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

On July 11, 1942, the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties addressed an open letter to the President of the United States urging him to reconsider Attorney General Francis Biddle's order to deport Harry Bridges; the letter also stated that: "It is equally essential that the Attorney General's ill-advised, arbitrary, and unwarranted findings relative to the Communist Party be rescinded." Alfred Baker Lewis, executive board, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and executive board member, Union for Democratic Action, New York, N. Y., signed the open letter, as shown in the pamphlet entitled "600 Prominent Americans Ask President To Rescind Biddle Decision," published September 11, 1942, by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties and incorporating the open letter in full. The open letter, together with a list of individuals who signed it, appeared in the Daily Worker on July 19, 1942 (p. 4).

The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as "Part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program;" and as subversive and Communist. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446); and press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948, respectively; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the federation as one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party (report of March 29, 1944; also cited in reports of June 25, 1942, and January 2, 1943). It was also cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law (Report No. 1115 of September 2, 1947).

An undated letterhead of the League for Mutual Aid, 104 Fifth Avenue, New York City, contained the name of Alfred Baker Lewis in a list of members of the organization's advisory committee. The league was cited as a Communist enterprise by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944.

"Greetings and best wishes for success to the second national Negro congress" were contained in the printed annual program of that congress, sent by A. Philip Randolph, chairman, and Alfred Baker Lewis, secretary, Negro Work Committee of the Socialist Party. (Printed annual program, second national Negro congress, Philadelphia, Pa., October 15, 16, and 17, 1937, p. 61.) The National Negro Congress was cited as an important sector of the democratic front, sponsored and supported by the Communist Party; and later, as subversive and Communist. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447; and press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the congress as the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes (report of January 3, 1939; also cited in reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944).

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Dr. James J. McClendon, national board of directors, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Daily Worker of March 18, 1945 (p. 2), and an undated leaflet, The Only Sound Policy for a Democracy, named Dr. James J. McClendon as one of the signers of a statement, sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, which supported the War Department's order on granting commissions to members of the Armed Forces who have been members of or sympathetic to the views of the Communist Party. Dr. McClendon was identified as President of the Detroit National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. D. J. J. McClendon was one of the sponsors of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, as shown by the program, Action Conference for Civil Rights, held in Washington, D. C., April 19–20, 1941; and on letterheads dated September 11, 1940, and November 6, 1940.

The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General in press releases dated December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included in his consolidated list of April 1, 1954. The Attorney General described the organization as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities stated that "There can be no reasonable doubt about the fact that the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties regardless of its high-sounding name—is one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party" (special committee report, March 29, 1944, p. 50); also cited in reports, June 25, 1942 (p. 20), and January 2, 1943 (pp. 9 and 12).

Dr. James J. McClendon was named in the Daily Worker of March 16, 1942, (pp. 1 and 4), and on a letterhead dated April 2, 1942, as one of the sponsors of the National Free Browder Congress.

The National Free Browder Congress was cited as a Communist front which arranged to meet March 28-29, 1942. Earl Browder was general secretary of the Communist Party, United States of America, who had been convicted and sentenced to Atlanta Federal Penitentiary for passport fraud. (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, March 29, 1944 (pp. 69, 87, and 132.)

Dr. James McClendon was one of the sponsors of the sesquicentennial bill of rights celebration, held under the auspices of the Michigan Civil Rights Federation, Detroit, Mich., December 1–2, 1939, as shown by the call of conference. Dr. James J. McClendon was one of the sponsors of a statewide conference, held under the auspices of the Michigan federation in Detroit, Mich., September 12, 1943, as shown by call of the conference. He was identified as president of the Detroit chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

The Michigan Civil Rights Federation was cited by the Attorney General of the United States as "an affiliate of the Communist front, the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties; and as subversive and Communist organization which has been succeeded by and now operates as the Michigan chapter of the Civil Rights Congress." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446; and press releases of December 4, 1947, June 1 and September 21, 1948; also including in his consolidated list of organizations, dated April 1, 1954.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities and the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Michigan Civil Rights Federation as a Communist-front organization. (From Report No. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944; and Report No. 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities, dated September 2, 1947, p. 3.)

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: A. Maceo Smith, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily

a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

A. Maceo Smith was a signer of a statement released by the Civil Rights Congress of Texas against a ban on the Communist Party as shown by the Worker, April 27, 1947 (p. 25).

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (pp. 2 and 19), cited the Civil Rights Congress as an organization formed in April 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties); "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it."

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: James Hinton, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

James M. Hinton, identified as president of the State conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People for South Carolina, was one of the sponsors of a Congress on Civil Rights, as shown on the call to the congress which was held in Detroit, Mich., April 27–28, 1946. (See pp. 21 and 22 of Rept. No. 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities on the Civil Rights Congress, September 2, 1947.)

The Civil Rights Congress was founded at a conference in Detroit April 27, and 28, 1946, effectuating the merger of the International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. The Civil Rights Congress was "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it" (pp. 2 and 19 of Rept. No. 1115).

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Theodore M. Berry, national board of directors, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

A 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers Guild which was made available to the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 1939, contains the name of Theodore M. Berry, 308 West Fifth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio, as a member.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Earl B. Dickerson, national board of directors, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

According to the Daily Worker of February 28, 1949 (p. 9), Earl Dickerson, attorney, Illinois, was one of the signers of a statement defending the 12 Communist leaders. He signed a statement in behalf of the attorneys in the Communist cases as shown by the July 31, 1950, issue of the Daily Worker (p. 9). This same information was shown in the February 1, 1950, issue of the Daily Worker (p. 3). As shown by the Daily People's World of May 12, 1950 (p. 12), Earl B. Dickerson was a signer of a statement to the United Nations in behalf of the Communist cases.

Earl B. Dickerson protested approval of the Smith Act by the Supreme Court as "having a disastrous impact upon * * * struggle of Negro people" (Daily Worker, October 1, 1951, p. 1). He filed a petition with the clerk of the United States Supreme Court supporting the pending application for a hearing on the constitutionality of the Smith Act as shown by the Daily Worker, October 4, 1951 (p. 15). Mr. Dickerson was identified in this source as a Negro attorney in Illinois. He spoke against the Smith Act according to the February 12, 1952 issue of the Daily People's World (p. 3), and was co-author of a memorandum to the Supreme Court "on the menace of the Smith Act to the Negro people" (Daily People's World, July 15, 1952, p. 1). Earl B. Dickerson, president, National Lawyers Guild, Chicago, was a signer of an appeal to President Truman requesting amnesty for leaders of the Communist Party convicted under the Smith Act (Daily Worker, December 10, 1952, p. 4). As shown by the Daily Worker, December 29, 1953 (p. 8) and the Worker, January 3, 1954 (p. 6), Earl B. Dickerson was one of 39 prominent Midwest citizens signing a plea for Christmas amnesty for Communist leaders convicted under the Smith Act, which was wired to President Eisenhower. He was one of the initiators of an appeal for reduced bail for Claude Lightfoot, Illinois Communist leader, indicted under a section of the Smith Act as shown by the September 12, 1954, issue of the Worker (p. 16.

According to the December 25, 1952 issue of the Daily Worker (p. 8), Earl D. Dickerson was a signer of an open letter to President Truman asking clemency for the Rosenbergs. The Daily People's World of March 13, 1953 (p. 3), reported that Earl B. Dickerson contributed a statement to the pamphlet, The Negro People Speak Out on the Rosenbergs, distributed by volunteers for the East Bay Committee To Save the Rosenbergs, Oakland, California.

Earl B. Dickerson was a signer of an appeal to the Greek Government protesting the court marital of Greek maritime unionists as shown by the Daily Worker, August 19, 1952 (p. 1).

Earl B. Dickerson was listed in the spring 1943 (p. 22) and fall session 1943 (p. 27) catalogs of the Abraham Lincoln School as a member of the board of directors. He was named in the same source as a guest lecturer at the school (p. 19).

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Abraham Lincoln School as an adjunct of the Communist Party in a letter to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947. The Attorney General redesignated the school April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 82), cited the Abraham Lincoln School as successor of the Workers School as a Communist educational medium in Chicago.

A pamphlet entitled "For a New Africa" (containing the proceedings of the conference on Africa, New York, April 14, 1944) names Earl B. Dickerson as a member of the National Negro Congress.

The National Negro Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front group (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes."

He was a member of the Council on African Affairs, as shown in a pamphlet entitled "8 Million Demand Freedom," and the pamphlet For a New Africa (p. 36). Earl B. Dickerson is listed as a member of the Council on African Affairs in a leaflet, issued by the organization, The Job To Be Done, a leaflet entitled "What of Africa's Place in Tomorrow's World?" a pamphlet entitled "Seeing Is Believing" (1947), and a letterhead of the group, dated May 17, 1945, and a pamphlet, Africa In the War.

The Attorney General cited the Council on African Affairs as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

The name of Earl Dickerson, of 35 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill., appears on a 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers' Guild on file with this committee. In 1949 he was president of the Chicago chapter of the guild and chairman at a meeting on anti-Communist legislation, as shown in the Daily Worker of March 15, 1949 (p. 6); in the same year he attacked the Marshall plan as shown in the Daily Worker of July 19, 1949 (p. 5), in which source he was identified as president of the Chicago chapter of the guild; he participated in a discussion entitled "Status of Civil Liberties," fifth annual convention, National Lawyers' Guild, Book-Cadillac Hotel, Detroit, Mich., May 29–June 1, 1941, as shown by the convention program printed in Convention News, May 1941 (p. 2), published by the guid. This same Convention News (pp. 3 and 4) listed him as a member of the convention nominations committee of the fifth national convention of the National Lawyers' Guild. He submitted a report of the giuld, denouncing lynching and discrimination, as shown in the Daily Worker, November 30, 1942 (p. 1). As shown by the October 15, 1951, issue of the Daily Worker (p. 1), Earl B. Dickerson was president of the Chicago chapter of the National

Lawyers' Guild; he spoke at the national convention of the organization in Chicago. The October 18, 1951, issue of the Daily People's World (p. 2), reported that Earl B. Dickerson was elected president of the National Lawyers' Guild. He was shown as president of the National Lawyers' Guild in the Daily Worker, January 25, 1952 (p. 1), and February 20, 1953 (p. 6), and the Daily People's World, January 25, 1952 (p. 8). The January 18, 1952, issue of the Daily People's World (p. 3) reported that Earl B. Dickerson was to speak on the Smith Act, the Constitution, and You, at a gathering of the San Francisco chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild on February 1, 1952. The Daily Worker of February 24, 1953 (p. 6), reported that Earl Dickerson, president of the National Lawyers' Guild, addressed the annual convention of the group held February 20–23, at the Park-Sheraton Hotel, New York City, and stated that "a new foreign policy is needed if the drive against liberties is to be halted." The Daily People's World of July 6, 1953 (p. 3), announced that he was to be honored by the Los Angeles-Hollywood chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild at a luncheon. The Daily Worker of August 28, 1953 (p. 2), reported that Earl B. Dickerson, president of the National Lawyers' Guild, issued a statement opposing the American Bar Association's call for disbarment of Communist lawyers. As shown by the September 6, 1953, issue of the Worker (p. 6), Earl Dickerson protested the placing of the National Lawyers' Guild on the list of subversive organizations by the Attorney General.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers' Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Nations Lawyers' Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the group as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

One Earl Dickerson (with no middle initial shown) spoke at the morning session of the Congress on Civil Rights which was held in Detroit, Mich., April 27–28, 1946, as shown in the program, Congress on Civil Rights (p. 1); Earl B. Dickerson signed a statement of the Civil Rights Congress which was in defense of Gerhart Eisler, according to the Daily Worker of February 28, 1947 (p. 2); he was one of the sponsors of the National Emergency Conference for Civil Rights which was held in New York City on July 19, 1948, according to the Daily Worker of July 12, 1948 (p. 4); a photostat of a letterhead of the Civil Rights Congress, Illinois, dated December 18, 1948, listed Earl Dickerson as a sponsor. As shown by the Daily Worker of November 1, 1950 (p. 4), Earl B. Dickerson was a sponsor of the Civil Rights Congress. A handbill, Dodge Local 3 Supports FEPC Rally, listed Earl B. Dickerson as one of those who would speak at a rally to be held under partial auspices of the Civil Rights Congress of Michigan on April 16, 1950.

The Attorney General cited the Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (pp. 2 and 19), cited the Civil Rights Congress as an organization formed in April 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties); "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it."

According to the printed program of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace (p. 14), Earl B. Dickerson was one of the sponsors of this conference which was held in New York City, March 27–27, 1949, under the auspices of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions; he signed a statement of the council which was reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 7, page 9435. Earl B. Dickerson was a signer of a Resolution Against Atomic Weapons as shown by a mimeographed list of signers attached to a letterhead of the National Council of the Arts, Science, and Professions dated July 28, 1950. Mr. Dickerson signed a statement to the American people, "We uphold the right of all citizens to speak for peace," released by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, as shown by the handbill, "Halt the Defamers Who Call Peace Un-American." He spoke at a conference on equal rights for Negroes in the arts held by the New York Council of the National Council of the Arts, New York City, November 10, 1951, according to the November 7, 1951 (p. 3), and November 14, 1951 (p. 7), issues of the Daily Worker. The Daily Worker of June 2, 1952 (p. 3), listed Earl B. Dickerson as one of the endorsers of the national council resolution calling for a hearing of Tunisia's demands in the United Nations. He spoke at a conference for equal rights for Negroes in the Arts, Sciences, and Professions held by the Southern California Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, on June 14, 1952, in Los Angeles (Daily Worker, June 20, 1952, p. 7).

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, April 19, 1949 (p. 2), cited the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions as a Communist-front organization. In this same report the committee cited the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace as a Communist front which "was actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations."

Earl B. Dickerson was a national sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, as shown by letterheads of the group dated February 26, 1946, February 3, 1948, May 18, 1951, and January 5, 1953. He signed an open letter of the organization to President Truman on Franco Spain as shown by a letterhead and mimeographed letter of April 28, 1949. He signed a petition of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee to President Truman "to bar military aid to or alliance with fascist Spain" as shown by a mimeographed petition, attached to a letterhead of the group dated May 18, 1951.

The Attorney General cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953 and included on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 174), cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as a Communist-front organization.

Mr. Dickerson was chairman of the Illinois Legislative and Defense Committee of the International Labor Defense, as shown in Equal Justice, September, 1939, (p. 3). He spoke before the International Labor Defense, together with Earl Browder, according to the Daily Worker of October 1, 1942, (p. 5); October 6, 1942, (p. 5); and October 11, 1942, (p. 3). The pamphlet Victory in Oklahoma, October 1943, back cover, listed Earl B. Dickerson as a member of the National Committee of the International Labor Defense.

The Attorney General cited the International Labor Defense as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953 and included on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as the "legal arm of the Communist Party." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (pp. 1 and 2), cited the International Labor Defense as "part of an international network of organizations for the defense of Communist lawbreakers."

Earl B. Dickerson was a speaker at the Conference on Constitutional Liberties, the founding conference of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, as shown in the printed program, Call to a Conference, page 2, June 7, 1940.

The Attorney General cited the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America as a conference as a result of which was established the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 102), cited the conference as "an important part of the solar system of the Communist Party's front organizations."

The program and call to a national conference of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, held in Cleveland, Ohio, October 25 and 26, 1947, listed Earl B. Dickerson as one of the sponsors of the conference; he was one of the sponsors of the sixth national conference, which was held in Cleveland, May 9 and 10, 1942, as shown in a leaflet of the conference, page 4. In the latter source, Mr. Dickerson was identified as a member of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practices. Earl Dickerson was a sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as shown by a 1950 letterhead, an undated letterhead (received for files, July 11, 1950), an undated letterhead (distributing a speech of Abner Green at the conference of the American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born of December 2–3, 1950), and a letterhead of the Midwest Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (April 30, 1951). Mr. Dickerson, identified as president of the Chicago Urban League, was a sponsor of a dinner given by the Midwest Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born for Pearl Hart (Daily Worker, Apr. 6, 1950, p. 4). A letterhead of the sixth annual conference of the Midwest Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born dated May 16, 1954, Chicago, listed Earl B. Dickerson as a sponsor.

The Attorney General cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States."

In 1942 Earl B. Dickerson was a patron of the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, as shown on a letterhead of the congress, dated October 27, 1942; he was named in Soviet Russia Today (December 1942 issue,

p. 42) as one of the sponsors of the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship; the call to the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, November 6–8, 1943, listed Earl B. Dickerson among the sponsors. He signed a statement of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, praising Wallace's open letter to Stalin, May 1948, as shown in a pamphlet, How To End the Cold War and Build the Peace, page 9. He was identified in the last-named source as an attorney at law, Chicago. A photostatic copy of a letterhead of the Chicago Council of American-Soviet Friendship dated September 17, 1951, listed Earl B. Dickerson as a sponsor of that group. A photostat of a letter of the national council dated March 19, 1952, listed Mr. Dickerson as a sponsor.

The Attorney General cited the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944, (p. 156), cited the National Council as "in recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Rusian."

The Daily Worker of October 21, 1942 (p. 1), named Earl B. Dickerson among the list of members of the National Emergency Committee To Stop Lynching. He signed an appeal to lift the Spanish embargo, which appeal was made by the Negro People's Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, according to the Daily Worker of February 8, 1939 (p. 2). He contributed to the Jue 22, 1943, issue of New Masses (p. 9). He signed a petition of the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder, as shown in an official leaflet of the organization.

The National Emergency Committee To Stop Lynching was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Negro Communist-front organization, whose secretary was Ferdinand C. Smith, high in the circles of the Communist Party (report, March 29, 1944, p. 180).

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 180), cited the Negro People's Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy as a Communist-front organization.

New Masses was cited as a Communist periodical by the Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447), and the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (report, Mar. 29, 1955, pp. 48 and 75).

The Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder was cited as Communist by the Attorney General in a letter dated April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist organization (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 6 and 55), cited the Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder as follows: When Earl Browder (then general secretary, Communist Party) was in Atlanta Penitentiary serving a sentence involving his fraudulent passports, the Communist Party's front which agitated for his release was known as the Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder.

An open letter demanding discharge of Communist Party defendants in Fulton and Livingston Counties contained the name of Earl B. Dickerson in the list of persons who signed according to the Daily Worker of September 24, 1940, page 5. He was attorney for Eugene Dennis, general secretary, Communist Party, as shown in the Daily Worker of November 19, 1947, page 7, being identified in this source as a former member of the city council, Chicago. Reference to Earl Dickerson as attorney for Eugene Dennis appears in the Worker, November 30, 1947, page 4; the Daily Worker of January 15, 1948, page 5; and the Daily Worker of October 27, 1948, page 10, in which source he is identified as a Negro leader, of Chicago.

Earl B. Dickerson was a sponsor of the American Peace Crusade, Illinois assembly, as shown by a letterhead dated April 12, 1951, the Illinois Peace Crusade, May 1951 (p. 4), and a photostat of a letterhead dated June 21, 1952. He was a sponsor of the American People's Congress and Exposition for Peace, held by the American Peace Crusade in Chicago, Ill., June 29, 30, and July 1, 1951, as shown by a leaflet, An Invitation to American Labor To Participate in a Peace Congress, the Call to the American People's Congress, and the leaflet, American People's Congress * * * Invites You To Participate in a National Peace Competition, June 29, 1951, Chicago, Ill. He was a sponsor of a contest held by the American Peace Crusade for songs, essays, and paintings advancing the theme of world peace as reported in the Daily Worker, May 1, 1951 (p. 11).

The Attorney General included the American Peace Crusade on his January 22, 1954, list of organizations designated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its statement issued on the March of Treason, February 19, 1951, and report on the Communist Peace Offensive April 1, 1951 (p. 51), cited the American Peace Crusade as an organization which the Communists established as a new instrument for their peace offensive in the United States and which was heralded by the Daily Worker with the usual bold headlines reserved for projects in line with the Communist objectives.

Masses and Mainstream for February 1952 (pp. 52–56) listed Earl B. Dickerson as coauthor of an amici curiae brief to the Supreme Court supporting an appeal for a rehearing of its decision upholding the Smith Act, dated September 27, 1951.

According to the April 30, 1950, issue of the Worker (p. 15), Earl B. Dickerson was a sponsor of the Midcentury Conference for Peace, cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as a meeting held in Chicago, May 29 and 30, 1950, by the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact and as having been "aimed at assembling as many gullible persons as possible under Communist direction and turning them into a vast sounding board for Communist propaganda" (report on Communist peace offensive, April 1, 1951, p. 58).

Earl B. Dickerson was a sponsor of the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt bill as hown by the pamphlet, Hey, Brother, There's a Law Against You (p. 2); a release of June 15, 1949 (p. 2), and a photostat of a letterhead dated May 5, 1950. He signed a statement of the organization according to the Daily Worker of April 3, 1950 (p. 4).

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill, December 7, 1950, cited the organization as "a registered lobbying organization which has carried out the objectives of the Communist Party in its fight against antisubversive legislation."

Earl B. Dickerson signed a letter defending the 12 Communist leaders, as shown on a letterhead, dated January 7, 1949; he later signed a statement asking for the release of the Communist leaders, as shown in the Daily Worker of November 8, 1949 (p. 6). He signed a brief on behalf of the attorneys who represented the Communist leaders, as shown in the Daily Worker of November 2, 1949 (p. 2); he signed a statement on behalf of the attorneys, as shown in the Daily Worker of December 7, 1949 (p. 5); he represented the attorneys who represented the 11 Communist leaders, according to the Daily Worker of January 24, 1950 (p. 3).

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Benjamin E. Mays, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Daily Worker, March 4, 1948 (p. 2), named Benjamin E. Mays as one of the signers of a letter in behalf of Communist deportation cases, which was sponsored by the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. A letterhead of the group contained his name as one of the sponsors (letterhead December 11 and 12, 1948).

The Attorney General of the United States cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversive and Communist in letters furnished the Loyalty Review Board and released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission June 1 and September 21, 1948. The group was redesignated by the Attorney General April 29, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the committee as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States."

Benjamin E. Mays, president, Morehouse College, was a member of the initiating committee for a Congress on Civil Rights which was held in Detroit, April 27 and 28, 1946. (See, Urgent Summons to a Congress on Civil Rights.) He was an honorary national chairman of the Civil Rights Congress, New York, as shown by an undated letterhead concerning a conference held October 11, 1947. He signed a call for a national conference of the Civil Rights Congress to be held in Chicago (Daily Worker, Oct. 21, 1947, p. 5).

The Civil Rights Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The group was redesignated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (pp. 2 and 19), cited the Civil Rights Congress as an organization formed in April 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberities); "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it."

Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, president, Morehouse College, Atlanta, Ga., signed a statement by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship in praise of Wallace's open letter to Stalin, May 1948 (pamphlet, How To End the Cold War and Build the Peace, p. 9). A leaflet, "End the Cold War—Get Together for Peace." (December 1948) named Benjamin E. Mays as one of the signers of the National Council's appeal to the United States Government to end the cold war and arrange a conference with the Soviet Union. He was a member of the Sponsoring Committee of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Committee on Education, as shown by a bulletin of the group, dated June 1945 (p. 22).

The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The group was redesignated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its

report of March 29, 1944 (p. 156), cited the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as "in recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian. * * *"

Dr. Mays signed an open letter sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties denouncing United States Attorney General Biddle's charges against Harry Bridges (Daily Worker, July 19, 1942, p. 4); booklet, "600 Prominent Americans," p. 25). He also signed a statement sponsored by this organization hailing the War Department's order on commissions for the Communists, as shown by the Daily Worker, March 18, 1945 (p. 2).

The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The group was redesignated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The group was cited previously by the Attorney General as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The special committee, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the federation as one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the federation as among a maze of organizations which were spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subverison from any penalties under the law.

Letterheads, dated June 12, 1947, and August 11, 1947, of the Southern Negro Youth Congres, list Dr. Mays as a member of the advisory board. A leaflet of the organization (exhibit 46, public hearings, July 22, 1947, Steele) also contained the name of Dr. Benjamin Mays.

The Southern Negro Youth Congress was cited as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U. S. A., which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means by the Attorney General in a letter released December 4, 1947. The group was redesignated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The special committee, in its report of January 3, 1940 (p. 9), cited the organization as a Communist front. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 17, 1947 (p. 14), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as surreptitiously controlled by the Young Communist League.

The Daily Worker, April 27, 1947 (p. 24), reported that Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, Georgia, signed a statement against the ban on the Communist Party. He signed a statement against the North Atlantic Pact, according to the Daily Worker of June 28, 1949 (p. 2). He spoke at a conference on "Jim Crow in the Nation's Capital" (Daily Worker, December 21, 1950, p. 8).

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: A. T. Walden, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Daily Worker of October 7, 1952 (p. 3), reported that A. T. Walden, Georgia, was to lead the National Lawyers Guild workshop discussions at a national conference on civil rights, legislation, and discrimination, New York City, October 10, 11, and 12.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the group as a Communist front which is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations and controlled unions and which since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.

A mimeographed letter addressed to the House of Representatives, May 12, 1948, included a list of signers opposing the Mundt anti-Communist bill. Austin T. Walden, Georgia, was one of those signers.

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Arthur D. Shores, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications, of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

According to letterheads of the Southern Negro Youth Congress, dated June 12 and August 11, 1947, Arthur D. Shores was a member of the advisory board of this organization. A page from an undated leaflet of the organization also listed Mr. Shores as a member of the advisory board. Arthur Shores, Negro attorney, was associated with Nesbitt Elmore in the defense of Senator Glen H. Taylor, of Idaho, who was fined $50 and ordered a 180-day suspended jail sentence for defying Birmingham's segregation laws at a meeting of the Southern Negro Youth Congress in Alabama (Daily Worker, May 6, 1948, p. 4).

The Southern Negro Youth Congress was cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as "surreptitiously controlled" by the Young Communist League (report 271, Apr. 17, 1947, p. 14). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated January 3, 1940, page 9, cited the Congress as a Communist front. The Attorney General of the United States cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, United States of America, which seeks to alter the form of Government of the United States by unconstitutional means (letter furnished the Loyalty Review Board, released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission, Dec. 4, 1947); the Attorney General redesignated the Congress pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450 of April 27, 1953, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

Arthur D. Shores, prominent Negro attorney, told the Daily Worker that "outlawing the Communist Party would 'pave the way for a one-party dictatorship in this country'" (Daily Worker, March 19, 1947, p. 5).

The Worker for December 14, 1947 (p. 8, southern edition), reported that Arthur Shores, identified as a leading Negro civil-rights lawyer, was assisting in the case of Mrs. Ruby Jackson Gainor, "outstanding Negro teacher fired by the Jefferson County Board of Education. * * * Mrs. Jackson is the leading petitioner in contempt-of-court proceedings against the board for its refusal to equalize salaries of Negro teachers in accord with a Federal court decree * * *." The article, which identified Mrs. Gainor as president of the Birmingham teachers' local of the United Public Workers, also reported: "The outcome of Mrs. Gainor's case has become the keystone of the fight of all the Negro teachers in Jefferson County for equal pay. The United Public Workers nationally is supporting the fight * * *."

It is noted that the United Public Workers of America was formed in 1946 by a merger of the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America and the United Federal Workers of America. Both of these unions were cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 18 and 19), as among the CIO unions in which the committee found Communist leadership strongly entrenched. The Congress of Industrial Organizations, by vote of the executive board, February 15, 1950, expelled the United Public Workers of America, effective March 1, 1950, on charges of Communist domination (press release, 12th CIO convention, November 20–24, 1950).

OCTOBER 13, 1955.

Subject: Lloyd Garrison, chairman, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Lloyd K. Garrison was a member of the National Committee of the International Juridical Association according to a letterhead of the organization dated May 18, 1942, and the leaflet, "What is the I. J. A.?" Lloyd K. Garrison, dean, University of Wisconsin Law School, commended the International Juridical Association bulletin in that pamphlet.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the International Juridical Association as a "Communist front and offshoot of the International Labor Defense." The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950 (p. 12), cited the International Juridical Association as an organization which "actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line."

The Daily Worker for March 18, 1945 (p. 2), and an undated leaflet, "The only sound policy for a Democracy," listed Lloyd K. Garrison, National War Labor Board, as one of the signers of a statement sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties hailing the War Department order on commissions for the Communists. A photograph of Mr. Garrison is found in the Daily Worker reference.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The Attorney General redesignated the organization April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program * * *" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party." The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as among a "maze of organizations" which were "spawned for the alleged purpose

of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law."

Lloyd K. Garrison, Madison, Wis., former Chairman of NLRB, was listed as a member of the Committee on Legal Research and Legal Education of the National Lawyers Guild and his book was reviewed in the newsletter of the National Lawyers Guide, July 1937 (pp. 2–3). Convention News, May 1941 (pp. 3 and 4), published by the National Lawyers Guild for the fifth annual convention, listed Lloyd K. Garrison as a member of the convention nominations committee of the fifth annual convention, Book-Cadillac Hotel, Detroit, Mich., May 29 to June 1, 1941.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

The pamphlet of the Second National Negro Congress, October 1937, listed Lloyd Garrison as one of those who sent greetings to the congress.

"The Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes is known as the National Negro Congress. * * * The officers of the National Negro Congress are outspoken Communist sympathizers, and a majority of those on the executive board are outright Communists" (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, January 3, 1939, p. 81; also cited in reports, January 3, 1940, p. 9; June 25, 1942, p. 20; and March 29, 1944, p. 180). The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Attorney General cited the organization previously as a Communist-front organization as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 88, part 6, page 7447.

The Daily Worker for February 23, 1939 (p. 3) reported that Lloyd Garrison spoke at a conference of the Wisconsin Conference on Social Legislation, Madison, Wis., February 18, 1939. The Attorney General cited the Wisconsin Conference on Social Legislation as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Sidney A. Jones, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Sidney A. Jones, attorney, was an endorser of the National Negro Congress as shown on the call for National Negro Congress, in Chicago, Ill., February 14, 1936.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, pp. 7746–7747). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "The Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes. * * *"

It was reported in the Daily People's World of December 2, 1947 (p. 4), that Sidney A. Jones, Jr., was vice president of the Chicago chapter of the National Lawyers Guild, and was further identified as being associated with the National Association for Advancement of Colored People, Urban League, Chicago. Mr. Jones was shown as an executive board member of the National Lawyers Guild from Chicago as of December 1949 and May 1950 in the Committee on Un-American Activities' report on the National Lawyers Guild September 17, 1950 (pp. 18–19).

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the group as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

The Daily Worker of April 3, 1950 (p. 4), listed Sidney A. Jones, attorney, Chicago, Ill., as one who signed a statement of the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill. A photostat of a letterhead of the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill (Chicago chapter), dated May 5, 1950, listed Sidney A. Jones as a Chicago sponsor of the organization.

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill, December 7, 1950, cited the organization as "a registered lobbying organization which has carried out the objectives of the Communist Party in its fight against antisubversive legislation."

Sidney Jones, vice president of the National Association for Advancement of Colored People, sent greetings to Paul Robeson according to the Daily Worker of April 29, 1947 (p. 12). He signed Labor Day greetings to the Daily People's World, which appeared in the August 29, 1947 (p. 4), issue of that paper; signed Statement by Negro Americans, in behalf of arrested Communist leaders (the Worker of August 29, 1948, p. 11); and he signed a statement on release of Communist leaders, and was identified as a Negro attorney in Chicago as noted in the Daily Worker of November 8, 1949 (p. 6).

The Daily Worker of December 25, 1952 (p. 8), listed Sidney Jones, attorney, Chicago, as a signer of an open letter to President Truman asking clemency for the Rosenbergs.

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: W. Robert Ming, Jr., national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

An election campaign letter of the National Lawyers Guild, dated May 18, 1940, listed Robert W. Ming, Jr., as the candidate for delegate to the national convention, Washington, D. C., chapter. Robert Ming., Jr., Washington, D. C., was a member of the convention nominations committee, fifth annual convention of the National Lawyers Guild, Book-Cadillac Hotel, Detroit, Mich., May 29 to June 1, 1941.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

A 1941 membership list of the Washington Book Shop listed Robert W. Ming, Jr., Howard University, Washington, D. C., as a member.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Washington Book Shop Association as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously cited. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 150), cited the Washington Book Shop Association as a Communist-front organization.

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Arthur J. Mandell, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The News Letter of the National Lawyers Guild, July 1937 (p. 2), named Arthur Mandell, Houston, Tex., as a member of the Guild's committee on American citizenship, immigration, and naturalization; and a copy of the 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers Guild, made available to the special Committee on Un-American Activities by the organization, contained the name of Arthur Mandell, Shell Building, Houston, Tex.

The National Lawyers Guild was cited as a Communist front by the special Committee on Un-American Activities (report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 149); and it was the subject of a separate report by the Committee on Un-American Activities (H. Rept. No. 3123, Sept. 21, 1950), wherein it was cited as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

Arthur J. Mandell, attorney, Houston, Tex., was shown in the Call to the First Congress of the Mexican and Spanish American Peoples of the United States, March 24–26, 1939, Albuquerque, N. Mex., as one of the signers of that Call. The Congress of the Mexican and Spanish American Peoples * * * was cited as a Communist front by the special Committee on Un-American Activities (report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 120).

A leaflet, attached to an undated letterhead of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, named Arthur J. Mandell, attorney, Houston, Tex., as a signer of the organization's January 1943 message to the House of Representatives. The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties has been cited

as being subversive and Communist (Attorney General letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated by the Attorney General pursuant to Executive Order 10450, see consolidated list, April 1, 1954); as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program" (Attorney General, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446); as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party" (special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 50; also cited in reports, June 25, 1942, and Jan. 2, 1943); and as being among a "maze of organizations" which were "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law" (Committee on Un-American Activities, report, Sept. 2, 1947, p. 3).

Arthur Mandell was a member of the resolutions committee at the Congress on Civil Rights in Detroit, Mich., April 27–28, 1946, as shown by a mimeographed release issued by the congress; and Arthur J. Mandell, Houston, was listed as a sponsor of the National Conference of the Civil Rights Congress in Chicago, November 21–23, 1947, in the printed program, Let Freedom Ring. The Civil Rights Congress has been cited as a subversive and Communist organization by the Attorney General (letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated, see consolidated list, April 1, 1954); and, as an organization formed in April 1946 by merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties), "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party," and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it" (Committee on Un-American Activities, House Report No. 1115, Sept. 2, 1947, pp. 2 and 19).

OCTOBER 26, 1955.

Subject: Robert W. Kenny, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Reference to Robert W. Kenny is found in the appendix to this committee's public hearings regarding communism in the United States Government, part 2, September 1950 (pp. 2991–2992), as follows:

"Robert W. Kenny: Kenny, attorney general of State of California during the years 1943–47 and president of the National Lawyers Guild during the years 1940–48, has been associated with the defense of a number of Communist cases. He was also one of the attorneys for the Hollywood 10. He sent greetings to the Biennial National Conference of the International Labor Defense held April 4–6, 1941; this organization was cited by the former Attorney General Francis Biddle as the 'legal arm of the Communist Party.'

"The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born has specialized in the legal defense of foreign-born Communists such as Gerhard Eisler. Kenny was a sponsor of its national conference held in Ohio on October 25–26, 1947, and again in 1950. He spoke in behalf of Communists held for deportation, according to the Daily People's World, Communist publication, dated March 8, 1948.

"On repeated occasions, Mr. Kenny has attacked the trial of the 11 Communist leaders convicted for teaching and advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence, particularly as reported by the Daily People's World of July 22, 1948, and the Worker of October 30, 1949.

"He signed a statement in behalf of arrested leaders of the Communist Party of Los Angeles, according to the Daily Worker of October 19, 1949, and the Daily People's World of November 7, 1949. Statements opposing the outlawing or restricting of the Communist Party have been signed by Robert W. Kenny and have appeared frequently in the Communist press. Mr. Kenny has opposed Government loyalty procedures on various occasions.

"On the eve of the 1947 May Day celebration, Pravda, the official newspaper of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, hailed Robert W. Kenny as a 'friend of the Soviet Union in the United States.' Another Communist government, namely that of China, selected Mr. Kenny to defend its legal interests, according to the Daily People's World of April 26, 1950 (p. 4).

"Robert W. Kenny has a number of affiliations and associations with Communist-front organizations. These include the American Youth for Democracy (formerly known as the Young Communist League), the National Committee to Win the Peace, of which he was vice chairman, Civil Rights Congress, Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, American Committee for Yugoslav Relief, Hollywood League for Democratic Action, California Labor School, Lawyers Committee on American Relations with Spain, Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, and the American Slav Congress."

Subsequent to this committee's release which contained the above reference to Robert W. Kenny, he had served as counsel for 66 witnesses before this committee.

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Milton R. Konvitz, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

A membership list of the National Lawyers Guild contains the name of Milton Konvitz, 744 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (List in committee files.) The National Lawyers Guild was cited as a Communist-front organization by the special Committee on Un-American Activities (report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 149). The organization was cited as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents" (Committee on Un-American Activities, report on the National Lawyers Guild, Sept. 21, 1950).

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Loren Miller, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

One Loren Miller, 837 East 24th Street, Los Angeles, Calif., was a signer of Communist Party election petition No. 120 in California in 1932.

An article entitled "Why I Will Vote 'Red'" written by Loren Miller appeared in the Daily Worker of July 11, 1932 (p. 4). In a note which accompanies this article, the following information is given concerning the author: "Loren Miller, until recently city editor of the California Eagle, Los Angeles, Calif., largest and oldest of western Negro newspapers, is now en route to the Soviet Union." Excerpts from this article follow:

"I regret very much that I will not be present to take an active part in the struggle that Negroes must wage to pile up a huge vote for William Z. Foster and James W. Ford, Communist candidates for President and Vice President.

* * * * *

"It must be evident to anybody who thinks through the things about which I have been talking that the Communist Party is our party. It is fighting our fights, warring against our enemies, struggling for our welfare. Commonsense dictates that we should support our party with every means at hand."

Loren Miller wrote an article for the Daily Worker while he was traveling in the Soviet Union with a group of Negro writers, workers, etc., observing conditions. This article concerned the equality of races in the Soviet Union and appeared in the Daily Worker of September 24, 1932 (p. 4). Mr. Miller compared racial equality in the Soviet Union and the United States, stated that the Communist Party in the United States was the only political party which promised equality, and concluded as follows:

"Only the Communists with their straightforward platform on relief for the por (sic) farmers and workers, their demand for self-determination for Negroes in the Black Belt, and with a Negro, James W. Ford, as nominee for the Vice Presidency deserve the vote of the Negroes of the United States. It is for these reasons that I wish to renew my plea to Negroes everywhere in the United States to vote Communist."

The Daily Worker of January 26, 1948 (p. 10), reported that Loren Miller, attorney, Los Angeles, defended Claudia Jones, Communist. He signed a statement opposing the Mundt anti-Communist bill as shown by the Daily People's World of May 12, 1948 (p. 3). According to the Daily People's World of July 22, 1948 (p. 3), Loren Miller, attorney, Los Angeles, attacked the arrest of the Communist Party leaders.

In the Daily Worker of December 24, 1931 (p. 3), Loren Miller was named as a reporter for the Worker. Reference to Loren Miller as a reporter for the Worker appeared in the Daily Worker of December 21, 1935 (p. 3). Loren Miller has been a contributor to the Daily Worker as shown in the issue of May 4, 1938 (p. 7), as well as the two issues already cited.

The Worker is the Sunday edition of the Daily Worker, which was cited as "official Communist Party, U. S. A., organ" by the Committee on Un-American Activities in report 1920, dated May 11, 1948. The publication was cited as "chief journalistic mouthpiece of the Communist Party" by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in report 1311 of March 29, 1944; it had previously been cited as a Communist publication in reports of the special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated January 3, 1939, January 3, 1940, January 3, 1941, and June 25, 1942.

Loren Miller was named as editor of New Masses in the issue of August 20, 1935 (p. 5), and as associate editor in the issue of January 14, 1936 (p. 5). He was shown as contributing editor in the following issues of New Masses: June 2, 1936 (p. 5), January

5, 1937 (p. 22), May 11, 1937 (p. 9), September 7, 1937 (p. 9), January 11, 1938 (p. 9), and September 20, 1938 (p. 14). He was a contributor to New Masses, as shown in the issue of August 20, 1935 (p. 26), and was named as a contributor to New Masses in the Daily Worker of April 3, 1936 (p. 3).

New Masses was cited as a "Communist periodical" by the Attorney General of the United States (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447). It was cited as a "national circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in report 1311 of March 29, 1944. New Masses had been cited previously as a Communist publication in reports of the special Committee on Un-Amerian Activities, dated January 3, 1939, and June 25, 1942.

As shown by an undated letterhead of Book Union, Inc., Loren Miller was a member of its advisory council. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in report 1311 of March 29, 1944, cited Book Union as "distributors of Communist literature."

According to a letterhead of August 24, 1939, Loren Miller was a member of the Harry Bridges defense committee, southern division.

In report 1311 of the special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944, the Harry Bridges defense committee was cited as one of the Communist fronts formed to oppose deportation of Harry Bridges, Communist Party member and leader of the San Francisco general strike of 1934 which was planned by the Communist Party.

As shown in the Call for the National Negro Congress held in Chicago, Ill., February 14, 1936, Loren Miller, Los Angeles, Calif., was one of the endorsers of the National Negro Congress.

"From the record of its activities and the composition of its (National Negro Congress) governing bodies, there can be little doubt that it has served as what James W. Ford, Communist Vice Presidential candidate elected to the executive committee in 1937, predicted: 'An important sector of the democratic front,' sponsored and supported by the Communist Party" (Attorney General, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The National Negro Congress was cited as a Communist front in reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated January 3, 1939, January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. The Attorney General cited the group as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

Loren Miller, author, was a signer of the open letter to American liberals, as shown in Soviet Russia Today, issue of March 1937 (pp. 14–15).

"In March 1937 a group of well-known Communists and Communist collaborators published an open letter bearing the title given above. The letter was a defense of the Moscow purge trials" (report of the special Committee on Un-American Activities, June 25, 1942).

As shown in the Proceedings of the Second United States Congress Against War and Fascism, held in Chicago, Ill., September 28, 29, 30, 1934, under auspices of the American League Against War and Fascism, the report of the publications committee was presented by Loren Miller. (See public hearings, appendix, vol. 10, p. 22.)

"The American League Against War and Fascism was formally organized at the First United States Congress Against War and Fascism held in New York City, September 29 to October 1, 1933. * * * The program of the first congress called for the end of the Roosevelt policies of imperialism and for the support of the peace policies of the Soviet Union, for opposition to all attempts to weaken the Soviet Union. * * * Subsequent congresses in 1934 and 1936 reflected the same program" (Attorney General, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6 p. 7442).

The American League Against War and Fascism was "established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union" (Attorney General, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7442). The Attorney General cited the American League Against War and Fascism as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited by the special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front in reports of the special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated January 3, 1939, January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944.

In connection with the testimony of Harper L. Knowles and Ray E. Nimmo before the special Committee on Un-American Activities on October 25, 1938, a brief relating to activities of the Communist Party among professional groups was presented and incorporated in the record. In this brief Loren Miller is described as "contributing editor to New Masses and a member of the Communst Party" (public hearings, p. 1997). According to this same source, he was a participant in the Western Writers Congress, cited as a Communist front by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in report 1311 of March 29, 1944.

A pamphlet, "Equality, Land and Freedom," published by the League of Struggle for Negro Rights, Decemeber 1934 (p. 44), listed Loren Miller as a member of the national council of that organization.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the League of Struggle for Negro Rights as follows: "The Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes is known as the National Negro Congress. Practically the same group of leaders directing this directed the League of Struggle for Negro Rights, which was, until 2 years ago, the name of the Communist front for Negroes. The name was later changed * * * in 1936 to the National Negro Congress."

It was reported in the Daily People's World of September 28, 1950 (p. 5) that Loren Miller was one of a group of Los Angeles lawyers who signed a brief against a Communist registration ordinance. The brief was presented in connection with the case of Henry Steinberg, county legislative director of the Communist Party, who was charged with failing to register with the sheriff's office in accordance with provisions of the ordinance. Reference to Loren Miller as one of the attorneys who signed a brief charging Los Angeles County's Communist registration ordinance with being "basically unconstitutional" also appeared in the Daily People's World of October 9, 1950 (p. 3). The brief was filed in connection with a hearing on a demurrer against the ordinance filed by attorneys for Gus Brown, Furniture Workers Local 576 business agent.

The Daily People's World of May 17, 1950 (p. 3), listed Loren Miller as one who signed a statement against the loyalty oath.

OCTOBER 26, 1955.

Subject: Bartley Crum, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Daily Worker of March 15, 1947 (p. 5) printed statements made by several individuals, registering opposition to the proposal of Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach to outlaw the Communist Party. Bartley Crum's statement, which immediately follows that of Robert W. Kenny, reads:

"It is unconstitutional and utterly stupid for Government to attempt to prevent people from thinking or believing as they wish. Action of this sort is contrary to the Bill of Rights. This Government was founded on the theory that we are not afraid of what any person or group of persons might think. Freedom of belief and freedom of speech are guaranteed.

"The Supreme Court has ruled that these freedoms may be limited only when a clear and present danger to the country exists. In that event the burden of proof rests upon Government which must show that the clear and present danger arises from the beliefs that are put forward.

"As a non-Communist, I think the most effective answer to the Marxists is to make our democracy work by providing equality and job opportunities for all, strengthening the trade unions and raising the standard of living."

The official organ of the Communist Party on the west coast, the Daily People's World of November 8, 1947 (p. 6), published an editorial regarding Mr. Crum, in which the Honorable Jack B. Tenney, chairman, California State Committee on Un-American Activities, was quoted as having called Mr. Crum a "Communist for every practical purpose."

Mr. Crum was attorney for Harry Bridges on behalf of the Civil Liberties Union (U. S. Supreme Court reports, 89 Law. Ed. October 1944 Term, U. S. 323–325, U. S. 326, p. 2106); he was identified as being from San Francisco. He was attorney for John Howard Lawson (brief for John Howard Lawson, U. S. Court of Appeals, February 16, 1949, District of Columbia, No. 9872); he was attorney for Dalton Trumbo (brief of *Dalton Trumbo* v. *United States of America*, U. S. Court of Appeals, District of Columbia, No. 9873); he served as attorney for John Howard Lawson, Dalton Trumbo, Samuel Ornitz, Edward Dmytryk, Adrian Scott, Ring Lardner, Jr., Lester Cole, and Bert Brecht (hearings before the Committee on Un-American Activities, October 27, 28, 29, and 30, 1947).

In a report on the National Lawyers Guild which was released by this committee September 17, 1950, a list of National Lawyers Guild members who have represented witnesses before the Committee on Un-American Activities was shown. "In each case, the witnesses have refused to answer questions regarding Communist affiliations propounded by the committee. In a number of cases espionage activities were involved. It should be noted in this connection that it is standard Communist practice to accept as attorneys only those who agree to abide by the party's propaganda and conspirative directives. Cases are known where attorneys who have volunteered their services have been summarily rejected because they would not become partners to the party's ulterior purposes." (Report on the National Lawyers Guild, p. 3.) The same report also named Mr. Crum as one of the vice presidents of the guild as of December 1949 and May 1950 (pp. 18 and 19).

Mr. Crum was vice president of the guild in 1945, as shown in the Daily Worker of September 25, 1945 (pp. 1 and 2); in 1947, as shown on a letterhead of the guild dated June 11, 1947, and a printed program of their conference on "Legislative Investigation? or Thought Control Agency?" dated October 20, 1947 (p. 3); and in 1948 as shown on letterheads of March 8 and May 7, 1948, and the Daily Worker of February 24, 1948 (p. 3).

The National Lawyers Guild was cited as a Communist-front organization by the special Committee on Un-American Activities (report of March 29, 1944); it was the subject of a report released by the Committee on Un-American Activities September 17, 1950, in which the guild was cited as "the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions."

The statement of policy of the National Committee to Win the Peace (dated February 6, 1947), contains the name of Bartley Crum in a list of persons who organized that committee; a letterhead of the Win-the-Peace Conference, dated February 28, 1946, named him as one of the sponsors of that conference, as does the Daily Worker of March 5, 1946 (the conference was held in Washington, D. C., April 5–7, 1946); the call to that conference contained Mr. Crum's name in a list of sponsors. A letterhead of the New York Committee to Win the Peace, dated June 1, 1946, lists his name as vice chairman of the national committee; the New York committee call to Win-the-Peace Conference, June 28 and 29, 1946, also listed him as vice chairman of the national committee.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Committee to Win the Peace as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

A letterhead of the Conference on China and the Far East, dated September 19, 1946, carries the name of Bartley C. Crum in a list of sponsors of that conference which was called by the national committee to Win the Peace and the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy; the call to that conference, which was held October 18–20, 1946, shows him as one of the sponsors; the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy was cited by the Attorney General as Communist (press release of April 27, 1949, and consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

Mr. Crum was one of the National Sponsors of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee (letterheads of that group dated February 26, 1946; February 3, 1948; April 28, 1949; May 18, 1951; and January 5, 1953; he spoke before a rally of that organization in Madison Square Garden, as shown in the Daily Worker of September 25, 1945 (pp. 1 and 2); an invitation to dinner which was issued by the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee for March 31, 1948, named Mr. Crum as a member of the National Reception Committee for Madame Irene Joliot-Curie who was in this country for a speaking tour, sponsored by the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee was cited as subversive and Communist (press releases of the Attorney General dated September 21, 1948, and December 4, 1947; also included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954); the Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited it as a Communist-front organization in report 1311 of March 29, 1944.

New Masses for October 30, 1945 (back page), and a letterhead of the American Committee for Spanish Freedom, dated January 21, 1946, both name Mr. Crum as vice chairman of that committee, cited as Communist by the Attorney General (press release of April 27, 1949; consolidated list of April 27, 1949).

Mr. Crum was one of the initiating sponsors of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions (Daily Worker of December 24, 1944, p. 14); and a member of the board of directors of the organization (letterhead of November 26, 1946). The independent Citizens Committee * * * was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Committee on Un-American Activities (report of April 1, 1951).

The spring catalog (1947) of the California Labor School lists Mr. Crum as one of the sponsors of that school; he is identified as president, San Francisco Chapter, National Lawyers Guild. The Yearbook of the school (1949, pp. 6 and 35) name him as a member of the board of directors and a sponsor of the school. Biographical notes are also given in the same source. The California Labor School was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (press release of June 1, 1948; included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

An invitation to attend a testimonial dinner in New York City, October 12, 1947, issued by the American Slav Congress, as well as the program of that dinner, contain the name of Bartley C. Crum in a list of sponsors of the dinner. The American Slav Congress has been cited as subversive and Communist (press releases of the Attorney General dated June 1 and September 21, 1948; also consolidated list released April 1, 1954); the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Congress as "a Moscow-inspired and directed federation of Communist-dominated organizations seeking by methods of propaganda and pressure to subvert the 10 million people in this country of Slavic birth or descent" (report dated June 26, 1949).

Mr. Crum signed a statement of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, hailing the War Department's order concerning commissions for Communists (Daily Worker, March 18, 1945, p. 2); Mr. Crum was identified as a lawyer from San Francisco, Calif. The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties has been cited by the Attorney General as an organization "by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program"; and as subversive and Communist. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 744C; and press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954.) The special committee cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party" (report of March 29, 1944; also cited in reports of June 25, 1942, and January 2, 1943); the Committee on Un-American Activities also cited the organization as having been "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law" (report 1115 of September 2, 1947).

The Daily People's World of May 10, 1946 (p. 5), announced that Mr. Crum (identified as a San Francisco attorney) would speak at the American Russian Institute's presentation of Russian author, Konstantin Simonov, in San Francisco, May 13; he also spoke at a meeting of the American Russian Institute as shown in the Daily Worker of June 3, 1948 (p. 2), in which source he was identified as publisher of PM, a New York daily newspaper. The American Russian Institute was cited as Communist by the Attorney General (press release of April 27, 1949; included on consolidated list of organizations released April 1, 1954).

The program of a dinner held on the first anniversary of the American Youth for Democracy, October 16, 1944, Bartley C. Crum is shown as a sponsor of the dinner committee. The American Youth for Democracy was cited as the new name under which the Young Communist League operates and which also largely absorbed the American Youth Congress (special committee in report 1311 of March 29, 1944); the Attorney General cited it as Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

Behind the Silken Curtain, written by Mr. Crum, was recommended for reading by Youth magazine (July-August 1947 issue), a bimonthly publication of the American Youth for Democracy; the same book was favorably reviewed in the June 24, 1947, issue of New Masses (p. 12); it was a selection of the Book Find Club, according to the New York Times of September 14, 1947 (book review section, p. 19); it was also favorably reviewed by Albert Kahn in the Worker (Sunday edition of the Daily Worker), for June 15, 1947 (p. 11M).

New Masses has been cited by the Attorney General as a Communist periodical (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447); and by the special committee as "a nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party" (report of March 29, 1944). The Daily Worker is the chief journalistic mouthpiece of the Communist Party (report of March 29, 1944).

Joseph Starobin, in his column, Around the Globe, which appeared in the Daily Worker of May 4, 1948 (p. 8), had the following to say concerning Bartley Crum, at the time the new PM appeared on newsstands: "Take Bartley Crum, for example, whose unquestionably progressive career has a dialectic all its own: A Willkie Republican leader who championed the reelection of FDR 4 years ago; a successful lawyer, of Catholic faith, I believe, with a record of sincere work in organizations which the Attorney General insists are subversive; a leader of the Progressive Citizens of America, who declined to come out for Henry Wallace, and yet, is said to feel very warmly toward Wallace and the program for which he stands; a political figure * * * he rejected a job in the Civil Aeronautics Board, but accepted membership in the investigation commission for Palestine; and came back with some conclusions which still plague the State Department and Truman, too. * * *"

OCTOBER 26, 1955.

Subject: Morris L. Ernst, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

In testimony of Walter S. Steele before the special Committee on Un-American Activities, August 15, 1938, Morris Ernst was named as a member of the board of the American Fund for Public Service (public hearings, p. 388). The following issues of New Masses named Morris L. Ernst as treasurer of the American Fund for Public Service, November 1930 (p. 19), November 1931 (p. 31), and January 2, 1934 (p. 2). He was named as treasurer and a member of the board of directors of the American Fund for Public Service on a letterhead (photostat dated September 8, 1930).

The American Fund for Public Service (Garland Fund) was "established in 1922 * * * it was a major source for the financing of Communist Party enterprises" such as the Daily Worker and New Masses, official Communist publications, Federated Press, Russian Reconstruction Farms, and International Labor Defense. William Z. Foster, present chairman, Communist Party, and Scott Nearing, a leading writer for the party, served on the board of directors of the fund (special Committee on Un-American Activities, report of March 29, 1944, pp. 75 and 76).

A letterhead of the American League for Peace and Democracy (a photostat dated April 6, 1939) carried the name of Morris L. Ernst as a member of the lawyer's committee of the league. The American League for Peace and Democracy was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General in letters furnished the Loyalty

Review Board and released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission, June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. It was established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism "in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union." (Attorney General of the United States, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7442.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the league as "the largest of the Communist-front movements in the United States" (report of January 3, 1939).

The Daily Worker of February 19, 1937 (p. 4), reported that Morris Ernst spoke at a meeting of the American Youth Congress in Washington, D. C. The American Youth Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953 and included on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list). The Attorney General cited the organization as "originated in 1934 and has been controlled by Communist and manipulated by them to influence the thought of American youth" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7444). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the American Youth Congress as "one of the principal fronts of the Communist Party" (report of June 25, 1942, p. 16).

Mr. Ernst spoke at a meeting of the League of American Writers in New York City, as was revealed by the Daily Worker of December 5, 1936 (p. 5). He spoke for the League for Mutual Aid on "Dethroning the Supreme Court," February 1, 1937, as shown in New Masses of January 26, 1937 (p. 37).

The League of American Writers was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948) and was redesignated pursuant to Executive Order 10450, April 27, 1953; and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The League of American Writers previously had been cited as a Communist front by the Attorney General and by the special committee. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7445; and reports of January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944, respectively). The special committee cited the League for Mutual Aid as a Communist enterprise (report of March 29, 1944, p. 76).

Morris L. Ernst was named on a letterhead of the Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, dated July 6, 1938, as a member of the Lawyers' Committee of that organization. "In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheatedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations" such as the Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy (report of the special committee dated March 29, 1944, p. 82).

Morris L. Ernst, identified as treasurer, American Fund for Public Service, was shown as a stockholder of New Masses on a photostatic copy of the statement of ownership of that publication, dated October 1, 1930. New Masses was cited as a"Communist periodical" by the Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7448) and as the "nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party" by the special committee (report of March 29, 1944, pp. 48 and 75).

The Nonpartisan Committee for the Reelection of Vito Marcantonio was cited as a Communist front by the special committee in the report of March 29, 1944 (p. 122). Mr. Ernst was chairman of the Nonpartisan Committee for the Reelection of Vito Marcantonio, as was shown on a letterhead of the organization dated October 3, 1936.

A newsletter of the National Lawyers Guild, dated July 1937 (p. 2), listed Mr. Ernst, of New York City, as chairman of the guild's committee on the relation of government to business. The Daily Worker of February 10, 1939 (p. 2), reported that he spoke at a meeting of the National Lawyers Guild; a letterhead of the guild, dated May 28, 1940, named Mr. Ernst as director ex-officio of that group; a membership list (1939) of the guild, on file with this committee, contains the name of Morris L. Ernst, 285 Madison Avenue, New York City.

On September 17, 1950, the Committee on Un-American Activities released a report on the National Lawyers Guild in which it was cited as a Communist front and the "foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions." An earlier report of the special committee (report of March 29, 1944, p. 149) cited the guild as a Communist front.

An editorial in the Daily Worker of December 10, 1947 (p. 9), criticized Morris Ernst for his proposed legislation to register front organizations. Morris L. Ernst, of New York City, testified voluntarily before the Committee on Un-American Activities, February 11, 1948, regarding legislation before the committee which would seek to curb or outlaw the Communist Party. He stated, in part, as follows:

"Mr. KERSTEN. Would you say we would have to have the freedom of expression on the parts of teachers in our schools, professors in our universities, the freedom of expression to the extent that the president of this particular institution could, if he wants to, permit his teachers to teach to the students, for example, the tenets of communism?

"Mr. ERNST. Well, may I state my position on that? I have got to cut down underneath it a bit.

* * * * *

"I think the Communists or the Klan have a right to elect the Government of the United States. Not having elected the Government of the United States, I take it to be the mandate of the people to the officials elected to make sure that neither Klan nor Communist policy is infiltrated or injected into the Government.

"Under those circumstances, it seems to me I would say that no klansman should be in the Bureau of Education of the United States Government even though on an open debate and an election with nightshirts off, they may elect the Government, that's what we are gambling on.

"Now, I have got faith that they are not going to elect the Government, if they take their shirts off.

"Mr. KERSTEN. The question is, however, do you think a university president has the right or teachers have the right in that university, if they wish to exercise it, to teach the student the tenets of communism?

* * * * *

"Mr. ERNST. I should say that if it is an avowed Communist or a teacher said this is what communism is, I would like to see that taught in the schools without nightshirts, yes. I would like to see it taught.

"Now that doesn't mean that I am at all in favor of a school being sneaked upon, as our schools were in New York by Communists sneaking their perfidious stuff underground. I am not afraid of the thesis of communism aboveboard, not at all. Americans will beat it down at every point. We are not afraid of them at all, haven't got the least fear of that crowd, and they are not all crackpots. They are fanatics, maybe, but not crackpots, but I have great fear of any secret group for this reason.

"Up to now the problem of America has been the protection of minorities against majorities, oppression by majority or minority. From now on in, I suggest our problem is reversed, because a tightly regimented controlled minority in a labor union, in any place in life with the complexities of modern life can oppress a majority, and that is what the Communists are doing to the decent part of the American labor movement today." (Public hearings, pp. 291, 292.)

Reference to Mr. Ernst was made by Maj. Gen. Charles Willoughby, a witness during public hearings before this committee, August 22, 1951, as follows:

"Without going into details which are in this file, the International Red Aid, Soviet-Comintern sponsored, becomes the the International Labor Defense, and the American Labor Defense becomes the Civil Rights Congress. And, incidentally, again Weiss, as an organizer, develops other agencies, such as the American Committee for the Defense of the Foreign Born, and several other organizations, all of which have been analyzed and commented on adversely by Mr. Morris Ernst, a reputable New York lawyer, who resented, apparently, ever having been mixed up with this group." (American Aspects of Richard Sorge Spy Case, p. 1188.)

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Z. Alexander Looby, national board of directors, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

A 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers Guild, on file with this committee, contains the name of Alexander Looby, 419 Fourth Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers' Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions," and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

The Daily People's World of April 25, 1948 (p. 11), reported that Alexander Looby, attorney, Nashville, Tenn., had spoken before the Southern Negro Youth Congress. The Worker of May 16, 1948 (p. 2), disclosed that Z. Alexander Looby, attorney, Nashville, Tenn., had spoken before the same organization.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U. S. A., which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means" (letter to Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947). The Attorney General redesignated the group April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1940 (p. 9), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 17, 1947 (p. 14), cited the organization as "surreptitiously controlled" by the Young Communist League.

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Paul J. Kern, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Paul J. Kern was attorney for Communist Party leaders such as Benjamin J. Davis, as reported in the Daily Worker of August 5, 1949 (p. 1), and October 26, 1949 (p. 3); he was a sponsor of the national nonpartisan committee to defend the rights of the 12 Communist leaders, as shown on a letterhead dated September 9, 1949, and the Daily Worker of July 18, 1949 (p. 2). He signed a statement of the Commtitee for Political Advocacy, defending the 12 Communist Party leaders (Narodna Volya for March 25, 1949, p. 4; and the Daily Worker of February 28, 1949, p. 9), in which sources he was identified as former president of the municipal civil service commission, and a letterhead of January 7, 1949. The Daily Worker of May 6, 1949 (p. 2), reported that Paul J. Kern, chairman of the Committee for Free Political Advocacy, condemned the trial of the Communist leaders.

Identified as being from New York City, Paul J. Kern was one of those who signed a statement addressed to the President of the United States defending the Communist Party (Daily Worker of March 5, 1941, p. 2); he was retained as special counsel in the Communist Party's fight to remain on the ballot in New York State (Daily Worker of September 23, 1946, p. 5); he also signed a statement in 1947 protesting the proposal to outlaw the Communist Party (Daily Worker of March 12, 1947, p. 3, in which source he was identified as a former New York City civil service commissioner); he was a member of the nonpartisan committee for the reelection of Congressman Vito Marcantonio, as shown on their letterhead of October 3, 1936; he condemned the purge of Communists from the film industry (The Worker of November 30, 1947, p. 10—southern edition—in which source he was identified as former New York City civil service commissioner).

Mr. Kern was named as one of more than 200 outstanding professors, clergymen, lawyers, writers, professional people, and others (who) have addressed a petition to United States Attorney General J. Howard McGrath, urging him to withdraw contempt proceedings. The contempt proceedings involved 17 men and women who invoked their constitutional right not to testify (before a congressional committee) on grounds of self-incrimination. From the Daily Worker, of February 19, 1951, p. 2.) The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 5, page 5841, named Paul J. Kern, New York City, as one of those who signed a statement opposing the Mundt anti-Communist bill. He signed a statement to the mayor of New York City and the city council, on behalf of Simon Gerson, a Communist (Daily Worker, of February 16, 1948, p. 16), and supported the Citizens Committee To Defend Representative Government which organization urged the seating of Simon Gerson (from an advertisement which appeared in the New York Times on February 19, 1948, p. 13, in which he was identified as former president of the municipal civil service commission).

In 1941 an investigation was made of the city council into the affairs and conduct of the municipal civil service commission of the city of New York and Hon. Paul J. Kern, its president, pursuant to section 43 of the charter of the city of New York.

Paul J. Kern was one of the sponsors of the Consumers National Federation, as shown in the pamphlet, The People Versus H. C. L., dated December 11-12, 1937 (p. 2). The Consumers National Federation has been cited as a Communist-front organization by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in a report dated March 29, 1944.

The Daily Worker, of March 18, 1937 (p. 5), named Paul J. Kern as vice president of the National Lawyers Guild; the article concerned Dr. Kern's attack on the United States Supreme Court; he was vice president of the guild in 1937, as shown by the organization's news letter of July 1937 (p. 2), in which source he was identified as being from New York; he was named in the same source as chairman of the guild's committee on publications and public relations; he spoke before the guild, as reported in the Daily Worker, of February 25, 1939 (p. 1), as having been president of the New York chapter of the guild for 2 years and as having denied that he had resigned from the guild. A membership list of the guild, dated 1939, contains the name of one Paul Kern whose address was shown as 1451 Municipal Building, New York City; a letterhead of the same organization, dated May 28, 1940, named him as director ex officio. Paul J. Kern participated in a discussion entitled "Status of Civil Liberties" at the fifth annual convention of the National Lawyers Guild, Detroit, Mich., May 29–June 1, 1941, as shown by the convention program printed in Convention News, May 1941 (p. 2). This same source showed him as a member of the convention resolutions committee.

In 1944 the special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization (report dated March 29, 1944); in 1950 the Committee on Un-American Activities released a report on the guild, in which it was called "the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" (report rated September 17, 1950).

Paul Kern spoke before the International Labor Defense during its New York State conference (Labor Defender, November 1937, p. 3); he was a sponsor of the organization's summer milk drive in 1939 (Equal Justice for June 1939, p. 7). Mr. Kern was a member of the national committee of the International Juridicial Association, as shown in the leaflet, "What is the I. J. A.?" The Attorney General of the United States cited the International Labor Defense as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as the legal arm of the Communist Party (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 75–78), cited the International Labor Defense as the legal defense arm of the Communist Party of the United States. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (pp. 1 and 2), cited the International Labor Defense as part of an international network or organizations for the defense of Communist lawbreakers. The International Juridicial Association was cited as a Communist front and an affshoot of the International Labor Defense (special committee's report of March 29, 1944); the Committee on Un-American Activitiess cited the International Juridicial Association as having actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line (report of September 17, 1950).

In March 1937 a group of well-known Communists and Communist collaborators published an open letter bearing the title given as "Open Letter to American Liberals in defense of the Moscow Purge Trials" (special Committee on Un-American Activities in report of June 25, 1942); Paul J. Kern signed the open letter as shown in the Daily Worker of February 9, 1937 (p. 2), and Soviet Russia Today for March 1937 (pp. 14–15).

An undated letterhead of the New York Tom Mooney committee listed Paul J. Kern as one of the sponsors of that organization; he was one of those who lectured at the School for Democracy, as shown in New Maasses for May 26, 1942 (p. 31); the catalog and program of the school, dated January 1942, listed him as a guest lecturer on legislation, lobbying, and the people's program, He was identified as president of the civil service commission, New York City.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the New York Tom Mooney committee as a Communist-front organization. "For many years, the Communist Party organized widespread agitation around the Mooney case, and drew its members and followers into the agitation (report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944, p. 154).

"In 1941, the Communists established a school in New York City which was known as the School for Democracy (now merged with the Workers School into the Jefferson School of Social Science)." The school was "established by Communist teachers ousted from the public school system of New York City." (Special Committee on Un-American Activities in report No. 1311.)

A handbill entitled "Protest Brutal Nazi Persecutions" announced a mass rally of the American Labor Party and named Paul J. Kern as one of the sponsors of the rally. The special committee found that "for years, the Communists have put forth the greatest efforts to capture the entire American Labor Party throughout New York State. They succeeded in capturing the Manhattan and Brooklyn sections of the American Labor Party but outside of New York City, they have been unable to win control" (report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944).

Mr. Kern signed the call of the American Youth Congress to their New York model legislature of youth, New York City, January 28–30, 1938, as shown on the leaflet, Calling Young People of New York, in which source he was identified as chairman of the New York Lawyers Guild. He spoke in New York City before the Workers Alliance, according to the Daily Worker of June 18, 1937 (p. 5).

The Attorney General cited the American Youth Congress as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Attorney General cited the American Youth Congress previously as controlled by Communists and manipulated by them to influence the thought of American youth (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7444). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 25, 1942 (p. 16), cited the organization as "one of the principal fronts of the Communist Party" and "prominently identified with the White House picket line."

The Attorney General cited the Workers Alliance as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a "Communist penetrated organization," (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7442). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 72–74), cited the organization as follows: "Among the successes in its 'front movements, the Communists point to the "Workers" Alliance of America.'" It was created in 1936 and organized "in practically every relief project in the country."

It was "apparently patterned after the 'Unemployed Councils of St. Petersburg,' Russia, set up in 1906 as a part of the Communist front there. As the councils in Russia staged sit-down strikes, so also did the Alliance stage sit-down strikes in various State legislatures and relief bureaus in our country."

Mr. Kern was attorney for the International Workers Order as reported in the Daily Worker of September 27, 1950 (p. 5), which source identified him as from New York.

The Attorney General cited the International Workers Order as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953 and April 1, 1954. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as "one of the strongest Communist organizations" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 79), cited the International Workers Order as "one of the most effective and closely knitted organizations among the Communist-'front' movements." The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the American Slav Congress, April 26, 1950 (pp. 82–84), cited the International Workers Order as "one of the strongest Communist organizations."

The Call to a Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, June 7, 1940 (p. 4), named Paul J. Kern as one of the sponsors of that conference, cited by the special committee as "an important part of the solar system of the Communist Party's front organization," (Report, March 29, 1944, p. 102). The Attorney General cited the conference as the one which resulted in the formation of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program."

Mr. Kern was chairman of a meeting in New York City of the North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy (Daily Worker, June 5, 1937, p. 2); he spoke before the group in February 1938, as shown in the Daily Worker of February 28 of that year (p. 8); a letterhead of the medical bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy, dated July 6, 1938, named him as a member of the lawyers committee of the organization; a letterhead of the group, dated January 30, 1939, also named him as chairman of the lawyers committee of the organization. Mr. Kern was one of the sponsors of the Medical Bureau, American Friends of Spanish Democracy, as shown in the Daily Worker of March 5, 1937 (p. 2); he signed a petition of the organization to lift the arms embargo against Loyalist Spain (Daily Worker of Apr. 8, 1938, p. 4).

In a booklet prepared and published by the Coordinating Committee to Lift The (Spanish) Embargo, and entitled "These Americans Say" (p. 8), Mr. Kern was named as a representative individual who advocated lifting the arms embargo; he spoke in New York City before the Morningside branch, Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade (Daily Worker of June 16, 1937, p. 3); he spoke before the brigade in September 1937, as shown in the Daily Worker of September 29, 1937 (p. 2); he endorsed the drive of the same organization to bring veterans back to America, as reported in the Daily Worker of June 7, 1938 (p. 2), and a circular entitled "And Tell the Folks That I'll Be Home If."

Mr. Kern sponsored the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign, according to a letterhead of that organization dated September 16, 1940; and was chairman of the Lawyers Committee on American Relations With Spain, a participating organization, as shown in the pamphlet, Children in Concentration Camps. A prospectus and review of the lawyers committee also named him as chairman of that group.

The North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy, American Friends of Spanish Democracy, the Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo, the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, and the Lawyers Committee on American Relations With Spain were all set up during 1937 and 1938, when it was the policy of the Communist Party to support the Spanish War. (Rept. No. 1311 of the special Committee on Un-American Activities dated Mar. 29, 1944). The North American Committee and the Abraham Lincoln Brigade were also cited as Communist organizations by the Attorney General (press release of April 27, 1949, redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list). The Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign was cited by the Special Committee as a Communist front organization (report dated January 3, 1940).

The call to a Bill of Rights Conference, New York City, July 16 and 17, 1949, named Paul J. Kern as an initiating sponsor and acting chairman of the conference; he was identified in this source as former president of the Civil Service Commission, New York City. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, member of the national committee of the Communist Party, in writing about the conference for her column in the Daily Worker (July 25, 1949, p. 8), stated that one of the highlights of the conference was the fight for the 12 defendants in the current Communist cases. She reported that seven of the defendants were present and participated actively. The New York Times (July 18, 1949, p. 13) reported that "the 20 resolutions adopted unanimously by the 2-day conference registered opposition to the conspiracy trial of the 11 Communist leaders, the presidential loyalty order, deportation for political belief, among others. The conference also called for an end to the investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation into political, rather than criminal, activities."

A short personal statement by Paul J. Kern against anti-Communist legislation appeared in New Masses for March 25, 1947 (p. 11); he was one of the sponsors of the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill, as revealed by a press release of the group dated June 15, 1949 (p. 2), in which source he was identified as being from New York City; the organization's pamphlet, "Hey, Brother, there's a law against you" (p. 2) and a photostatic copy of a letterhead dated May 5, 1950 also named Mr. Kern as one of the sponsors of that group which this committee cited as "a registered lobbying organization which has carried out the objectives of the Communist Party in its fight against antisubversive legislation" (Rept. No. 3248 of Jan. 2, 1951, originally released Dec. 7, 1950).

The Daily Worker of February 2, 1938 (p. 5), reported that Paul J. Kern had spoken before the League of American Writers. He signed a statement of the American League Against War and Fascism against Franco spies, as shown in the Daily Worker of May 11, 1937 (p. 1); he was one of the sponsors of a joint meeting of the American League Against War and Fascism and American Friends of the Chinese People (Daily Worker, Sept. 24, 1937, p. 6); he was chairman of the Lawyers' Committee, American League for Peace and Democracy, as shown on their letterhead dated April 6, 1939.

The League of American Writers was cited as a Communist-front organization by the special committee in reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944; it was cited as a Communist front by the Attorney General, and subsequently as subversive and Communist (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7445; and press releases of June 1 and Sept. 21, 1948, redesignated Apr. 27, 1953, and included on Apr. 1, 1954, consolidated lists).

The American League Against War and Fascism, predecessor of the American League for Peace and Democracy, was cited as a Communist-front organization (special committee in reports of Jan. 3, 1939; Jan. 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and Mar. 29, 1944; and by the Attorney General; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7442; and press releases of Dec. 4, 1947, and Sept. 21, 1948, redesignated Apr. 27, 1953, and included on Apr. 1, 1954, list).

Identified as president municipal civil service commission, New York City, Paul J. Kern was one of those who signed a petition of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, as shown on a mimeographed sheet attached to a letterhead of the group dated January 17, 1940. The American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom was cited as a Communist-front organization which defended Communist teachers (special committee in reports of June 24, 1942; and Mar. 29, 1944).

Mr. Kern was a member of the advisory board of Film Audiences for Democracy, according to Film Survey of June 1939 (p. 4). The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited Film Audiences for Democracy as a Communist-front organization (report of Mar. 29, 1944). He was a sponsor of the Greater New York Emergency Conference for Inalienable Rights, as shown on the program of the conference which was held February 12, 1940. The special committee cited the New York organization as a Communist front (report of Mar. 29, 1944).

A program of the American Continental Congress for World Peace, held in Mexico City, September 5–10, 1949, named Paul J. Kern as one of the sponsors of that congress, cited by this committee as "another phase in the Communist peace campaign aimed at consolidating anti-American forces throughout the Western Hemisphere (report 378 of Apr. 25, 1951).

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Karl N. Llewellyn, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Prof. K. N. Llewellyn, Columbia Law School, spoke at a conference of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights as shown by the program, February 12, 1940.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 96 and 129), cited the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights as a Communist-front which was succeeded by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights as among a "maze of organizations" which were "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law."

A letterhead of the Non-Partisan Committee for the Re-election of Vito Marcantonio dated October 3, 1936 listed Karl N. Llewellyn as vice chairman of the organization.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 122), cited the Non-Partisan Committee for the re-election of Vita Marcantonio as a Communist-front organization.

An undated letterhead of the International Juridical Association listed Prof. Karl Lewellyn, New York, as a member of the National Committee.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the International Juridical Association as "a Communist front and an offshoot of the International Labor Defense." The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950 (p. 12), cited the International Juridical Association as an organization which "actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line."

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Shad Polier (Isador Polier), national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Who's Who in America (vol. 25, 1948–49, p. 1971) shows that Justine Wise Polier married Shad Polier in 1937. Who's Who in American Jewry (vol. 3, 1938–39, p. 818) shows that Justine Wise Polier is the daughter of Rabbi Stephen S. Wise and that she married Isadore Polier, March 26, 1937, New York City. It is noted further that Max Lowenthal, a witness during public hearings before this committee, September 15, 1950, when asked if he were acquainted with Shad Polier, stated: "Yes, he was Rabbi Wise's son-in-law." (Communism in the United States Government, pt. 2, p. 2984.) Therefore, this report includes references from the public records, files and publications of this committee which appear under the name, Shad Polier, and references which appear under the name, Isadore Polier.

Shad Polier was named in the election campaign letter of the Washington, D. C., chapter of the National Lawyers Guild, dated May 18, 1940, as a candidate for delegate to the national convention of the Guild. Convention News for May 1941 (p. 3) listed Shad Polier, New York City, as a member of the nominations committee of the National Lawyers Guild Fifth Annual Convention at the Book-Cadillac Hotel, Detroit, Mich., May 29–June 1, 1941. Shad Polier is shown as the writer of an article in the Lawyers Guild Review, vol. VI, pp. 490–491.

The National Lawyers Guild was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (Report 1311, March 29, 1944, p. 149), and was the subject of a separate report by the Committee on Un-American Activities, September 17, 1950, in which it was cited as a Communist front that "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

A letterhead of the International Juridical Association, dated May 18, 1942, carries the name of Shad Polier, New York, as a member of the organization's national committee. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the International Juridical Association as "a Communist front and an offshoot of the International Labor Defense" (report of March 29, 1944, p. 149); the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the International Juridical Association as an organization which "actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line" (report 3123, September 21, 1950, p. 12).

A 1941 membership list of the Washington Book Shop, on file with this committee, contains the name of Shad Polier, 3610 Idaho Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. "The Washington Cooperative Book Shop, under the name 'The Book Shop Association,' was incorporated in the District of Columbia in 1938. * * * It maintains a bookshop and art gallery at 916 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., where literature is sold and meetings and lectures held. Evidence of Communist penetration or control is reflected in the following: Among its stock the establishment has offered prominently for sale books and literature identified with the Communist Party and certain of its affiliates and front organizations." (United States Attorney General, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447). The Attorney General also included the Book Shop on lists of subversive and Communist organizations furnished the Loyalty Review Board (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948) and redesignated it pursuant to Executive Order 10450 (memorandum of April 29, 1953, released by the Department of Justice); and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities also cited the Washington Bookshop as a Communist front (report of March 29, 1944, p. 150).

The news letter of the National Lawyers Guild for July 1937 (p. 2) named Isadore Polier, New York City, as chairman of the guild's committee on constitutional and judicial review. A leaflet, What is the IJA?, contains the name of Isadore Polier as a member of the National Committee of the International Juridical Association. An undated letterhead of the group listed him as executive director, and this committee's report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950 (p. 13), reported that Isadore Polier was executive director of the International Juridical Association at "the time of its inception." See citation on page 1.

The Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 4), reported that Isadore Polier signed a petition, sponsored by the American Friends of Spanish Democracy, to lift the arms embargo. "In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations * * * such as * * * American Friends of Spanish Democracy" (report of the special committee dated March 29, 1944, p. 82).

The booklet, These Americans Say (p. 8), compiled and published by the Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo, named Isadore Polier among the representative individuals who advocated lifting the Spanish embargo. The Coordinating Committee To Lift the (Spanish) Embargo was cited by the Special Committee as one of a number of front organizations, set up during the Spanish Civil War by the Communist Party in the United States and through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation (report of March 29, 1944, pp. 137 and 138).

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Jawn Sandifer, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Daily Worker of April 10, 1951 (p. 5), reported that Jawn A. Sandifer was a speaker for the National Lawyers Guild. The October 7, 1952, issue of the Daily Worker (p. 3), reported that Jawn L. Sandifer, New York, was to lead workshop discussions at the national conference of the National Lawyers Guild on civil rights, legislation, and discrimination to be held at the Park Sheraton Hotel, New York City on October 10, 11, and 12, 1952.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organiaztion as a Communist front, which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Sidney R. Redmond, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

S. R. Redmond signed the open letter of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties denouncing the Attorney General's attack on the Communist Party and decision in the Harry Bridges case as shown by the Daily Worker of July 19, 1942 (p. 4), and the booklet, 600 Prominent Americans (p. 27). Sidney R. Redmond, editor, National Bar Journal, St. Louis, Mo., signed a statement of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties supporting the War Department's order on granting commisions "to members of the Armed Forces who have been members of or sympathetic to the views of the Communist Party" according to an undated leaflet, "the only sound policy for a democracy" and the Daily Worker, March 19, 1945 (p. 4).

The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Attorney General cited the organization previously as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party." The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the National Federation * * * among a "maze of organizations" which were "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law."

Subject: George M. Johnson, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by

or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

George M. Johnson, Washington, D. C., was a member of the executive board of the National Lawyers Guild as of 1949. (See the committee's report on the National Lawyers Guild, p. 18.)

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers' Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers' Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist-front which "Is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Edward P. Lovett, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this Committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

A 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers Guild listed Edward P. Lovett, 615 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., as a member of that organization.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers' Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers' Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Louis L. Redding, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

A 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers' Guild listed Louis Redding, 1002 Franch St., Wilmington, Del., as a member of the organization. Louis L. Redding, a member of the Delaware bar, was among the speakers at a panel session on Civil Rights and Liberties as part of the National Lawyers' Guild annual convention, February 20–23, 1953, New York City, according to the Daily Worker, February 20, 1953 (p. 6).

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers' Guild as a Communist front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers' Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

The official proceedings of the National Negro Congress, 1936 (pp. 5, 6, 41), listed Louis L. Redding, Delaware, as a member of the National Executive Council and a member of the presiding committee and general resolutions committee.

The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953 and included on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist front (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes."

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Joseph B. Robinson, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

One Joseph B. Robinson signed the call for the National Emergency Conference, Washington, D. C., May 13 and 14, 1939.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 49), cited the National Emergency Conference as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 12), cited the National Emergency Conference as follows: "It will be remembered that during the days of the infamous Soviet-Nazi pact, the Communists built protective organizations known as the National Emergency Conference, the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, which culminated in the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties."

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Dr. Edward L. Young, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Dr. Edward L. Young was an initial sponsor of the American Peace Crusade as shown by letterheads dated February 1951 and February 1953. He signed a petition of the American Peace Crusade calling on President Truman and Congress to seek a big-power act as reported by the Daily Worker of February 1, 1952 (p. 1), in which source he was identified with the Harvard University Medical School. The Daily Worker of February 1, 1951 (p. 2), listed Dr. Edward L. Young, Committee on Physicians for Improvement of Medical Care, Brookline, Mass., as a sponsor of the American Peace Crusade.

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its statement issued on the March of Treason, February 19, 1951, and report on the Communist peace offensive, April 1, 1951 (p. 51), cited the American Peace Crusade as an organization which "the Communists established" as "a new instrument for their peace offensive in the United States" and which was heralded by the Daily Worker "with the usual bold headlines reserved for projects in line with the Communist objectives." The Attorney General of the United States designated the American Peace Crusade January 22, 1954 pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

Dr. Young was a United States sponsor of the American Continental Congress for Peace as shown by an official leaflet published by the Congress.

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Communist peace offensive, April 1, 1951 (p. 21), cited the American Continental Congress for Peace as "another phase in the Communist 'peace' campaign, aimed at consolidating anti-American forces throughout the Western Hemisphere."

According to a statement attached to a press release of the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, dated December 14, 1949 (p. 10), Dr. Edward L. Young, Committee of Physicians for Improvement of Medical Care, Brookline, Mass., signed a statement calling for international agreement to ban use of atomic weapons.

The Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact was cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as an organization which was formed as a result of the Conference for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact and which was located, according to a letterhead of September 16, 1950, at 30 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.; and to further the cause of "Communists in the United States" doing "their part in the Moscow campaign."

A mimeographed petition, attached to a letterhead of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee dated May 18, 1951, listed Dr. Edward L. Young, Brookline, Mass., as one who signed a petition to President Truman "to bar military aid to or alliance with Fascist Spain."

The Attorney General cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 174), cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as a Communist-front organization.

Dr. Edward L. Young was shown as a member of the board of directors of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions on a leaflet, Policy and Program Adopted by the National Convention, 1950, a letterhead dated July 28, 1950, and a letterhead dated December 7, 1952 (photostat). He was a sponsor of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, New York City, March 25–27, 1949, as shown by the conference program (p. 13), the conference call, and the Daily Worker, February 21, 1949 (p. 9). As shown by the conference program (p. 10), he spoke at the conference, and according to Speaking of Peace, edited report of the conference (p. 49), Dr. Young introduced the discussion on psychiatric aspects of today's international crisis. He signed a statement supporting a rehearing of the case of the Communist leaders before the Supreme Court and protesting the Smith Act as shown by We Join Black's Dissent, a reprint of an article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, June 20, 1951, by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. The Daily Worker of February 28, 1949 (p. 2) reported that Dr. Young was a speaker for the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. He signed a statement of the organization as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 7, page 9435. He signed a resolution against atomic weapons released by the National Council as shown by a mimeographed list of signers attached to a letterhead of July 28, 1950. He signed a peace appeal in a drive of the National and New

York Councils of the Arts, * * *, as reported in the Daily Worker of May 16, 1952 (p. 2).

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 19, 1949 (p. 2), cited the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions as a Communist-front organization. In this report, Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, the committee cited the conference as a Communist front which "was actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations."

As shown by an undated leaflet, "Prominent Americans Call For * * *" (received by this committee September 11, 1950), and the Daily Worker of Aug. 10, 1950 (p. 1), Dr. Edward L. Young signed the World Peace Appeal.

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Communist peace offensive, April 1, 1954 (p. 34), cited the World Peace Appeal as a petition campaign launched by the permanent committee of the World Peace Congress at its meeting in Stockholm, March 16–19, 1950; as having "received the enthusiastic approval of every section of the international Communist hierarchy"; as having been lauded in the Communist press, putting "every individual Communist on notice that he 'has the duty to rise to this appeal' "; and as having received the official endorsement of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R., which has been echoed by the governing bodies of every Communist satellite country, and by all Communist Parties throughout the world."

The following is quoted from a "Statement of Principles for the Defense of Democracy Against McCarthyism," as reported by the Daily Worker of March 31, 1954 (p. 8):

"Minority opinion is being suppressed by such devices as blacklisting, dismissal from employment, and even jailing.

"Teachers, lawyers, doctors, writers, artists, actors, and other professionals should be free to practice their professions without discrimination because of their political beliefs or associations, whether they be Republican, Democrat, Socialist, or Communist."

The Daily Worker article reported that "the signers of the statement urge support for an eight-point program, including abolition of the Attorney General's list of 'subversive organizations,' reinstatement of teachers dismissed in recent inquiries, and amnesty for those in jail on charges of 'conspiracy to teach and advocate' their political views." Dr. Edward L. Young, Brookline, Mass., was named as a signer.

The call to a bill of rights conference New York City, July 16 and 17, 1949, named Dr. Edward L. Young, Massachusetts General Hospital, as a sponsor. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, a member of the national committee of the Communist Party, in writing about the conference for her column in the Daily Worker (July 25, 1949, p. 8), stated that one of the highlights of the conference was the fight for the 12 defendants in the current Communist cases. She reported that seven of the defendants were present and participated actively. The New York Times (July 18, 1949, p. 13) reported that "the 20 resolutions adopted unanimously by the 2-day conference registered opposition to the conspiracy trial of the 11 Communist leaders, the Presidential loyalty order * * * deportation for political belief * * * among others. The conference also called for an end to the investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation into political, rather than criminal, activities."

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Viola Bernard, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 4), listed Viola Bernard as one who signed a petition of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy to lift the arms embargo.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 82), cited the American Friends of Spanish Democracy as follows: "In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations * * * such as * * * American Friends of Spanish Democracy."

OCTOBER 25, 1954.

Subject: Dr. John P. Peters, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Communist Daily Worker, on March 5, 1941 (p. 2), printed the text of a statement signed by "450 leading figures in America urging the President and Congress to uphold the constitutional rights of the Communist Party of the United States." Prof. John P. Peters, New Haven, Conn., was listed among the signers. The statement said, in part:

"The Communist Party has been submitting itself to the franchise of the American people for 20 years. For all that time its program and its activities are an open record. In the few cases in which one of its members has been tried for advocating force and violence, the evidence has not been about anything they have done, nor about the party program, but about the writings of earlier Communists, and in particular the implications drawn from these by the prosecution. * * * Consequently we, who are not Communists, whose concern goes beyond the preservation of their constitutional rights to the maintenance of the democratic way of life as the road into the future, urge you, the President, to exercise your authority and influence to prevent those under you from stimulating un-American actions against Communists by undemocratic utterances * * *."

The following is quoted from a Statement of Principles for the Defense of Democracy Against McCarthyism, as reported by the Daily Worker of March 31, 1954 (p. 2):

"Minority opinion is being suppressed by such devices as blacklisting, dismissal from employment, and even jailing * * *.

"Teachers, lawyers, doctors, writers, artists, actors and other professionals should be free to practice their professions without discrimination because of their political beliefs or associations, whether they be Republican, Democrat, Socialist, or Communist."

The Daily Worker article reported that "the signers of the statement urge support for an eight-point program including abolition of the Attorney General's list of 'subversive organizations,' reinstatement of teachers dismissed in recent inquiries, and amnesty for those in jail on charges of '"conspiracy to teach and advocate" their political views.'" Dr. John P. Peters, New Haven, was named as a signer.

The files of this committee contain an undated "Open Letter to the Members of the 83d Congress of the United States" mimeographed on the letterhead of the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act (Internal Security Act of 1950). The letter (received by the committee in January 1953) urged support of "legislation seeking repeal of the McCarran Act (the Internal Security Act of 1950)." The letter said, in part:

"We ask this because we believe that it is the essence of our American democratic tradition that the right of dissent is basic to our democratic institutions; that the people and not the government shall judge the merit of ideas; that the people shall be free to organize into political, religious or economic associations without governmental restraint; that men may be punished for crimes they commit but never for opinions they hold * * *"

Dr. John P. Peters was named as a signer.

The Daily Worker of July 27, 1953 (p. 8), reported that "Initiators and sponsors of the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act made public yesterday an open letter to President Eisenhower asking him to urge Congress 'to repeal or thoroughly revise' the McCarren-Walter Immigration Act." Dr. John P. Peters, New Haven, was listed among the signers.

According to the Daily Worker of February 25, 1942 (pp. 1 and 4), John P. Peters was a signer of a call issued by the National Free Browder Congress. The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited that congress as a Communist front which arranged to meet March 28–29, 1942. Earl Browder was general secretary of the Communist Party, United States of America, who had been convicted and sentenced to Atlanta Federal Penitentiary for passport fraud (report of March 29, 1944, pp. 69, 87, and 132).

An undated leaflet published by the Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder named as one of those who appealed to President Roosevelt for justice in the Browder case John P. Peters, professor of internal medicine, Yale Medical School, and secretary of the Committee of Physicians for Improvement of Medical Care. The Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder was cited as Communist by the United States Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447; letter to Loyalty Review Board, released April 27, 1949). It was included in a consolidated list of organizations previously designated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, compiled from memoranda of the Attorney General dated April 29, July 15, September 28, 1953, and January 22, 1954 (indicated in citations hereinafter by *).

The Daily Worker of July 19, 1942 (p. 4), reported that John P. Peters was a signer of an open letter in defense of Harry Bridges, cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (report of March 29, 1944, pp. 87, 112, 129, and 166).

On the back of letterheads dated June 8, 1943, and January 10, 1944, Prof. John P. Peters, Yale University, was a committee member or sponsor of the Citizens Victory Committee for Harry Bridges (ibid., p. 97).

It was reported in the Daily Worker of December 10, 1952 (p. 4), that Professor Peters was a signer of an appeal to President Truman requesting amnesty for leaders of the Communist Party convicted under the Smith Act.

Dr. John P. Peters, of the Yale University School of Medicine, was a sponsor of the Bill of Rights Conference, New York City, July 16–17, 1949, according to the Daily Worker, July 1, 1949 (p. 5), and the call to the conference. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, in writing about the conference for her column in the Daily Worker (July 25, 1949, p. 8), stated that one of the highlights of the conference was the fight for the 12 defendants in the current Communist cases. She reported that seven of the defendants

were present and participated actively. The New York Times (July 18, 1949, p. 13) reported that "the 20 resolutions adopted unanimously by the 2-day conference registered opposition to the conspiracy trial of the 11 Communist leaders, the Presidential loyalty order * * * deportation for political belief * * * among others. The conference also called for an end to investigations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation into political, rather than criminal activities."

Soviet Russia Today, in its issue of September 1939, printed the text of an open letter calling for closer cooperation with the Soviet Union. The letter was quoted as saying: "The Soviet Union continues as always to be a consistent bulwark against war and aggression, and works unceasingly for the goal of a peaceful international order." Dr. John P. Peters, department of internal medicine, Yale University Medical School, was listed as a signer. Soviet Russia Today was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (report of March 29, 1944, p. 167; June 25, 1942, p. 21) and by the Committee on Un-American Activities (report No. 1953, April 26, 1950, p. 108).

Dr. Peters was a sponsor of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, as shown by the call to the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, November 6–8, 1943 (p. 4), and a memorandum isued by the council, March 18, 1946. Soviet Russia Today reported (June 1943, p. 21) that he was a signer of an open letter to the American people, sponsored by the council. The Attorney General cited the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as subversive and Communist (letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948; September 11, 1950). In its report of March 29, 1944, p. 156, the special Committee on Un-American Activities said: "In recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian has been known as the National Council for American-Soviet Friendship."

According to a letterhead dated September 22, 1939, John P. Peters was a member of the National Committee of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom. A mimeographed sheet attached to a letterhead dated January 17, 1940, named him as a signer of a petition sponsored by the organization. The American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom was cited as a Communist front which defended Communist teachers (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, reports of June 25, 1942, p. 13, and March 29, 1944, p. 87).

John P. Peters was listed as a signer of an appeal sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, urging the Governor of California to dismiss charges against Sam Adams Darcy, Communist leader, in a report which appeared in the Daily Worker, December 19, 1940. The article said (p. 5):

"Darcy was recently extradited by California authorities from Pennsylvania, where he was State chairman of the Communist Party. He faces up to 14 years imprisonment for a minor inaccuracy in his registration as a voter in California in 1934."

This committee's report on Civil Rights Congress as a Communist-front organization, September 2, 1947, contains a reprint of a statement (from PM, March 3, 1947, p. 20) by "outstanding Americans" who urged the President to "effect immediate release of Gerhart Eisler," a German Communist. Prof. John P. Peters, Yale Medical School, was named as one of those joining in the statement.

A letterhead dated April 6, 1939, showed Dr. John P. Peters as a national sponsor of the American League for Peace and Democracy. That organization was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (letters to the Loyalty Review Board released June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, pp. 7442 and 7443). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities called it "the largest of the Communist 'front' movements in the United States * * * Earl Browder was its vice president * * *. An examination of the program of the American League will show that the organization was nothing more nor less than a bold advocate of treason" (reports of January 3, 1939, pp. 69–71, and March 29, 1944, p. 37.)

A pamphlet, Relighting the Lamps of China, named John P. Peters as a medical sponsor of the China Aid Council, cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as a subsidiary of the American League for Peace and Democracy (report of June 25, 1942, p. 16).

Professor Peters was a signer of an open letter sponsored by the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, according to a report in the Daily Worker, May 13, 1940, pp. 1 and 5. In its report of September 2, 1947, p. 12, the Committee on Un-American Activities said: "It will be remembered that during the days of the infamous Soviet-Nazi pact, the Communist built protecting organizations known as the National Emergency Conference, the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, which culminated in the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties." The organization was also cited by the special committee, in its report of March 29, 1944, pp. 48 and 102.

As reported in the foregoing, Professor Peters was named as a signer of an appeal sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties in Behalf of Sam Darcy. A booklet, "600 Prominent Americans" (p. 27), names him as a signer of an open letter sponsored by the federation, urging the President to rescind "the Attorney General's ill-advised, arbitrary, and unwarranted findings relative to the Communist Party" and Harry Bridges. An advertisement in the New York Times, April 1, 1946 (p. 16), listed him as a signer of a statement sponsored by the federation, opposing use of injunctions in labor disputes. The Attorney General stated that the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446; also cited in letters to the Loyalty Review Board released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948). The Committee on Un-American Activities reported that it was among a maze of organizations which were "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general, but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law" (report No. 1115, September 2, 1947, p. 3). The special Committee on Un-American Activities called it one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party (report of March 29, 1944, p. 50).

A letterhead dated November 18, 1936, named John P. Peters as a member of the doctors committee on the medical bureau, American Friends of Spanish Democracy. New Masses reported (January 5, 1937, p. 31) that he was a member of the professional committee of that organization. Letterheads dated July 6, 1938, and January 30, 1939, named him as a sponsor of the medical bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy (see also New Masses, May 18, 1937, p. 25). "In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations" (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report of March 29, 1944, p. 82). The organizations named in this paragraph were among those referred to in the citation.

A booklet, "These Americans Say: 'Lift the Embaro Against Republican Spain,'" the material for which was compiled and published by the Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo, named John P. Peters as a representative individual who "in the name of true neutrality, in the cause of world peace and democracy," advocated lifting the embargo on the sale of arms to Spain. The Coordinating Committee was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as one of a number of front organizations set up during the Spanish Civil War by the Communist Party in the United States (report of March 29, 1944, pp. 137 and 138).

According to a letterhead dated November 16, 1939, John P. Peters was a sponsor of the Medical Aid Division of the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign, cited as a Communist front (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report of Jan. 3, 1940, p. 9).

The Daily Worker of December 24, 1944 (p. 14), named Dr. John P. Peters as an initiating sponsor of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. A letterhead of the Connecticut ICCSAP listed him as a council member. Letterheads of May 28, 1946, and November 26, 1946, named him as a member of the board of directors of the ICCSAP. The Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions as a Communist front (Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, H. Rept. No. 1954, Apr. 26, 1950, p. 2; H. Rept. 378, Apr. 25, 1951, pp. 11 and 12).

Dr. Peters was named as a sponsor of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, New York City, March 25–27, 1949, which was arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions (conference call; conference program, p. 13). The Daily Worker of May 16, 1952 (p. 2), reported that he was a signer of the Peace Appeal in the spring peace drive of the National and New York Councils of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. The National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions was cited as a Communist front by the Committee on Un-American Activities (H. Rept. 1954, Apr. 26, 1950, p. 2).

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Dr. Russell L. Cecil, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

A pamphlet, "Relighting the Lamps of China," listed Russell L. Cecil as a medical sponsor of the China Aid Council.

The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 25, 1942 (p. 16), cited the China Aid Council as a "subsidiary" of the American League for Peace and Democracy, cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism "in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union * * *" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, pp. 7442

and 7443). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 69–71), cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as "the largest of the Communist 'front' movements in the United States * * *."

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Dr. C. Herbert Marshall, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

A membership list of the American League for Peace and Democracy which was compiled by the special Committee on Un-American Activities from original records of the organization, subpoenaed in 1939 by the committee, contains the name of one C. Herbert Marshall, of 2712 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and September 21, 1948. The Attorney General redesignated the organization April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism "in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, pp. 7442 and 7443). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 69–71), cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as "the largest of the Communist 'front' movements in the United States. * * *"

C. Herbert Marshall was shown as a sponsor of the Washington Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder in an advertisement of the organization which appeared in the Washington Post of May 1942 (p. 9). "When Earl Browder (then general secretary, Communist Party) was in Atlanta Penitentiary serving a sentence involving his fraudulent passports, the Communist Party's front which agitated for his release was known as the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder * * * Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, one of the few outstanding women leaders of the Communist Party in this country, headed it" (special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, March 29, 1944, pp. 6 and 55). The Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder was cited as Communist by the Attorney General in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

The call to a conference on civil rights, April 20–21, 1940 (p. 4), lists C. Herbert Marshall, M. D., as a sponsor of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, under whose auspices the conference was held. A letterhead of the organization, dated April 26, 1940, also shows C. Herbert Marshall as a sponsor. In 1941, Dr. C. Herbert Marshall was a member of the executive committee of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, according to a letterhead dated May 23, 1941.

The Attorney General cited the Washington Committee for Democratic Action as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as an "affiliate" or "local chapter" of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. "The program of the Washington committee followed that of the national federation. National Communist leaders have addressed its meetings, and conferences sponsored by it have been attended by representatives of prominent Communist-front organizations" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7448). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 25, 1942 (p. 22), cited the Washington Committee for Democratic Action as follows: "When the American League for Peace and Democracy was dissolved in February 1940 its successor in Washington was called the Washington Committee for Democratic Action."

As shown by an advertisement in the Washington Post, May 18, 1948 (p. 15), Dr. C. Herbert Marshall signed a statement against the Mundt anti-Communist bill.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Gloster Current, director of branch department, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Gloster Current and his orchestra were scheduled to play at the Independence Day picnic to be held July 3–4, 1938, under the auspices of the Communist Party of Michigan, according to a leaflet entitled "Where's Everybody Going?" which announced the picnic.

The Civil Rights Federation (affiliated with the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties) issued a call to a statewide conference, September 12, 1943, in Detroit, Mich.; the name of Gloster Current appeared on the call in a list of sponsors and he was identified as secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Detroit chapter.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Michigan Civil Rights Federation as an affiliate of the Communist front, the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties; and as a subversive and Communist organization which has been succeeded by and now operates as the Michigan chapter of the Civil Rights Congress. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446; and press releases of December 4, 1947, June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included on his consolidated list of organizations.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities and the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Michigan Civil Rights Federation as a Communist-front organization. (From Report No. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944; and Report No. 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities, dated September 2, 1947.)

In July 1947 Mr. Walter S. Steele testified in public hearings before this committee, at which time he named Gloster Current of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People as a council member from the United States to the World Federation of Democratic Youth (from Steele testimony, p. 81).

The World Federation of Democratic Youth was founded in London in November 1945 by delegates from over 50 nations. From the outset, the World Federation of Democratic Youth demonstrated that it was far more interested in serving as a pressure group in behalf of Soviet foreign policy than it was in the specific problems of international youth. (From Report No. 271 of the Committee on Un-American Activities dated April 17, 1947.)

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Ruby Hurley, southeast regional secretary, Birmingham, Ala., NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Ruby Hurley was a sponsor of the World Youth Festival, Prague, July–August 1947, as shown by the World Youth Festival, page 7, and the booklet, the Bright Face of Peace, published by the United States Committee for the World Youth Festival. As shown by the call to World Youth Festival (p. 3), the festival, held in Prague from July 20 to August 17, 1947, was sponsored by the World Federation of Democratic Youth and the International Union of Students.

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 17, 1947 (pp. 12 and 13), cited the World Federation of Democratic Youth as follows: "The AYD (American Youth for Democracy) is affiliated with the World Federation of Democratic Youth, which was founded in London in November 1945 by delegates from over 50 nations. * * * From the outset the World Federation of Democratic Youth demonstrated that it was far more interested in serving as a pressure group in behalf of Soviet foreign policy than it was in the specific problems of international youth."

The International Union of Students was cited as follows by the Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of April 17, 1947 (p. 13): "The World Federation of Democratic Youth brought into being the International Union of Students, which held a meeting in Prague on August 17–31, 1946. The administration and direction of this project was entrusted to a 17-man executive committee, of whom 12 were known Communists."

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Franklin H. Williams, west-coast regional secretary, counsel, San Francisco Calif., NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Franklin H. Williams was a member of the executive board, New York committee, Southern Conference for Human Welfare, as shown on an undated leaflet entitled "The South Is Closer Than You Think," published by the New York office and received for committee files about February 1947.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 147), cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist front which received money from the Robert Marshall Foundation, one of the principal sources of funds by which many Communist fronts operate. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 12, 1947, cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist-front organization "which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South" although its "professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States."

The Daily Worker, in its issues of December 16, 1947 (p. 10) and December 21, 1947 (p. 4), reported that Franklin Williams, New York

State chairman, American Veterans' Committee, was a speaker at a rally protesting the barring of Howard Fast from speaking at student campus rallies at Columbia University, Brooklyn, and City Colleges. Fast was barred from speaking because he was under a 3-month jail sentence for contempt of Congress.

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: U. S. Tate, regional special counsel for southwest, Dallas, Tex., NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

According to the program, Second National Negro Congress, October 1937, U. Simpson Tate was chairman of a discussion group at the congress. In the material prepared by Walter S. Steele and submitted in connection with his testimony before the special Committee on Un-American Activities on August 17, 1938, U. Simpson Tate was named as having been elected national treasurer of the National Negro Congress at the second congress (public hearings, p. 626).

The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Attorney General cited the organization previously as a Communist front (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes."

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Thurgood Marshall, special counsel, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Thurgood Marshall was a member of the national committee of the International Juridical Association, as shown in the pamphlet, What Is the I. J. A.? The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the International Juridical Association as "a Communist front and an offshoot of the International Labor Defense" (Rept. No. 1311, dated March 29, 1944). In a report on the National Lawyers Guild, prepared and published September 17, 1950, by the Committee on Un-American Activities, the International Juridical Association was cited as an organization which "actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line."

A list of officers of the National Lawyers Guild, as of December 1949 (printed in the committee's report on the National Lawyers Guild, p. 18) contains the name of Thurgood Marshall, New York City, among the members of the executive board. He was shown to be an associate editor of the Lawyers Guild Review in the issue of May-June 1948 (p. 422). It was reported in the Daily Worker of November 30, 1942 (p. 1), that Mr. Marshall, special counsel of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, was one of those who submitted a report denouncing lynching and discrimination which was adopted by the national executive board of the National Lawyers Guild. It was also reported in the Washington Evening Star (February 8, 1948, p. A-22 and February 12, 1948, p. A-8), that Mr. Marshall, identified as special counsel, NAACP, criticized the loyalty program in a public forum held under the auspices of the National Lawyers Guild in Washington, D. C.

The National Lawyers Guild was cited by the special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front in Report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944 (p. 149). In the committee's report on the organization, released in 1950, the guild was cited as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

The Daily Worker of November 24, 1947 (p. 4) reported that Thurgood Marshall was among a group of attorneys who sent a telegram to New York Congressmen asking them to oppose the contempt citations in the case of the so-called Hollywood 10.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Clarence M. Mitchell, director, Washington Bureau, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Clarence Mitchell, a representative of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, appeared before the Committee on Un-American Activities, May 3, 1950, in opposition to H. R. 7595, at which time he stated that he was not then and had never been a member of the Communist Party. He stated that the question as to whether or not he was a member of the Communist Party "is an unfair question, because it immediately precludes from appearing before this committee many of the people who would be on trial under a bill of this kind (H. R. 7595). Presumably there are people who may, for sincere and personal reasons, wish to be members of the Communist Party, but they may want to come here and object to this bill, but I suppose if they had to answer that question they very likely would not come." (Public hearings, pp. 2296-2302.)

It is noted by the Daily People's World of February 12, 1952 (p. 2) that Clarence Mitchell, director of Washington bureau of the National Association for Advancement of Colored People, "blasts civil rights record of presidential hopeful." The Daily Worker of February 15, 1952 (p. 1) reported that Clarence Mitchell, director of Washington bureau, NAACP, appeared before the Senate Armed Forces Committee in protest of universal military training.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Henry Lee Moon, director, public relations department, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

A membership list of the Washington Book Shop which was subpenaed by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in 1941 contains the name of Henry Lee Moon with address shown as 1206 Kenyon Street NW., Washington, D. C.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Washington Book Shop Association as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 150), cited the Washington Book Shop Association as a Communist-front organization.

Henry Lee Moon, New York, was a member of the national executive council of the National Negro Congress, as shown on the official proceedings of the congress for 1936 (p. 40).

The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. A. Phillip Randolph, president of the congress since its inception in 1936, refused to run again in April 1940 "on the ground that it was 'deliberately packed with Communists and Congress of Industrial Organization members who were either Communists or sympathizers with Communists.' Commencing with its formation in 1936, Communist Party functionaries and fellow travelers have figured prominently in the leadership and affairs of the Congress, * * * according to A. Phillip Randolph. John P. Davis, secretary of the congress, has admitted that the Communist Party contributed $100 a month to its support." (Attorney General, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes."

A review by Abner W. Berry of Henry Lee Moon's book, Balance of Power: The Negro Vote, was published in the Daily Worker of May 28, 1948 (p. 12). The review reads, in part:

"As a newspaperman who spent the war years in Washington and later was associated with the CIO Political Action Committee, Henry Lee Moon has written, in balance of power a helpful survey of Negro suffrage in America. He defends the Negro voter against the charge of venality and corruptibility with the materials of history, and traces the long fight for the franchise.

* * * * *

"* * * It is the only volume brought to our attention which gives a detailed national picture of the Negro vote. It is too bad the author felt impelled to defend the two-party system and the Negro. And it is worse that he chose this otherwise useful contribution as the bearer of his offering of fuel for the cold war."

A photograph of Henry Lee Moon was published in the June 16, 1932, issue of the Daily Worker (p. 2).

The Daily Worker of June 17, 1946 (p. 2), reported that one Henry Moon (no other identification shown) was one of the signers of a statement of the Action Committee To Free Spain Now which protested the delay in breaking diplomatic relations with Franco Spain.

The Attorney General cited the Action Committee To Free Spain Now as Communist in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

The Daily Worker of February 16, 1949 (p. 13), reported that Henry Moon was nominated as commentator of the Voice of Freedom Committee.

The Attorney General included the Voice of Freedom Committee on the April 1, 1954,

consolidated list of organizations previously designated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450.

OCTOBER 25, 1955.

Subject: Clarence A. Laws, regional director, New Orleans, La., NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

An undated letterhead (1947) of the Committee for Louisiana, affiliated with the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, listed Clarence A. Laws as a member of the executive committee of the organization.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 147), cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist front which received money from the Robert Marshall Foundation, one of the principal sources of funds by which many Communist fronts operate. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 12, 1947, cited the Southern Conference * * * as a Communist-front organization "which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South" although its "professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States."

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Robert L. Carter, assistant special counsel, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Robert L. Carter wrote an article which was published in the Lawyers Guild Review (vol. VI, pp. 553–54, and 599–601). The Lawyers Guild Review was cited as "an official organ of the National Lawyers Guild" by the Committee on Un-American Activities, report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 21, 1950 (p. 13).

The National Lawyers Guild was cited by the special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front organization in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149). It was cited as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents." (Committee's review on the National Lawyers Guild, September 21, 1950.)

It was reported in the Times Herald of April 28, 1948 (pp. 1 and 4) that Robert L. Carter, of the American Veterans' Committee, was a sponsor of a conference against anti-Communist legislation.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Torea Hall Pittman, assistant field secretary, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The official proceedings of the National Negro Congress for 1936 (p. 6) listed Mrs. Torea Pittman, of California, as a member of the general resolutions committee of the National Negro Congress.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. A. Phillip Randolph, president of the congress since its inception in 1936, refused to run again in April 1940 "on the ground that it was 'deliberately packed with Communists and Congress of Industrial Organizations members who were either Communists or sympathizers with Communists.' Commencing with its formation in 1936, Communist Party functionaries and fellow travelers have figured prominently in the leadership and affairs of the congress * * * according to A. Phillip Randolph, John P. Davis, secretary of the congress, has admitted that the Communist Party contributed $100 a month to its support." (Attorney General, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes."

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Madison S. Jones, Jr., assistant field secretary, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

No reference to Madison S. Jones, Jr., is found in the records of the committee; however, one Madison Jones, 557 West 144th Street, signed the Communist Party nominating petition for councilman of the city of New York, Borough of Manhattan, in 1945 (Davis). (See p. 21 of the petitions.)

One Madison Jones, of New York, youth director for the National Association of the Advancement of Colored People, spoke at a peace mass meeting at Mecca Temple (Daily Worker, February 2, 1941, p. 3 ,col. 4).

In 1954, the total list of officers, board members, executive staff members, and others listed are 193. Out of that number, 89 of them have been cited by the House Un-American Activities Committee, or 46.1 percent of the total. It should be noted, however, that 16 persons serve in more than one capacity and are listed in both capacities. When you consider that these 16 persons have double offices or designations, the total list would be 177 of which 78 are cited by the House Committee on Un-American activities, or 44.1 percent.

The facts speak for themselves; the record has been made. There can be no successful contradiction of these affiliations by these individual members of the association.

On yesterday, it was my privilege to have a lengthy talk with my good friend, Mr. W. B. Nicholson, superintendent of the public school system at Blytheville, Ark. Mr. Nicholson is a learned educator and a student of race relations. In the conversation I had with him, his remarks were adduced to writing, and I would like that the full text of his statement be incorporated as a part of my remarks:

I have striven to approach this issue in my thinking in a way that I cannot be accused honestly of being guilty of prejudice against any man because of the color of his skin or the texture of his hair. But, to me, the acts of the NAACP are in violation of the divine principles of creation—and I don't think that is prejudice.

In my thinking, any act on the part of man to annihilate those things which are so fundamental in their nature that they have survived time, and still exist, is just counter to the original intention of the Creator.

Now, when the NAACP embarks on a program to break down the laws against interracial marriages in our respective States—and I understand there are 28 States that have laws against it—then the NAACP is not after all working honestly and sincerely for the recognition of the rights of the Negro; they are really working for the abolition and ultimate annihilation of both races.

I am thoroughly convinced that the NAACP does not reflect the honest, sincere sentiments and wishes of the southern Negro. Now, the southern Negro is the only one I am acquainted with. I have lived in Tennessee, Georgia, Alabama; and now I live in Arkansas. I have visited in New Orleans, traveled through Louisiana, and the Carolinas. I spent a year in North Carolina and a great deal of time in South Carolina. The Negro, as I know him, is not honestly being represented and his views are not being reflected accurately or correctly by the NAACP's programs, goals, or campaigns.

I am convinced in my own mind—I might not be able to put my finger on the facts—but I am convinced that the NAACP has embarked on a program which will result in great harm to both races in this country if they can succeed with it.

The Negroes in our area openly say that they want to maintain their own social identity in their schools and their organizations as it now is.

I acquiesce and concur fully with the views which Mr. Nicholson expresses.

I call upon this Congress to probe fully and completely the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Now, what should that investigation include? How large a scope and sphere should the committee encompass and inquire into? Would it not be proper to ascertain the amount of the collections of the organization; the salary of its officers; the source of its contributions and what expenditures are anticipated by this organization in the various States of the Union in the furtherance of their objectives? According to the Commercial Appeal article by Paul Malloy which had been referred to earlier, NAACP Counsel Thurgood Marshall was quoted as saying:

What is so particular about Mississippi? It is just a State in the Union; and as long as it stays in the Union, it will have to play by the rules. We have set up a fund there of close to $300,000.

Now, I think it would be in order that the Congress and the people should know what funds have been earmarked for other States. I feel that such a thorough investigation is necessary to protect the southern Negro and others who have been duped, victimized, and exploited by and through the promotion schemes of the NAACP. It would be most desirable

that our southern Negroes should know the facts with respect to any organization with which they would become alined or affiliated. Having lived among these people all my life, I am convinced that they would not knowingly contribute to or take part in the activities of any organization upon which there is a question mark.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the exposition which the gentleman is making of the citation of officers and directors and others acting in an official capacity in this NAACP organization. I call to the gentleman's attention the fact that in today's Washington Post and Times Herald, there is a news item stating as follows:

RESOLUTION HITS AT NAACP

COLUMBIA, S. C., February 22.—The South Carolina General Assembly today adopted a resolution asking the United States Attorney General to place the National Association for Advancement of Colored People on his list of subversive organizations.

Fifty-three of the NAACP's top officers have been cited by the House Un-American Activities Committee for "affiliation with or participation in Communist, Communist front, fellow-traveling or subversive organizations or activities," the resolution declared.

Adoption was without comment in both house and senate.

The resolution said the NAACP "should be classified as a subversive organization so that it may be kept under surveillance and that all citizens of the United States may have ample warning of the danger which lurks in such an organization."

Employment of NAACP members by the State or its political subdivisions would be banned under a bill passed by the house to the senate today.

Mr. GATHINGS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his contribution, and to have in the RECORD at this point the information in the resolution that has been passed by the South Carolina General Assembly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Has the gentleman completed his statement?

Mr. GATHINGS. I have.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I would like to congratulate the gentleman for rendering a distinct service to his country, by exposing this organization which is stirring up racial hatreds throughout not only the South but also throughout the entire country.

I think it is the duty of this Congress, as the gentleman has stated, to investigate the background of the leaders of the NAACP and to investigate their activities fully.

I might state further that it might be well for this Congress also to take a look at this so-called Leadership Conference which is scheduled for Washington in the next few weeks.

Mr. GATHINGS. In the near future, I believe.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Permit me, if you will, to read from the remarks of Representative DIGGS of Michigan, under date of February 9, 1956, which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, in which he inserted a news release issued by the leaders of this group calling this conference to be held in Washington on March 4 through March 6.

The person who issued the call is one Roy Wilkins, chairman of the group, who is also, as I understand, the secretary of this NAACP outfit.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is right.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I quote from the news release as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"It is essential," the call declared, "that Congress enact legislation in this session to safeguard the civil rights of American citizens and the processes of orderly government."

The news release goes further to state this:

The conference seeks enactment of an eight-point legislative program including job equality through the establishment of an effective Federal FEPC, withholding of Federal funds from any institution which defies the constitutional prohibition against segregation in public facilities, making lynching and other race-inspired acts of violence Federal offenses, abolition of the poll tax and protection of the right to vote, establishment of a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice with authority to protect civil rights in all sections of the country, creation of a permanent Federal Commission on Civil Rights, elimination of remaining segregation and other forms of discrimination in interstate travel, and provision for majority rule in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

In this article they quote this Roy Wilkins as stating this:

The influence of this assembly on the Congress will depend less upon the number of individual delegates in attendance than upon the number of States and congressional districts represented.

When I heard that meeting was to be held in the Interior Department Auditorium, a Government building under the administration of the General Services Administration, I inquired to find out if political meetings could properly be held in that auditorium. I find that these are the regulations governing the use of the departmental auditorium and adjacent conference rooms.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD a copy of these regulations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
REGION 3,
Washington, D. C.

REGULATIONS GOVERNING THE USE OF THE DEPARTMENTAL AUDITORIUM AND ADJACENT CONFERENCE ROOMS, CONSTITUTION AVENUE BETWEEN 12TH AND 14TH STREETS NW.

1. The departmental auditorium and conference rooms A, B, and C adjacent thereto shall be available for assignment to:

a. Agencies of the Federal Government and the government of the District of Columbia, for official use.

b. Officially recognized agencies, clubs, or educational units of the Federal Government or the government of the District of Columbia.

The foregoing shall not be construed to include sponsored meetings, meetings of a political, sectarian, fraternal, or similar nature, or meetings held for the purpose of promotion of commercial enterprises or commodities.

2. Application for the use of the auditorium or conference rooms should be submitted at least 1 week in advance. It should be addressed as follows and include the information outlined below:

General Services Administration. Attention: Triangle area manager, region 3, room 1408, New Post Office Building, 12th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington 25, D. C.

a. Name of agency in whose behalf the application is submitted.

b. Date of requested assignment, and hours proposed for its commencement and termination.

c. Nature of the contemplated program.

d. Approximate number of persons expected to attend.

e. Whether motion pictures or lantern slides are to be exhibited, stating (1) size of film, 35 or 16 millimeter; (2) size of lantern slide.

3. No program shall continue beyond midnight.

4. If the projection of motion pictures or lantern slides is a part of the program, competent operators will be furnished under the supervision of the General Services Administration.

5. Music racks, ushers, and attendants for checking wraps, if needed, must be furnished by and at the expense of the permittee.

6. No admission fee shall be charged, no indirect assessment shall be made for admission, and no collection shall be taken. Commercial advertising or the sale of articles of any character will not be permitted.

7. The serving of refreshments is prohibited.

8. A sample of any literature or folders to be distributed or posted shall be forwarded for review when formal request is made for either the auditorium or conference rooms.

9. All persons attending meetings will be required to go directly to the auditorium or conference rooms and to leave by the most direct exit. They shall be provided with tickets or other identification, except when the general public is invited. No one will be admitted to other parts of the building unless in the possession of a properly signed pass.

10. All persons attending meetings will be subject to the "Rules and Regulations Governing Public Buildings and Grounds," promulgated by the Administrator of General Services.

11. Smoking is prohibited within the auditorium.

Approved December 1, 1953.

WILLIAM A. MILLER,
Regional Director.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. You will note that these regulations provide that the departmental auditorium and conference rooms A, B, and C adjacent thereto shall be available for assignment in 2 instances, and 2 instances only.

First. To agencies of the Federal Government or the government of the District of Columbia for official use.

Second. Shall be available to officials of recognized agencies, clubs, and educational units of the Federal Government or the government of the District of Columbia.

On February 20 I sent the following telegram to the Secretary of Labor, who I am informed, had requested the General Services Administration to permit

the use of this auditorium by this group under the sponsorship of the Labor Department:

I am informed that at the request of the Department of Labor General Services Administration is granting the use of the Departmental Auditorium, Constitution Avenue between 12th and 14th Streets NW., to a conference scheduled for March 4, 5, and 6. Inasmuch as this gathering is purely political in nature and has been called for purpose of lobbying and pressuring the United States Congress, I urge you to withdraw the Department's request for use of the auditorum, Roy Wilkins, chairman of the conference, is quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in issuing the call for the conference, as follows:

"The influence of the assembly on the Congress will depend less upon the number of individual delegates in attendance than upon the number of States and congressional districts represented."

General Services Administration regulations prohibit the use of this auditorium for political meetings but they seem to think your request for its use should be honored. I do not believe it was ever the purpose of Congress when creating the Department of Labor and enacting subsequent laws that the Department should engage in such a bold and blatant political move as you are doing in helping to sponsor this so-called leadership conference.

Mr. Speaker, 3 days have expired and I have not heard a word from the Secretary of Labor. I think the appropriate congressional committee might well go into this situation and find out if it is true that the NAACP and its allied left-wing organizations are actually being regarded as official agencies of the United States Government by virtue of this recognition accorded them by the Department of Labor. I may say that I am not sure any of the groups listed are Red, but I do know that the Communists have allied themselves with the aims of the NAACP. I think we should look into this proposition.

Mr. GATHINGS. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I hope other Members of the Congress will join me in protesting the use of this Interdepartmental Auditorium by these radical organizations that have been attempting to high pressure, bulldoze, and intimidate the Congress into going along with their political aims and desires.

Mr. GATHINGS. Since the gentleman has not heard from the Department in answer to his request, it seems to me it would be most desirable and urgent that something be done soon because the meeting will be held in a very short time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I wonder what the Secretary of Labor might say if the citizens' councils of the States of Mississippi, Alabama, or Georgia, organizations designed to promote the interests of the white people, as well as to defend the Constitution, were to request permission to use this Interdepartmental Auditorium?

Mr. GATHINGS. That would be mighty interesting to me. I am appreciative of the gentleman's remarks and am in full accord with you that a Federal departmental auditorium should not be used for a mass political gathering. I trust that the Secretary of Labor will deny the use of that Department's facilities for this conference.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. ASHMORE. First, I want to thank the gentleman for bringing some most enlightening information to the Members of this House. I have been amazed to hear these facts concerning various Members of the NAACP, most of them officers of the organization, being on the subversive list. Most of those the gentleman mentioned were officers or directors of that organization, is that correct?

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes. I would like to say to the gentleman that I have here an actual list of those that will be inserted in the RECORD. Some of the citations are of a most severe nature, others are not——

Mr. ASHMORE. And the total number was 80 something, did I understand the gentleman to say?

Mr. GATHINGS. No, I do not think there were that many—41 percent, I believe it was. I will have to get that figure.

Mr. ASHMORE. Officers and directors?

Mr. GATHINGS. But it was about 41 percent of the total that were listed as heads of the organization in various capacities; that is, the board of directors, its officers, its executive staff, its legal division, and its health division.

Mr. ASHMORE. I have heard many reports and many rumors and, you might say, talk or gossip, whatever it might be, about various members of the NAACP being subversive or communistic, but none of those statements or reports have pinpointed the thing to the degree that the gentleman has. The gentleman has brought out these statements and these records which show undoubtedly that many of their leaders are on the subversive list.

Mr. GATHINGS. Well, you can see the large list here. They are the ones that will be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. ASHMORE. I want to commend the gentleman again for bringing those facts to us, and I also want to commend the legislature of my home State of South Carolina for requesting the Attorney General to place the NAACP, because of these facts and other facts which have been brought to us, on the subversive list. And, I want to say further that if the Attorney General does not do it, I want to know why he does not do it in the light of the facts we have heard here today. I do not see how he could do otherwise than say that the entire organization, infested with leadership of this type, should be placed on the subversive list. I believe, that in fairness to those who have been placed on the list, and the American poeple in general, that this organization should be declared subversive, and if the Attorney General fails to do so he should make a clear-cut statement as to why he does not.

Mr. GATHINGS. And I think that the Congress should probe this organization in all of its phases.

Mr. ASHMORE. Yes, and I hope the Members of the Press will give as much publicity to these facts as has been given to the other side of the case. I think it is only fair to the Southland, to the white people and to the colored people of this country, that both sides be brought out and let us know what is going on in this country.

Mr. GATHINGS. I feel that our southern Negroes ought to know these facts.

Mr. ASHMORE. Yes. And, if many of our southern Negroes did know the facts, they would not follow this NAACP leadership, because I know of some in my hometown of Greenville, S. C., who have been putting greenbacks into the bushel baskets, when they collected funds to fight these things that the NAACP wanted to fight, but when they found out what the true purpose of the NAACP was, they quit going to the meetings, stopped giving their money to the leaders of the NAACP in my city and are now on the other side of the fence, on the side where they used to be, with the white people of the South who have done so much for the Negro.

The South Carolina resolution is as follows:

Concurrent resolution requesting the Attorney General of the United States to place the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the subversive list for reasons set forth herein

Whereas the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee reveal records of affiliation with or parties in communism, Communist-front, fellow traveling, or subversive oganizations or activities on the part of the following officials of the NAACP: the president, the chairman of the board, the honorary chairman, 11 of 28 vice presidents, the treasurer, 28 of 47 directors, the chairman of the national legal committee, the executive secretary, the special counsel, the assistant special counsel, the southeast national secretary, the west coast secretary, the director of the Washington bureau, and director of public relations and two field secretaries;

Whereas of the NAACP's 28 vice presidents, the following 11 have records of un-American activities: John Haynes Holmes, 23 citations; A. Phillip Randolph, 20 citations; the late Mary McLeod Bethune (who still is listed as a vice president) and William Lloyd Imes, 16 citations each; Oscar Hammerstein, II, the composer, and Bishop W. J. Walls, 7 citations each; Ira W. Jayne and L. Pearl Mitchell, 2 citations each; Williard S. Townsend, T. G. Nulter, Grace B. Fenderson, 1 citation each;

Whereas of the 47 members comprising the association's board of directors, the following 28 have records of Un-American activities: Earl B. Dickerson, 25 citations; Algernon D. Black, 18 citations; Lewis Gannett, 15 citations; Roscoe Dunjee, 13 citations; S. Ralph Harlow, Channing H. Tobias, 10 citations each; William H. Hastie, 9 citations; Hubert T. Delaney, 8 citations; Benjamin E. Mays, president of Atlanta's Morehouse College, 6 citations; Robert G. Weaver, 5 citations; Buell G. Gallagher, 4 citations; President Arthur B. Spingarn, Earl G. Harrison, James J. McClendon, Ralph Bunche, Allen Knight Chalmers, and W. Montague Cobb, 3 citations each; J. M. Tinsley, Wesley W. Law, of Savannah, Ga., Norman Cousins, Alexander Looby, Henry J. Greene, Alfred Baker Lewis, 2 citations each; H. Claude Hudson, Carl R. Johnson, A. Marceo Smith, James Hinton, Theodore M. Berry, 1 citation each;

Whereas other officers of the NAACP with un-American activities records are: Lloyd Garrison, chairman, national legal committee, 5 citations; Treasurer Allan Knight Chalmers and Branch Department Director

Glaster B. Current, 3 citations each; Southeastern Regional Secretary Ruby Hurley, West Coast National Secretary Franklin H. Williams, Field Secretary Madison S. Jones, and Assistant Special Council Robert L. Carter, 2 citations each; and Field Secretary Tarea Hall Pittman, 1 citation: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the General Assembly of South Carolina believes that for the reasons herein set forth that the NAACP should be classified as a subversive organization so that it may be kept under the proper surveillance so that all citizens of the United States may have ample warning of the danger to our way of life which works in such an organization; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Attorney General, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. GRANT. I want to congratulate my colleague from Arkansas for bringing this to the attention of the House. It seems to me that this forum here, in the Halls of the Congress, is about the only place you can get any publicity or the only place you can discuss it in this section of the country. The gentleman will probably recall that several years ago there was pictured in Life magazine some scenes of school buildings over in his or near his congressional district in West Memphis, Ark.

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes, I recall that.

Mr. GRANT. They showed several colored children drinking from a hydrant with one dipper. Well, I imagine the gentleman, like myself, has carried water from the spring and drunk it out of a gourd. The superintendent of schools in one of the counties of my congressional district in Alabama, which has one of the finest systems of both white and colored schools that can be found in the entire United States, had some 12 or 15 pictures taken of colored schools in that county and sent them to the publishers of Life, showing them what fine colored school buildings we had in the State of Alabama.

Mr. GATHINGS. If the gentleman will suffer an interruption right there, I would like for a representative of the magazine to come to West Memphis now and see the facilities we have for our colored children.

Mr. GRANT. I want to say this to my colleague from Arkansas, they were returned, they were not published because such magazines take the attitude that nothing good can come out of the South. Therefore, they do not want to show the good part of anything.

Mr. GATHINGS. I could very easily show the gentleman some very fine buildings; as a matter of fact, some of the Negro schools in my congressional district are finer than the white schools.

Mr. GRANT. That is true.

GATT AND THE FARM PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the State Department has just signed an international agreement, the revised General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which threatens this country's domestic farm policy. Now it wants Congress to approve our joining an international agency, the Organization for Trade Cooperation, which was created to enforce this agreement.

The agreement, known as GATT, calls on the United States to drop import restrictions on foreign farm and dairy products at the earliest practical moment. It urges the United States to abandon all subsidies and other forms of Government aid which result in the sale of American farm products abroad at prices less than those prevailing here. In a report released July 12, 1955, the contracting parties to GATT advise the United States and other industrialized nations to concentrate on manufactures, leaving the production of food and raw materials to underdeveloped nations.

IMPORTS

Thanks to farm price supports, the American farmer gets a better price for his products than any other farmer in the world. Foreign farmers can sell in the American market for less, and still get more than they do at home. Inevitably, unless imports are controlled, farm products from abroad would flood in and wreck the support program.

The Government presently limits imports by setting specific quotas for price-supported products—wheat, cotton, butter. Imports of other products beyond a stated quantity pay an extra tariff charge. This applies, for example, to potatoes, wool, and tobacco.

Quotas can at any time be established for any product covered "by any loan, purchase or other program or operation undertaken by the Department of Agriculture or any agency operating under its direction." The same law provides that—

> No trade agreement or other international agreement heretofore or hereafter entered into by the United States shall be applied in a manner inconsistent with this section.

In spite of this law the State Department, in the spring of 1955, signed the revised GATT, which now has 35 members. Article XI of the revised GATT flatly provides that—

> No * * * quotas * * * shall be instituted or maintained by any contracting party on the importation of any product of * * * any other contracting party.

Another clause, it is true, permits quotas on agricultural products provided domestic production is also controlled and provided that such quotas will not reduce the share of the market normally held by imports—article XI, section 2. Domestic production of many of the products on which the United States maintains quotas is controlled—for example, wheat, tobacco. In these cases the only question is whether or not the quotas fairly represent the share of the market normally held by imports. The revised GATT provides that, in the event of dispute, the question will be referred to the proposed new Organization for Trade Cooperation, called OTC—GATT, article XXIII. Note: In OTC the United States has only 1 vote out of 35 or possibly, if party to a dispute, none—see article 8, OTC charter.

This exception, however, does not apply to quotas presently maintained by the United States on butter, cheese, dried milk, rye, oats, barley, and linseed oil. Domestic production of these is not controlled. After 5 years of wrangling, in the course of which the State Department apologized for the action of Congress in authorizing quotas on these products, a temporary waiver was obtained permitting us to continue such quotas for the time being.

As a condition of this waiver, however, the State Department agreed that the United States will consult with other nations before setting any new quotas and will remove existing quotas on all farm products, whether covered by the waiver or not, as soon as circumstances permit. It also agreed to report progress once a year and, if any such quotas remain in effect at the time of report, explain why and what steps are being taken to remove them.

No wonder that in its statement of legislative policies for 1954 the National Grange said:

> We recommend that congressional action be taken to examine the State Department's structure and to clearly define the authority of that Department to make commitments in the name of the United States Government without congressional aproval.

EXPORTS

It is often pointed out that the United States exports a large part of its production of certain important farm products. In the marketing year 1953–54 we shipped abroad 19 percent of our wheat crop, 24 percent of our cotton, 26 percent of our tobacco and 45 percent of our rice. Despite these figures for particular crops, however, about 90 percent of our total farm output is marketed at home. Exports are nevertheless important.

It is not as frequently pointed out that these exports are largely financed by the American taxpayer. Of $3.2 billion worth of farm products exported in the fiscal year 1954–55, $1.7 billion worth—more than half—were covered by some kind of Government aid, either grant, loan or other aid to foreign countries or direct subsidies to our own exporters.

GATT is antagonistic to any form of aid, direct or indirect, which results in a surplus for export. It calls on member countries to avoid the use of such aids for primary products, which includes most farm products. If a member country does resort to aids of this kind, it must first consult with other members and apply the program in such a manner that its farmers do not thereby acquire more than an equitable share of the export market. Apparently, in event of dispute, OTC will decide what is an "equitable share"—GATT, articles XVI, XXIII and OTC charter:

> So, as with import quotas, our farm policy is again in conflict with GATT. As a result, formal complaints have been filed by Greece against United States export subsidies for sultana raisins, and by Italy against our export subsidies for oranges

and almonds. The first case was settled by reducing the subsidy from $2.95 to $2 per 100 pounds, a reduction of 30 percent. In the second, the United Kingdom (in the interest of Cyprus) the Union of South Africa, and Canada are supporting Italy. This case is still pending.

Furthermore, thanks in part to GATT's general opposition to aids which even indirectly stimulate exports, we are stuck with $7 billion worth of agricultural surpluses. Secretary of Agriculture Benson spent weeks during the summer of 1955 traveling around among the GATT countries, and others, to find out where and at what prices they will agree to let us sell these surpluses in the world market. Even when we try to give them away other countries claim we are depriving them of historical markets for their own farm exports.

TARIFF RATES

Adequate tariff rates on farm products could have reduced the need for quotas. But the State Department chose to go in the opposite direction. Under the Trade Agreements Act and GATT it has cut rates on farm products in half.

The rate on wheat, for example, was cut from 42 to 21 cents per bushel, on cotton from 7 to 3½ cents per pound—1¾ cents for long staple—on butter from 14 to 7 cents per pound, on cheese from 35 percent ad valorem to around 15 percent ad valorem. Meanwhile prices have doubled, cutting in half the protective effect of rates fixed in cents against the former price. The few rates not cut include such items as mules, chickpeas, dandelion roots, and acorns.

The effect of these cuts, and the resulting need for quotas, can be illustrated by the present problem in butter. According to Otis M. Reed, testifying before the Senate Finance Committee on behalf of the American Butter Institute:

New Zealand can ship butter here, pay all the costs, pay the present tariff and still have an advantage of 7 cents on our market.

That 7 cents is exactly the amount by which the State Department cut the rate. Except for that cut no quota would have been required.

Moreover, in GATT, the State Department agreed to freeze these cuts and even negotiate further cuts when asked. If for any reason we raise a rate previously cut, we are obliged to work out some form of compensation—such as reducing some other rate—with any member nation whose producers are affected. One of the responsibilities of OTC will be to decide what is appropriate compensation—GATT, articles III, XXIII, XXVIII, and XXIX:

The United States has already felt the bite of these provisions. In 1952, because dried figs were coming into this country in such increased quantities as to threaten serious injury to domestic producers, the President raised the rate on dried figs from 2½ cents to 4½ cents per pound. Thereupon Turkey, with the approval of the other GATT countries, increased her duties on iron furniture, desks, cabinets, office machinery, and milling machinery. Greece, with no rates she wanted to raise, formally requested the United States either to restore the 2½ cents rate or, failing that, to reduce rates on other products Greece wanted to sell in the American market. Italy simply wanted the 2½ cents rate restored.

A general settlement has now been worked out. But it took 3 years and several new concessions by the United States.

OPINION ABROAD

There is no doubt about the reality of the conflict between our farm policy and GATT. It broke out into the open at a meeting of GATT countries in Geneva early in 1955. Here, from a story by Henry Gemmill and Mitchell Gordon in the Wall Street Journal for March 4, is an eye-witness account:

FOREIGN FUROR—UNITED STATES FARM PROPS ANGER ALLIED NATIONS AND IMPEDE UNITED STATES PLANS FOR FREER TRADE

It is becoming increasingly clear that a domestic policy of the United States Government—its propping of farm prices—is losing America friends abroad.

For example, the United States has been insisting that nations should end quantitative restrictions in imports—specifically the widespread discrimination against goods bought with dollars. Time and again the Americans have been hooted down because the United States itself has slapped import quotas on many a farm product to protect its high-priced domestic market. And it has demanded a waiver in the revised GATT pact to permit this to continue.

For another instance, the United States representatives have been pressing here for tighter rules concerning the disruptive effect of what is called State trading—government buying and selling of the raw materials and products of industry. But they have been laughed at by other delegates, who cite sales of butter and grain from the vast surplus stocks of the United States Commodity Credit Corporation.

The influential Manchester Guardian pictures America as asking GATT for legal permission to live in a state of sin. The London Economist, internationally read and usually pro-American, depicts the United States insistence on quotas for farm imports as sadly retrogressive. Other publications have played up the official protests registered by Denmark, the Netherlands, Australia, and New Zealand against United States efforts to sell surplus butter abroad and have featured the contention of Burma and Siam that the United States is cutting into those nations' export market for rice.

GAAT'S OWN POSITION

The conflict is further highlighted by a formal report issued in the name of the contracting parties to GATT this summer.

This report openly takes the position that industrial nations like the United States should concentrate on the production of manufactured goods, leaving the production of raw materials and foodstuffs to underdeveloped nations. By specializing in this way, the report says, each nation would become more efficient. Such a policy, according to the report, would help bring down the price of farm products, contribute to a more effective allocation of world resources and thereby to the promotion of economic wealth among all nations.

It will come as a surprise to the average American farmer to learn that he is making ineffective use of world resources. Although his costs are higher, because he pays his help more and enjoys a higher standard of living, he can still produce more per acre than any other farmer in the world. It is hard to believe that he will willingly help the State Department put him out of business by concurring in this kind of global planning.

It may also stun underdeveloped nations to learn that, in order to keep the price of raw materials and foodstuffs down, it is their duty to remain underdeveloped forever. It was just this sort of thinking—trying to keep the colonies as a perpetual source of cheap raw materials for England—which helped provoke the American Revolution.

THE NEXT MOVE

Congress has never approved GATT. In fact no present contracting party has yet accepted GATT otherwise than provisionally.

The State Department is now asking Congress in effect to approve GATT without looking at it. By a bill styled H. R. 5550 it seeks confirmation of United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, GATT's policing arm. But none of the substantive provisions of GATT—the rules against quotas and subsidies, for instance—are submitted. Thus Congress is confronted by the problem of delegating vital authority to OTC without any previous or present opportunity of passing on the regulations OTC will enforce.

Once OTC is established, and GATT thereby indirectly approved, the conflict between our farm policy and GATT will intensify. With the State Department and 34 nations behind GATT and OTC, and Congress having signed away its authority, there is little doubt which would eventually win.

PROTEST

GATT and OTC have been advertised as the logical culmination of the State Department's trade agreements program.

But they are not what Congress had in mind when it passed the Trade Agreements Act. The first words of that act were and are "For the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States," not for "the more effective allocation of world resources." On the contrary when an organization frankly created for this other purpose was proposed—the International Trade Organization in 1947—Congress sat on it.

Many farmers have been induced to go along with the State Department's tariff-cutting policy by the slogan "We have to buy in order to sell." Now, however, farmers are coming to realize that, for farm products, this slogan is deceiving. Because of low labor costs many countries can grow farm products more cheaply than we. They will certainly not buy such products from the American farmer unless, by some form of subsidy, or foreign aid, they can get them still cheaper. Even then countries with a surplus to sell accuse us of dumping and disrupting the market.

One of the main purposes of the State Department's tariff reduction program is to foster trade in place of aid. Dr. Claudius Murchison, economic adviser, the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., analyzes the implications of this for farmers as follows:

Of our total imports only about 2½ billion represent imports in the so-called protected categories. Yet this limited segment includes the commodity range which

would have to provide the offset for reduced foreign aid if it is to be accomplished by an increase of imports from tariff reductions. Even a doubling of such imports would fall short by one-half of offsetting the discontinuance of foreign aid as a balance of payments factor. Obviously this area of trade is too narrow a basis for the intended objective.

Consequently, one is forced to the conclusion that the free-trade advocates also have in mind the withdrawal of quota and tariff protection from American agriculture. This could mean nothing less than the abandonment of the entire agricultural support program.

Worse still, the cold fact is that, no matter how much this country buys from other countries, the dollars they earn will seldom come back to the farmer. They will go instead for things like trucks and automobiles—and even farm machinery to increase the foreign farm output.

It is not to foreign markets that the farmer must turn but to an expanding home market, which is already taking 90 percent of his output. And like himself, his customers in the home market need the protection of fair tariffs against low labor cost competition from abroad.

As these facts come home to roost, more and more farmers are joining the protest against the State Department's present policies. As noted earlier, the National Grange has already called for a congressional investigation. Much to the surprise of the State Department, votes from the traditionally low-tariff farming regions of the South and West nearly defeated H. R. 1, the bill extending the Trade Agreements Act for 3 more years. Only when amendments were added improving the protection of domestic producers did the bill pass.

H. R. 5550

Defeating H. R. 5550—the OTC bill—may be difficult. Superficially, GATT and OTC seem innocent enough—simply a method of working out complicated trade problems by friendly discussion with other countries. Many farmers may be lulled into a false sense of security by their success with H. R. 1. Others may still be confused by State Department slogans.

It is imperative to dispel this apathy. If H. R. 5550 passes, OTC will become an accomplished fact, wedding the United States to GATT for good. Immediate, active protest is needed to prevent this.

Even if H. R. 5550 is defeated, GATT itself will linger, further entangling the farm program in international politics. Congress needs to go beyond H. R. 5550 and investigate GATT directly. Only by facing up to the problem squarely, and letting their Congressmen and Senators know where they stand, can farmers and farm groups arrest the present drift to a diplomatic instead of a domestic farm program.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief statement?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, our country is spending billions of dollars and untold energy and resources in order to defeat the threat of communism. We all recognize the Communist danger. But I am convinced there is a danger here at home which we scarcely recognize.

I am speaking of the threat of monopoly—the increasing danger that a few corporations will grow so large and so powerful they will bring an end to the effective functioning of our competitive free-enterprise system. Many a small-business man knows from intimate experience what I am talking about. For in the past 3 years there has been a tremendous wave of mergers—great corporations combining to become even larger. Over 3,000 corporations have disappeared in these 5 years, having been swallowed up by bigger firms.

The amazing thing is that as these great corporations carry out their merger acquisitions they do not stay in their own lines of business. The Wall Street Journal reports:

Rail-equipment builders enter the road-machinery and electronics field. A chemical concern proposes marriage to a washing-machine maker. A coal-mining organization acquires oil, shipping construction machinery and machine-tool firms. A construction contractor acquires a steel mill and a paint-maker.

And so the story goes. Huge corporations are gobbling up smaller, independent businesses, making it more and more difficult for the small-business man who is the backbone of this Nation to stay in business. It is harder for the small-business man, because a large corporation entering a new line of business can afford to lose money in order to drive out its small-business competitors. The big corporation simply makes up losses in its new field out of profits—often monopolistically fat profits—it makes in its long-established lines. Now, there are those who say there is something natural and inevitable about the continued growth of huge corporations. These apologists for monopoly seem to agree with Karl Marx that economic processes are somehow beyond man's control. Mr. Speaker, I am glad there are so many Members of this Congress who emphatically disagree with that point of view. We can stop the growth of monopoly in America; we can preserve our free competitive system, if we make up our minds to do the job, if we strengthen our antitrust laws and appropriate adequate funds for their enforcement.

We cannot expect the Federal Trade Commission, for instance, successfully to defend the public interest against the country's top corporation lawyers if we give it only pennies with which to work.

In this connection I want to commend the House Anti-Monopoly Subcommittee and its able chairman, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. EMANUEL CELLER. Our country owes a great deal to Mr. CELLER for his years of yeoman service in the battle against monopoly and for freedom of enterprise.

The Antimonopoly Subcommittee has unanimously recommended that Congress "make a substantial increase in its appropriations to the Federal Trade Commission, with the increase earmarked specifically for merger work." The subcommittee has recommended $951,000 for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I want to urge that we support the recommendation of the Antimonopoly Subcommittee. We are spending billions to protect ourselves from the Communist brand of aggressive centralized power. Surely we cannot afford to lose by default to the aggressive, centralized power of monopoly here at home because of our failure to appropriate less than a million dollars.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill, H. R. 7763.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at that point in the RECORD where the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] yielded to me for some comment, I may insert the full resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of South Carolina that was referred to.

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

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. [Mr. METCALF]. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include two newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is good for all Americans to be reminded from time to time how fortunate we are to live in a land where the press is free. I was reminded of that truth vividly the other day. A friend of mine was expressing resentment over a news column, which he thought contained unfair criticism of a public official. He said, "Isn't it terrible that a man in public life has to take such criticism?" My answer was: Think how much more terrible it would be if you lived in a country where public officials could not be criticized.

We must never forget that freedom of expression is our strongest guaranty of other freedoms upon which our democracy is based because a tyrant's most dreaded enemy is a free press.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert two newspaper clippings at this point.

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

There was no objection.

[From the Boston Post of February 21, 1956]

NO MAN'S COLLAR

Until now the Boston Post has remained silent concerning a conflict with the Shubert theatrical interests. This conflict involves the fundamental right of freedom of the press and the privilege of honest reporting.

This matter has already received mention in other publications. For the issues at stake concern the very foundation on which the free press in this country is based. Post readers, who are directly involved, now have a right to know the facts.

The facts are very simple.

The Shubert interests have blacklisted Elliot Norton, the Post's drama critic, from their theaters because he wrote a review and a subsequent Sunday column on "The Ponder Heart." The review and the column displeased J. J. Shubert, who owns or operates Boston's seven legitimate theaters.

NO SURRENDER OF FREEDOMS

When the Post refused to order Mr. Norton to revise his future writing so that it would be more satisfying to Mr. Shubert, the advertising placed in the Post by the Shubert theaters was slashed.

The Post does not question the right of the Shuberts to drop Mr. Norton from its press list; we are quite willing to pay for his tickets.

Nor does the Post challenge the privilege of the Shubert interests to reduce their advertising. They have a perfect right to do so.

If the price of the Shubert advertising is a surrender of the right of freedom of expression and honest reporting and a tacit understanding that every show presented in a Shubert theater will be praised, whether deservedly or not, then that is a price the Post will not pay.

OBLIGATION TO READERS

The Post does not wear the collar of Mr. Shubert, or anyone else. Our obligation is to our readers. Our responsibility is to tell them the truth, as we see the truth.

Elliot Norton, whose writing the Shuberts seek to control, is an experienced and well equipped drama critic. A graduate of the Boston Latin School and Harvard College, he is a well rounded newspaper man who has been with the Post for 30 years. He has been its drama editor for 22 years.

He is one of the country's foremost experts in his field. His opinions are respected by leading producers, directors, and actors in the theatrical profession. A mild-mannered person who is extremely popular with his fellow-newspaper workers, he is a constructive rather than a destructive writer. His suggestions frequently have been adopted by producers and directors to improve their shows.

Richard Rodgers, celebrated composer and partner of Oscar Hammerstein, declared recently in a national television interview that Rodgers and Hammerstein open their plays in Boston largely because of Mr. Norton's analysis and constructive criticism.

Raymond Massey has referred to Mr. Norton as one of the theater's finest jurors. Helen Hayes has called Mr. Norton one of the outstanding dramatic critics of the country, adding that what is more important, he loves the theater.

The late George M. Cohan described Mr. Norton as not only a very important, well-informed and widely read critic, but what is far more important, he doesn't permit his personal likes and dislikes to creep into his writing. He shoots straight.

Cornelia Otis Skinner declared that Mr. Norton commands the respect and friendship of everyone in the theater who appreciates sincerity and uncommon critical perception.

Tallulah Bankhead characterized him as a first rate and sincere observer of the drama with real integrity and affection for the theater.

Those are but a few of the testimonials to Norton's ability, integrity and sincerity as a drama critic that could be cited.

The Post, of course, does not challenge the right of anyone to disagree with Elliot Norton. But it does insist most forcefully on his right to express his honest opinions to Post readers.

COLUMNS NOT FOR SALE

The news columns of the Post are not for sale to Mr. Shubert or to anyone else. It would be nothing more than a complete abandonment of newspaper integrity and a shoddy sellout of Post readers, if Mr. Norton were to be instructed that in the future his reviews and columns are to be written to please J. J. Shubert and that he no longer can call plays as he sees them. That has not happened. It will not happen.

The implications in the banning of the Post drama critic are far-reaching. If the Shubert interests can control the play reviews and tell a critic what to write, someone else obviously can do the same thing in another section of the newspaper.

If the Shuberts can do what they are endeavoring to do, it would be the beginning of the end for the free press and the honest reporting and expression of opinion that are its bulwarks.

The charge made by the Boston representative of J. J. Shubert is that Mr. Norton "belabored" the theater.

Here is what precipitated that charge:

Mr. Norton wrote a critical review of The Ponder Heart, in which he referred to it as a "disappointing play." Subsequently, in his Sunday column, he elaborated on his first criticism.

TICKETS DENIED CRITIC

A representative of the Shubert interests visited the Post advertising director the day after this column was published to complain about it. He was referred to J. J. McManus, editor in chief of the Post. The Shubert spokesman insisted to Mr. McManus that Mr. Norton had no right to criticize the play a second time. He maintained that Norton's job should be "to help the theater."

Editor in Chief McManus replied that Mr. Norton's function was to act as drama critic, not to praise plays which do not deserve praise. He declared that Mr. Norton would not be ordered to change his attitude or alter his writing in any way.

The Shubert representative, thereupon, declared that Mr. Norton would be suspended from the theater's press list and that no ticket would be available for him for a play opening that night. He was told that the Post will be glad to pay for the critic's tickets.

Mr. Norton purchased a ticket that night for Someone Waiting, liked the show and said so in his review the next day.

On that occasion, the Post did not report this brazen attempt to muzzle the press. However, so many other publications, upon learning of the matter, have commented on it that we believe the time has come to discuss it fully.

The Shubert interests, unable to dictate the policy concerning Mr. Norton's columns and reviews, next notified the Post that they were cutting down all advertising in this newspaper, presumably in the assumption that such a step would whip the Post into line.

[From the Boston Post of February 22, 1956]

NO MAN'S COLLAR

(Continued from yesterday)

When the Shubert theatrical interests sought to stifle the expression of honest opinions in the reviews and columns written by Elliot Norton, The Post's drama critic, it was not the first time they boldly tried to stangle the freedom of the press.

Other newspapers and publications have been the targets for similar brazen and dictatorial tactics, when they told the truth, as they saw it, about presentations in theatres owned or controlled by the Shuberts.

Here in Boston, The Pilot, official publication of this Catholic Archdiocese, was suspended from the Shubert press ticket list because its editors dared to publish three reviews which displeased J. J. Shubert.

The Pilot was one of the newspapers which protested editorially, when it first became known that Mr. Norton's name had been stricken from the press list of the Shubert theatres because The Post had refused to order him to change his writing so that it would conform with the ideas of Mr. Shubert.

"LIKE A SPOILED CHILD"

The archdiocesan newspaper, whose comment is reprinted in full on page 20, observed that the principle involved in the Norton incident was either write the reviews to suit J. J. Shubert or, like any other spoiled child, J. J. doesn't want to play any more."

"This attempt at censorship by pressure should get some strong reaction from those who really care for the American stage—we hope they wil stand up and be counted," The Pilot declared.

When the national magazine, Newsweek, telephoned John Shubert, son of J. J. Shubert, in New York for a comment on the black listing of the Post's critic, the magazine's reporter quoted him as replying: "You write a bad review and we'll fix you, too."

Newsweek pointed out that as far back as 1915, Alexander Woollcott, then writing for the New York Times, was barred from the Shubert theatres in New York because he wrote that a Shubert production was "not very amusing."

OTHER CRITICS BLACKLISTED

Over the years, the Shuberts have similarly blacklisted or refused press tickets to other critics and columnists in New York, Chicago and elsewhere, Newsweek reported. The magazine referred to Mr. Norton as "perhaps the most respected critic in New England."

Variety, the "bible of the entertainment world," long has been blackballed by the Shuberts because of its refusal to surrender its rights of honest reporting and expression of opinion.

In an article on the removal of Norton from the Shubert press list, Variety reported that "there have been numerous Shubert bans against critics and columnists in New York."

"The fact that Norton's outspoken opinions have made him the outstanding Boston critic, virtually the only one taken seriously by the trade, has not spared him the resentment of those whose shows he has rapped," Variety asserted.

CAN SHUBERTS DICTATE?

The issue involved in the conflict between the Shubert interests and the Post, which has seen the Shuberts not only blacklist drama editor Norton but also reduce their advertising in the Post in reprisal for Mr. Norton's criticism, is very simple.

That question is: Should the Post stand firm and insist upon the right of honest writing for its readers; or should it allow the Shuberts to dictate what will be said about the plays staged in the theaters under their control?

Fundamentally, what the Shuberts are seeking to do in their efforts to strangle freedom of newspaper expression is no different from the tactics of dictators which resulted in the destruction of the free press in some countries.

It is incredible that this should happen in Boston, the Cradle of Liberty, where freedom itself was born. Yet the first step would

be taken, if J. J. Shubert were to prevail in this instance.

By itself this dispute is not of vital consequence. It is not of great importance whether the Shubert interests bar Mr. Norton from their press list or if they reduce their advertising in the Post.

GREAT PRINCIPLE INVOLVED

But the implications involved are of tremendous significance, and the principle at stake concerns one of the rights that is guaranteed in the United States Constitution—that of freedom of the press, that of a newspaper to tell its readers the truth.

It would be a bitter day for the people of this city and Nation, if the time ever comes when one man, whatever material power he may wield, can deny that right. In essence, that is what J. J. Shubert is trying to do.

If the owner of a chain of legitimate theaters can dictate what is said in the drama section of a newspaper about the plays that are presented, it logically follows that a man who controlled enough advertising could elect Governors and Presidents by telling the newspapers whom they must support for high public office.

That is a shocking, sobering thought. But the shocking, sobering fact is that the breakdown of the free press in the dictator countries began with orders as to what could and could not be printed in one section of a newspaper.

The Post reiterates. It wears no man's collar. It never will. The Post's responsibility is to its readers. That duty demands the presentation of the truth and honest opinions without fear or obligation. To allow J. J. Shubert or anyone else to dictate what should be printed in any section of this newspaper would be to break faith with those readers.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for time to speak about a shocking and disgraceful incident that has occurred in the district I represent and in the capital city of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

It concerns a flagrant attempt to violate one of the basic and fundamental freedoms that is guaranteed in our Federal Constitution—the right of freedom of the press.

Involved in this conflict are the Boston Post, the leading Democratic newspaper in New England, and the Shubert theatrical interests.

The Shubert group attempted to dictate what could and could not be published in the Post's dramatic reviews concerning the plays and shows presented in the legitimate theaters under its control.

When the Boston Post refused to be intimidated and insisted on exercising its right to tell the readers the truth in its drama section, the Shubert interests blacklisted Mr. Elliot Norton, the Post's drama editor, in its theaters and reduced its advertising in the Post.

This is not the first time that Mr. J. J. Shubert has tried to enforce his views upon an entire community Mr. Speaker, and unless we take some action I suspect it will not be the last.

This has happened in the past, Mr. Speaker, in Boston, in New York, and Chicago. Now a great Democratic newspaper has seen fit to take a stand and make a flight on this issue, and I am going to ask the House Judiciary Committee to investigate this matter and to call Mr. J. J. Shubert before it and ask him some very pertinent questions.

In my city, Mr. Speaker, we also have a publication called the Pilot. Most of you undoubtedly have heard about it. It is the official publication of the Catholic Archdiocese of Boston.

When it dared to publish three reviews which displeased Mr. J. J. Shubert, it was immediately blacklisted in the Shubert theaters.

When a reporter on the national magazine Newsweek called a representative of the Shubert interests, he was told that if he published anything on the matter, he also would be "fixed."

Variety, the so-called bible of the entertainment world, is blacklisted by the Shuberts.

I am proud, Mr. Speaker, that in my district a great newspaper has chosen to make a public fight against bold and flagrant attempts to muzzle and stifle the free press which is so important in our democratic form of government.

There is a great deal about this matter which I believe the Judiciary Committee of the House should investigate. I believe Mr. Shubert should be called before the committee and made to explain what gives him the right to boldly and brazenly attempt to trespass upon the freedom of the press, and why he has the effrontery to attempt to muzzle honest reporting and truthful expression of opinion.

I also feel that the committee should make a thorough investigation to determine whether our antitrust laws are not also being violated. In the great city of Boston, Mr. Speaker, all seven legitimate theaters are under the control of the Shuberts. That situation will be partly corrected in 2 years as a result of a recent court order, but at the present time a producer must obey the dictates of the Shuberts or he cannot bring his show to Boston. He can be blackballed just the same as the newspapers which refused to write their drama reviews in a manner which will be pleasing to Mr. Shubert.

The Shuberts exercise a very tight and very complete monopoly over the legitimate theater in the city of Boston. And there are other questions to which the Judiciary Committee should get the answer. Is there an advertising racket employed by the Shuberts so that a producer who takes a show into Boston cannot even advertise his own production in the newspapers, except in the manner prescribed by the Shuberts. I would like to know whether these arrogant and insufferable people exercise such control over civil liberties that in this day and age they can tell a producer where he must place his advertising and where he cannot place it.

I ask that the committee ascertain whether the contracts which the Shuberts execute are framed in such a way that the producer is coerced and intimidated under the threat of not getting another theater unless he does what the Shuberts tell him he must do. I want the committee to determine just what harsh conditions are imposed on producers who want to present their shows in theaters under the Shubert control. Is it true that they must come in on the Shubert terms or that otherwise they cannot come in at all? This is a matter which I believe warrants the attention of our Committee on the Judiciary.

While the committee is making the investigation it would also be interesting if we investigated some of the filthy productions in their theaters. Furthermore, it would be interesting if we investigated the Communist line that many of their plays have been following through the past and all of these various actors that they had before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

There is no question but that a monopoly of the worst sort is involved here, and I believe there are very serious violations of the antitrust law. It may not be an important episode in our history, Mr. Speaker, when a drama critic is blacklisted in all the legitimate theaters in a great metropolitan city because he insists on his right to publish his honest opinions. But it is of great consequence when a man who has a monopoly in his field tries to muzzle and throttle the press and to violate the freedom of the press. To me it is a shocking thing that such an attempt could be made in the historic city of Boston, the cradle of American liberty, the place in which the fight for American freedom was started. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if it was in vain that the early patriots dumped the tea in Boston Harbor. I can tell you there are many people in the city of Boston who believe there should be another tea party and that Mr. Shubert should be dumped into the harbor. If this man is to be allowed to whittle away at the freedom of the press in one area and if he can get away with his outrageous effort to gag the Boston Post, then other men with evil intentions are certain to try the same thing in other fields. That is exactly what the Communists do. That is how the breakdown of the free press started in those countries which now are under the oppression of Soviet tyranny. Any attempts to infringe upon the rights guaranteed under our Constitution concern this Congress. I certainly hope that the House Committee on the Judiciary will thoroughly probe this insult to the people of the great city of Boston, and that Mr. Shubert will be called before the committee and asked to answer a great many questions concerning his monopoly in the capital city of Boston.

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL'S ELOQUENT TRIBUTE TO LINCOLN

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a Lincoln Day speech by Mr. VURSELL.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, an address seldom, if ever, equaled, paying tribute to Lincoln and showing that adherence to the principles enunciated by Lincoln will insure our national prosperity and security, was made by our colleague, the Honorable

CHARLES W. VURSELL, at Belleville, Ill., on February 9, 1956.

That address reads as follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY CONGRESSMAN VURSELL AT LINCOLN DAY DINNER, FEBRUARY 9, BELLEVILLE, ILL.

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, we meet tonight to pay homage to the memory of Abraham Lincoln, which will, I know, renew our faith in the greatness of America. Lincoln's life and his impregnable faith are enduring monuments that must continue to serve as beacons of hope for us all.

Lincoln, the great leader and father of the Republican Party, met the challenge of his life in a way that has made us forever proud to say, "he walked among us."

Abraham Lincoln met the need of his time just as President Eisenhower today responds to the challenge to our safety and security. Lincoln and his party held a great Nation together by wisdom, faith and courage.

Tonight, for a moment, let us bring to mind some of our great statesmen, whose acts and lives have been an inspiration to millions of American citizens and early guideposts to the building of this great America:

Thomas Jefferson, the author of the immortal Declaration of Independence.

Gen. George Washington, and his troops fighting for the independence of this country at Valley Forge, and throughout the Revoluntary War. Then, to his inauguration as the first President of the United States, in which office he served the people for two terms, and went down in history as the Father of His Country.

Then, let us move on to the next greatest American of his time, Abraham Lincoln. The first President to serve under the new Republican Party, and whose memory we commemorate this evening. Of the many great deeds that immortalized Lincoln's name, was his saving the Union, as "One nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Since the era of Lincoln, our country in the past 40 years has gone through three tragic wars, and has been faced with the threat of world communism.

During this era there arose from humble birth, the greatest military leader in world history, Dwight D. Eisenhower, in whom later the people showed their confidence by electing him President of the United States, in 1952.

All public polls show that Eisenhower has united the thinking of the American people—and gained their affection—as no one has done since the days of Washington and Lincoln. He has attracted the people because of his ability, his sincerity, his integrity, his courage, and his spiritual leadership. He is now regarded as the world's leading statesman, in his continued effort for world peace.

There are some who believe that divine providence always has ready the right man to meet major crises which threaten the future of our country—founded on Christian principles.

He came to power as President at a time when there had been years of dissension—at a time when the people had lost much of their confidence in Government policies which were threatening the financial stability of our Nation.

History will doubtless associate his name, and contributions to America, along with those of Washington and Lincoln. Washington, the Father of His Country; Lincoln, who saved the Union; Eisenhower, who saved the United States from a dangerous economic crisis on the homefront, and stopped the advancement of world communism.

Now, my friends, on this occasion, it is always appropriate to discuss the policies of the Republican Party and make comparisons of its record with that of the opposing party. On these occasions being held throughout the Nation, commemorating the memory of Abraham Lincoln, who might be regarded as the "Father of the Republican Party," the people are given an opportunity to compare the two parties on their records. I shall attempt such a comparison tonight.

First, I want to point out some of the accomplishments of the past 3 years of the Eisenhower Republican administration—and compare them with 20 years of the constant control of this country by the Democratic Party.

What did we find when Eisenhower and the Republican Party came to power in January 1953?

We found a public debt of about $270 billion. A budget request prepared by President Truman for $76,800 million to defray the expenses of the first year of the Eisenhower administration. He said it was a tight budget, and could not be cut.

We also found $80 billion in debts had been contracted, which were coming due weekly, and monthly, and had to be paid. In addition, President Truman had spent $9,700 million more in his last year in office than he had collected in revenue—leaving a deficit which we had to pay.

We found $140 billion in Government bonds which had been sold to people over the past years were coming due in the first year of the Eisenhower administration, which had to be refinanced.

We found the people had lost confidence in their Government, to the extent that they cashed in $550 million more of their Government bonds in 1952 than the Government could sell back to the people—a dangerous situation.

Of greater importance, the Korean war, which had taken a terrible toll of American lives, and billions of dollars, was dragging along in a stalemate.

HOW WE MET THE CRISIS

Let me show you how the Eisenhower Republican administration met and solved every crisis.

EISENHOWER TO KOREA

Shortly after the election in November, Eisenhower went to Korea, as he said he would if elected, and made a careful study of the Korean situation, and conditions in the Far East. When he was later inaugurated as President, he served notice on Russia, China, and the world that his Government would not permit the Korean stalemate to continue—that something had to be done.

They recognized the great military ability of President Eisenhower. They knew he meant business, and that their day of bluff and appeasement was over.

Within a few weeks, Mr. Malik, then representing Communist Russia in the U. N., spoke up, urging an immediate move toward peace.

STOPPED THE WAR IN KOREA

We stopped the war in Korea, as the first great accomplishment of the Eisenhower Republican administration. Not one American soldier in the past 2½ years has lost his life on the battlefield.

We stopped the war that cost us over 157,000 American casualties. We stopped the war that the Truman-Atcheson administration got us into, and whose policies prevented our soldiers from winning.

Every American father and mother, and millions of our people throughout our land tonight are grateful for this great humanitarian service to the people of our Nation. Tonight we have peace and prosperity throughout the land. We no longer are dependent upon war. Our people now have a feeling of serenity, hope, and confidence in the future.

HOW WE MET THE CRISES ON THE HOMEFRONT

President Eisenhower persuaded some of the ablest businessmen in the Nation to come into Government service—to head some of the most important departments of Government. He knew that it would take the best brains in the Nation, some of the most successful businessmen in the country to reorganize and unscramble the overstaffed, inefficient departments of Government the New Deal political bureaucrats had been 20 years building up.

He knew it would take men of wide business experience, such as: Charlie Wilson, who now heads the Department of Defense, and George Humphrey, of Ohio, as Secretary of the Treasury, who has done the biggest and best job in that governmental department that has ever been rendered to the Nation. All of the other departments of Government have been staffed with the highest caliber of businessmen, who have dedicated their efforts to the service of our country.

EISENHOWER URGES ECONOMY

The first act of the President was to write the heads of each department, urging they economize to the limit. This they have done as no other group of administrators has done during my 14 years in the Congress.

Heretofore, the heads of the departments have often come to the Appropriations Committee with their requests padded—asking millions more than were needed. These new department heads now come before our Appropriations Committee, and state they want to cooperate fully with the committee. They ask for the least they feel is necessary in their departments, and make it known that it will be their purpose to spend the funds as economically as possible, in the hope they may have some balance left at the end of the year. I can say here and now, very truthfully, wasteful spending has come to an end in all departments of Government. This one act of the President, in securing men who will cooperate, is saving hundreds of millions of dollars each year for the taxpayers.

REPUBLICAN CONGRESS COOPERATES

We in the Congress realized drastic action must be taken to preserve the financial solvency of the Nation. In the first session of Congress we cut the proposed budget for the first year of the Eisenhower administration (which Truman said could not be cut), by about $14 billion.

Then, to keep our pledge to reduce taxes as early as possible, we continued the excess-profits tax for 6 months. We also continued the corporation tax at 52 percent for another year. We built up the Treasury to the point where for 1954 we were able to reduce taxes by $7,400,000,000—the greatest tax reduction ever voted by the Congress.

In addition to this, we revised the entire tax code, which had not been done in over half a century. We cut out inequalities. We provided tax relief in this revision for millions of smaller taxpayers, and for business.

In fact, we gave small business the green light of confidence throughout the Nation, and held out hope that big business would also find, in the revision, some benefits.

The business people of the Nation, little and big, recognized that the Republican Party opposes socialistic policies of Government, and that business, as well as all the people, had a friendly Government that intended to keep the avenues of opportunity open for all our citizens—from the most humble to the highest.

Two-thirds of this tax reduction of $7.4 billion went to the taxpayers in the lower brackets, and the larger part of the other one-third reduction went to the taxpayers in the medium brackets, and only a small part went to big business.

I point this out because the Democrat leaders, who had increased taxes for 20 years, and who had never reduced taxes, immediately falsely claimed that the Republicans' tax bill favored big business. They knew

then, and they know now, when they make such statements they are only attempting to deceive the people.

WE PREVENTED A DEPRESSION

We gave this tax reduction the 1st day of the 2d year of the Eisenhower administration, because we realized that in the transition of our Government from war to peace there was great danger of a recession, or depression, following.

We knew that the leaders of the Russian Government felt when the war was over that the United States would go into a depression that would enhance their opportunity to spread communism in America. Many leaders of European governments were also fearful this would happen.

And in the beginning of 1954, men began to lose their jobs, business began to slacken, and there were those in the Democrat Party, Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, particularly, who began to preach to the press, and to the Nation, that a depression was inevitable—that a recession was here. Others, for political purposes, took up the gloom and doom theme song at that time.

The Republican administration took the position that if we would allow the people to keep $7.4 billion, and not take it away from them in taxes, they would spend this $7.4 billion—much of it for things that people had to buy—but which first had to be made in the factories and foundries of the Nation. In other words, we increased the purchasing power of the American people by $7.4 billion in the belief that it would help us beat off the threat of depression until the transition from war to peace had been accomplished.

We were so right that while the first year, 1953, of the Eisenhower administration had proven to be the most prosperous administration in the history of our Nation, that recovery set in in 1954, which brought that year out as the second best peacetime year of prosperity the Nation had ever enjoyed.

BUSINESS EXPANSION

Our reduction of wasteful spending, of establishing sound business policies, building up the financial strength of the Treasury, following with a tax reduction, brought about an expansion of business in the beginning of 1955 which has given this Nation the greatest era of prosperity it has ever enjoyed.

We stopped inflation that had risen 13 percent under the last 3 years of the Truman administration, penalizing all wage earners, consumers, annuitants, and bondholders, by driving down the purchase power of the dollar to 50 cents.

During the past 3 years of the Eisenhower Republican administration, the general cost of living has not increased by even 1 percent. Food prices of all kinds, which make up a large part of the consumers' budget are lowest since 1950. The average cost of food is now 13 percent lower than it was in May 1955.

ITS EFFECT ON LABOR

Over 65 million laboring men have jobs at the highest wages ever known, and their take-home pay, by reason of our reduction of taxes, alone has been increased by over 10 percent. In addition, their take-home pay now buys 13 percent more food than they were able to get under the Truman administration, and their wages are the highest ever in the history of this Nation.

BUSINESS IS BOOMING

Throughout 1955 steel production, oil production, industrial production in every category have broken all past records. More houses have been built by veterans, and others, under the Eisenhower administration than ever before. Department stores sales have reached one peak after another. More people own automobiles than ever before. More radios, more television sets, and more electrical appliances have been made, and purchased, than in any years of our history. The people have bought, and are holding, more Government bonds than ever before. More food of every kind has been purchased by the people, and the leading economists predict that there will be a general level of prosperity prevailing throughout the entire year of 1956.

Our gross national product has risen from $345 billions in 1952 (under the Truman administration) to an annual rate running close to $400 billions; in other words, an increase in our annual output of almost $55 billions in the last 3 years under the Eisenhower administration.

If further proof is needed, our citizens have bought, and are now holding $1,929,000,000 more E and H savings bonds than they held in the last year of the Truman administration. They have bought many billions more of all other series of Government bonds—a tribute to the confidence of the Eisenhower Republican administration. All of this has been accomplished in an era of peace.

Fewer young men have been drafted into the service. Everything is booming but the guns; in fact, the people have never had it so good.

Regardless of the sharp criticism and false claims of the Democrat leaders, who were thrown out of power in 1952 because they failed the people, the average American knows that the Republican Party has given them what the great majority want—peace and prosperity.

Knowing this, they will vote to continue 4 more years of the sound policies of the Eisenhower Republican administration.

A BALANCED BUDGET

Adlai Stevenson and his party leaders, in 1952, told the people our promises to reduce taxes could not be kept. Of course, if his party had been successful, taxes would not have been reduced. We stopped wasteful spending, adopted business principles, and gave the people a tax reduction of $7.4 billion—the largest in history.

Adlai Stevenson, their candidate, told the people our promises to balance the budget were false, and this could not be done. Of course, if he had been elected, inflation would have continued, and the budget would not have been balanced.

He was wrong again. We will balance the budget this coming June, and have a surplus left over, of several hundred million dollars, that can be applied to reducing the national debt—or to give the people another tax reduction.

The Democrats told you that another Hoover depression would follow—if Eisenhower and a Republican Congress were elected—and there would be a return to the soup and bread lines. They were wrong again.

The boundless prosperity, with over 65 million people employed, refutes that statement. The Secretary of the Treasury, George Humphrey, and President Eisenhower, in a recent statement said that we would not only balance the budget in June 1956, but we would balance the budget again in June 1957.

THE FARM PROBLEM

Most well-informed farmers know that the present low farm prices in some categories are the direct result of the laws passed under the past Democrat administrations which had been effective up to the 1955 crop season. They know that the mountain of surplus farm products sold to the Government, of over $8 billion, overhanging and depressing the farmers' market has driven his prices down.

For example, the Government-owned or controlled 2 billion bushels of wheat before we began to harvest last year's wheat crop of 860 million bushels. The same applies to cotton and to a lesser extent to corn, which overhangs the market and has naturally depressed farm prices.

Most farmers know that in 1952, under the last year of the Truman administration, all hog prices for the year averaged $17.80 a hundredweight, and that throughout 1953, under the Republican administration, they averaged $21.59 a hundredweight, and that in 1954 they averaged $21.60 a hundredweight—both years much higher than in the last two years of the Truman administration.

Farmers know that the big drop in hog prices last October, to a low of $12 per hundredweight, was due to the great increase of the last three pig crops by 12 percent over normal; that the market was broken when 34 percent more hogs came on the market in the third week of October 1955 than had come to the market on the same week in October 1954. The facts are that hogs had been so profitable during all of 1953 and 1954 that the farmers increased the hog crop to where the surplus was so great that it glutted the market, and wrecked prices.

I am happy to note that due to the pork purchase program of Secretary Benson, and due to the reduction of the last pig crop, that the price of hogs has recovered rapidly to over $15 a hundredweight.

REMOVING SURPLUSES

The Eisenhower administration knows that farm surpluses must be disposed of before the farmers can fully share in our prosperity. During the 3 years of the Eisenhower administration, we have disposed of over $4 billion of farm surpluses owned by the Government. We have made such an effort to regain our export markets that in the same time our exports have totaled over $4½ billion. Exports during each of the 3 years of the Eisenhower administration have been increased, and we will continue to increase our exports this year.

With the nine-point farm program the President has recommended, including the soil bank program, added to what we have already done to remove the cause of low farm prices, we feel certain that the farmers will soon share fully in the boundless prosperity of our country. We will continue to exert every effort to that end.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Recently, some Democrat Party leaders sought to gain political advantage by criticizing the statement of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles over a news article in a popular magazine quoting him as saying in substance: three times we have been at the brink of war under the Eisenhower administration, and maintained peace by our strong policy which served notice on China and Russia not to miscalculate our position. He wanted the Communists to know if they started to grab more territory they would have war with Uncle Sam. He afterward answered such criticism that one had to take such a calculated risk to prevent war.

The great majority of our citizens applaud President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles for taking this strong position. Basically, it is the same policy that Teddy Roosevelt took, and prevented war. His policy was "speak softly but carry a big stick," and the bigger the bully, the firmer we should be—and the bigger the stick we should carry. This is a proud American policy, too long neglected, that will help prevent war, and maintain peace.

NO MORE APPEASEMENT

Contrast this statement, and its results, with the past blunder of the Truman-Acheson administration, when a few months before the Korean war, Secretary of State Dean Acheson declared to the world that Korea was outside of our perimeter of defense in the Far East—meaning we did not intend to defend South Korea if she were attacked.

In addition, they pulled our troops out of South Korea, and most of them from Japan. In fact, this the Communists regarded as an invitation to China and North Korea to gobble up South Korea. They promptly moved in, and when the North Korean Communists crossed the line, with strong military forces, Truman and Atcheson switched their policy, and put this country into war overnight.

A few American soldiers, including General Dean, left in South Korea without sufficient arms, joined the South Korean forces in an attempt to hold back the invaders. It was then that American soldiers tried to stop the Communists' tanks from the north with only machineguns and a few bazookas. Many of them were slaughtered before General MacArthur could move in reinforcements from Japan. Through the terrible months following, thousands of our soldiers lost their lives and were about to be driven into the sea when, through their valor, with the help of the South Koreans, this terrible tragedy was prevented.

THE BRINK OF WAR

Talk about Dulles' statement of being at the brink of war, and preventing it. The Democrat administrations, during the last 40 years, not only led us to the brink of war three times, but over the precipice into World War I, which took the lives of 50,000 American men, and more wounded; then, into World War II, which cost the lives of 300,000 soldiers, and a million Americans wounded; then, after the blunder of Truman and Atcheson, in which Secretary of State Atcheson said, "we will let the dust settle. Korea is outside our perimeter of defense," they plunged us into the Korean war overnight that took the lives of over 54,000 soldiers, with 103,000 wounded.

President Eisenhower, Secretary Dulles, and the American people know that Russia respects nothing but force. They know that in World War I, World War II, and the Korean war that we were drawn into all of them because of our weak appeasement policies, which led other nations to believe they could start these wars, and the United States would remain out of them.

This appeasement policy led the Kaiser to believe, in 1914, that we would not enter the war. This appeasement also led Hitler and Mussolini to believe, in 1939, they could take over Western Europe, and we would not enter the conflict.

Had Truman and Atcheson issued such a policy as Eisenhower and Dulles have issued, clearly warning the Communists in advance that we would fight to repel aggression in Korea, the chances are great that the Korean war, that took the lives of 54,000 Americans, would have been avoided.

Russia, China, and the Communist world now know not to make that mistake again, and they will doubtless not make it, because they know they could not win.

OUR MILITARY STRENGTH

Since President Eisenhower was elected, we have built up the strongest military force in the world—not for war, but to prevent war—and continue our efforts for world peace. Our military machine has been modernized to make the greatest use of newly developed atomic weapons, and of long and short range missiles.

RUSSIA SURROUNDED

We have Russia surrounded today by a hundred airbases on the west, reaching from Norway down through England, France, Spain, across North Africa into Turkey, Greece, Saudi Arabia, and Pakistan. In addition, we have our great Mediterranean fleet all ready, poised on her south, which contains many great flattop aircraft carriers from which our planes can take off—100 from each deck every hour—and rain atomic bombs on the war industries of Russia within from 1 to 3½ hours flying time.

We have our Pacific fleet ready for action north of Japan with flattop carriers, and planes ready to strike eastern Russia and China with bombs. We have airbases in Japan, Formosa, Okinawa, and the Philippines that can rain bombs on the Communist enemy in eastern Asia within 1 to 4 hours flying time.

Our military buildup under President Eisenhower, and our foreign policy have worked so well that we have stopped Russia and China. We have so far deterred them from starting another war, to the point where the best military authorities predict continued peace. Continued peace because Russia knows that if she and China start another war, we have the power to destroy their industries, and their power to successfully wage war.

In conclusion may I say that time has permitted me to only touch upon a few of the many great accomplishments of the Eisenhower administration, which has brought to all of our people 3 years of expanding business, full employment, a bountiful prosperity, and peace.

Corruption and Communists have been eradicated from government. Honesty and efficiency has again been installed. Confidence in the future has been firmly established under the leadership of our great President, who has again brought dignity to the White House, and has gained the respect and the confidence of our people and the leaders of the free nations of the world.

This is what the American people voted for in 1952. They will not allow these greatly improved conditions to be taken away from them by the Trumans, the Harrimans, the Kefauvers, the Stevensons—who offer the people nothing but a return to the wasteful spending, scandals, mismanagement, inflation, and governmental chaos they stopped in 1952 by the election of Eisenhower and a Republican Congress.

While we hope and pray that the President's health will continue to improve to the point where the people can have his great leadership another term, if perchance he decides he must retire, the people know that for their own good they must have 4 more years of the Eisenhower Republican policies, and will elect a Republican nominee for President who has his support, and a Republican Congress. They will vote to help continue his program—he so nobly began.

INVESTIGATION OF THE FEDERAL AIRPORT AID PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, today I have requested an investigation of the Federal airport aid program. This request is contained in a letter addressed to the Honorable ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, chairman of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee of the House of Representatives, which I will insert in full in my remarks.

I might point out that the Government Operations Committee of the House has the duty under the rules of the House of Representatives of studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and its efficiency.

In its rules the Government Operations Committee of the House created various standing subcommittees, one of which is the Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs. That subcommittee has investigative jurisdiction over several departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government, among them the Department of Commerce. In the Department of Commerce is the Civil Aeronautics Administration which is the agency through which the program for Federal aid to airports is carried out.

My interest in this subject has developed largely because of a rather violent controversy between two airports in the Detroit metropolitan area. One of those airports, Willow Run, is the terminal for scheduled commercial airlines serving the Detroit area. The airfield itself does not happen to be in my congressional district, but the terminal for the airport is in my district, the county line running between the terminal and the airfield.

Willow Run Airport was built in conjunction with the Willow Run bomber plant constructed during the early years of the war by the Ford Motor Co. for the purpose of building B-24 bombers. That plant—and that field from which thousands of large bombers were flown—served admirably during World War II and provided weapons which enabled the United States and it allies to be victorious.

I was told by the Ford Motor Co. representative in charge of the airport that when Willow Run was built it was the finest airport in the United States.

The commercial airlines before and during World War II used the Detroit City Airport at Gratiot and Six Mile Road in the city of Detroit as their terminal. But when the airlines began their tremendous postwar expansion immediately after World War II and commenced to use four-engine craft, the Detroit City Airport became inadequate, partly because of a huge gas tank located on the airport, and partly because of the limited length of the runways. The airlines had nowhere to go.

But here was this beautiful Willow Run airport, a war casualty, which became surplus after World War II, having served its military purpose. An arrangement was worked out whereby that surplus airport was deeded to a public body, the regents of the University of Michigan, a body corporate of the State of Michigan, with the provision that it be maintained as a public airport.

The university was interested in the airport because it had important research contracts, mostly for the Defense Department, and used some of the buildings on the airport and some of the space of the airport for its research activities. The university, however, was not in a position to go into the airport business as such, and, in turn, made an arrangement with a corporation formed by the airlines to maintain and operate the airport.

For 10 years now Willow Run Airport has served satisfactorily as the terminal

for the Detroit area. It has done so at practically no public expense and although it is the sixth busiest airport in the country in terms of volume of traffic handled, it has never had an accident.

Now, about six air miles away from the Willow Run Airport there is another airport called the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport. After the war the Wayne County Road Commission, which owns that airport, and its engineer, Leroy C. Smith, began a gigantic expansion program at Wayne Major. They have poured into that airport some $13 million of Wayne County-State of Michigan funds and they have poured into it in excess of $4 million of Federal Airport aid funds which is 52 percent of all the Federal airport aid money that went to the State of Michigan in the 10-year period from 1946 to 1956. I have no doubt but what Leroy Smith is a competent highway engineer, but I am equally as convinced that he knows little about airport engineering.

Willow Run was a large existing airport in 1946 and it was the Detroit terminal. Does it make sense, then, to commence a new major airport only 5 or 6 air miles away from another airport and in the same traffic pattern? I say it does not take an expert to realize that the erection of two major airports in the same air traffic pattern is just a waste of money and does not make sense for future airport planning.

Mr. Smith, who is quite an able politician and has been active in Detroit and Wayne County for many years, was able to persuade the Detroit City Council, the Wayne County Board of Supervisors, and the Wayne County Road Commission to designate Detroit-Wayne Major Airport as the official terminal for the city of Detroit.

The lobbyist for the Wayne County Road Commission, John P. McElroy, is a member of the Michigan Aeronautics Commission. Smith and McElroy were able to persuade the Michigan Aeronautics Commission to designate Wayne Major airport as the so-called official terminal for the city of Detroit.

Armed with those resolutions and those commitments from Michigan bodies, they came to Washington and persuaded the Civil Aeronautics Administration also to recognize this airport which was being built up right next to an existing airport, as the official terminal for the city of Detroit. That is the reason why this $4 million of airport money has been poured into that airport within the last 10 years.

Now, just about 2 weeks ago, in the allocation under the 1956 appropriation for airport aid money, Wayne Major was granted an additional $975,000 from funds for this fiscal year. And, I might say that I was told by the Civil Aeronautics Administration officials that they arbitrarily set a ceiling of $1 million for any one airport, so Wayne Major got almost the ceiling.

This means what? It means that the Civil Aeronautics Administration has committed itself to a further huge expansion program which is estimated to run in the neighborhood of $30 million to $32 million, and when they get through they still will have just one airport.

That seems to me a foolish and unconscionable waste of public funds, and I believe it ought to be investigated. And, if the decision made by the Civil Aeronautics Administration with respect to this airport program is typical of its decisions nationwide, I say it is high time that the Congress knew about it.

It is particularly important, in my judgment, that the airport aid program be investigated by a congressional committee, because only last year we practically took Congress out of the airport picture.

I might say parenthetically that I am getting awfully tired of having Congress abdicate its policymaking authority and turning everything over to the executive branch of the Government.

We passed Public Law 211 last summer which for a period of 4 years commits the sum of about a quarter of a billion dollars for airport aid throughout the country. But the law went beyond that. It departed from our usual practice of authorizing year by year and authorized the program for a 4-year period. But, even beyond that, it practically committed the Congress to appropriate the funds to that extent and leaves very little discretion in the Committee on Appropriations or in the Congress itself. So, we are faced with this proposition—no matter how we may like whatever pattern of airports the Civil Aeronautics Administration decides it wants in the United States, we here in the Congress are powerless to object to it or to have any influence or control over what happens.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in my remarks a letter I have written to the chairman of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, of which I am a member, and I also should like to insert following that a brief summary of the press release I issued in requesting an investigation of the airport aid program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 22, 1956.

The Honorable ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN,
Chairman, Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Government Operations Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: As you know, Public Law 211 of the 84th Congress, 1st session, vested vast authority in the Secretary of Commerce, to be exercised through the Civil Aeronautics Administrator, over the future pattern of airport construction in the United States.

That measure was an unusual departure from traditional procedure because it provided authorization for a period of 4 years rather than 1, and committed a total of a quarter of a billion dollars of Federal funds for airport aid, to be matched, of course, by an equal amount of State and local funds.

Another unusual feature of that act is that for all practical purposes the Congress, for that 4-year period, divested itself of any power over the airport-aid program. The law, in effect, bound the Appropriations Committees, and the Congress itself, to appropriate such funds as may be necessary to discharge the obligations of the Federal Government arising from grant agreements made by the Civil Aeronautics Administrator.

The rules of the House of Representatives impose on the Government Operations Committee "the duty of—studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency." The House Government Operations Committee in its rules delegated that authority with respect to the Commerce Department to the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of which you are the chairman.

I urge the subcommittee to undertake immediately a broad and comprehensive investigation of the Federal airport-aid program.

In support of this request I cite what appears to be an unconscionable waste of public funds in the grants heretofore made and those projected for the future to the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport located near Romulus, Mich.

Until the end of World War II the scheduled commercial airlines used the Detroit City Airport at Gratiot and Six Mile Roads in the city of Detroit as their terminal. When commercial aviation in its big postwar growth began to use four-engine aircraft, Detroit City Airport became inadequate and an alternate terminal for the scheduled airlines was needed immediately.

They turned to Willow Run Airport, located near Ypsilanti, Mich., built during World War II in connection with the Ford Motor Co. bomber plant and used to fly off thousands of B-24 bombers. After the war the airport was declared surplus and an arrangement was worked out whereby Willow Run Airport was deeded to the University of Michigan with the proviso that it be maintained as a public airport. The university utilized a portion of the property for important research work, mostly for the Department of Defense, and leased to a corporation formed by the airlines the space needed for scheduled commercial flight operations.

For 10 years Willow Run has satisfactorily served as the air terminal for the Detroit metropolitan area at almost no public expense. It is the sixth busiest airport in the country and has never had an accident.

Meanwhile, the Wayne County Road Commission and its engineer, Leroy C. Smith, undertook a gigantic expansion program at Detroit-Wayne Major Airport. Additional land was purchased or condemned. Roads were closed. Runways and other necessary aviation facilities were constructed. A total of $13 million of Wayne County and State of Michigan funds was poured into the project, and $4,035,858 of Federal airport aid money, 52 percent of the total received by the State of Michigan, was spent on this expansion program between 1946 and 1956.

The Wayne County Road Commission, its engineer, Leroy C. Smith, and its lobbyist, John P. McElroy, have conducted a relentless campaign to coerce the scheduled commercial airlines to transfer their operations from Willow Run Airport to the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport. They obtained resolutions from the Detroit City Council, Wayne County Board of Supervisors, Wayne County Road Commission, and the Michigan Aeronautics Commission, of which lobbyist McElroy is a member, approving Detroit-Wayne Major Airport as the commercial air terminal for the Detroit area. Thus armed, they secured the approval of the Civil Aeronautics Administration as represented by the allocation of Federal airport aid funds. In 1955, they urged the Department of Defense to locate military jet-training operations of the Navy, the Air Force, and the Michigan Air National Guard at Willow Run Airport after refusing a request by the Navy Department to locate Navy Reserve jet-training operations at Detroit-Wayne Major Airport.

They did this with the purpose and intent of making the airlines so uncomfortable at Willow Run that they would be forced to move to Detroit-Wayne Major. As a result of those efforts the Air Coordinating Committee ordered its airport use panel to hold public hearings and make recommendations concerning the best interests of the public, the most feasible civil-military utilization of the airports, existing and proposed, in the Detroit area.

June 22–23, 1955, the airport-use panel held public hearings in the city of Detroit and November 4, 1955, issued a report recommending in substance that Willow Run be used for military purposes and that Detroit-Wayne Major be used as the commercial air terminal for the Detroit area. Curiously, the report of the airport-use panel completely disregarded questions of cost and expressly ignored the problem of air space congestion, the two most important factors in determining the proper use of airports in the area.

Subsequently, the airlines in discussion with officials of Wayne Major Airport learned that it would cost from $28 million to $32 million more to complete the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport so as to accommodate present air traffic.

Detroit-Wayne Major and Willow Run Airports are only 6 air miles apart from border to border and 8 air miles apart from center to center. They have a common air traffic pattern. In instrument flying weather, takeoffs and landings at Detroit-Wayne Major Airport are controlled from the Willow Run tower. Jean Pearson, the Detroit Free Press aviation writer, who has written a very illuminating series of articles on Detroit's airport problems, very aptly stated: "On the ground you have two large airports—Willow Run and Detroit-Wayne Major. In the air you have only one."

It does not require technical or expert knowledge to conclude that someone blundered badly in attempting to develop a major airport right next to an already existing major airport, both of which would necessarily use the same traffic pattern.

December 28, 1955, six of the seven major airlines now using the Willow Run Airport as their terminal for the Detroit metropolitan area announced "once and for all" that they had no intention of removing operations from Willow Run and transferring them to Detroit-Wayne Major. They indicated that they believed another airport would be needed for the Detroit metropolitan area but that it should be located in a different traffic pattern from Willow Run, and they condemned the Detroit-Wayne Major expansion program as a waste of money, a substantial part of which the airlines themselves would be expected to provide.

February 9, 1956, the Civil Aeronautics Administration announced the allocation of Federal airport-aid funds for fiscal year 1956, and $975,000 was allocated to Detroit-Wayne Major Airport. The request of Willow Run Airport for $86,500 was denied in its entirety.

It is my suggestion that the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee explore the administration of the airport-aid program by the Civil Aeronautics Administration in its entirety, taking as an example the present and prospective expenditure of Federal funds at Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, with a view to determining whether or not those moneys are being expended efficiently and economically in the interest of civil aviation and its future development in the United States.

Because of my intense interest in this subject over the past year, I have accumulated an immense amount of material, all of which is placed at the disposal of the subcommittee to facilitate its inquiry.

Because of the importance of civil aviation to our national economy, I hope the subcommittee will give top priority to this inquiry.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

PRESS RELEASE OF FEBRUARY 23, 1956

Representative GEORGE MEADER, Republican, Michigan, today called for a full-scale inquiry into the Federal Airport Aid program and termed "an unconscionable waste of public funds" Federal grants to Detroit-Wayne Major Airport at Romulus, Mich.

The Detroit-Wayne County port is located 6 air miles from Willow Run Airport, Detroit's commercial air terminal, and has been developed since the end of World War II. It currently serves one scheduled air carrier, elements of the Michigan Air National Guard, air cargo carriers, and scores of light and executive-type aircraft.

MEADER requested the inquiry into Federal airport aid in a letter to Representative ROBERT MOLLOHAN, Democrat, West Virginia, chairman of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee.

MEADER, himself, is a member of that subpanel which is charged with keeping tabs on expenditures in the Department of Commerce, which through its Civil Aeronautics Administration, administers the Federal Airport Aid Act.

The Michigan lawmaker noted that the current airport aid act "was an unusual departure from traditional procedure because it provided authorization for a period of 4 years rather than 1 and committed a total of a quarter of a billion dollars of Federal funds for airport aid over the next 4 fiscal years. It also commits Congress to appropriate funds for that period."

In a speech to the House of Representatives MEADER declared: "That unusual authority granted the Civil Aeronautics Administrator makes it even more imperative that Congress maintain its check on how that money is spent."

MEADER called attention to the post-war growth of civil and military aviation and its future role in the American economy.

He also called attention to the early post-war need of commercial airlines for a larger airport in the Detroit area and how Willow Run Airport, owned by the University of Michigan, has served safely for 10 years as the motor city's air terminal at almost no expense to taxpayers.

MEADER declared: "Despite repeated assurances by the airlines that they would not move to Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, Detroit and Wayne County officials went ahead in frenzied fashion to build another huge airport at public expense on top of one which already exists.

"The Civil Aeronautics Administration gave tacit approval to that waste of public money by continually allocating taxpayer money to a white elephant which rather than ease the congested air traffic situation in the Detroit area actually has complicated it."

MEADER quoted a recent Detroit newspaper story which noted: "On the ground you have two large airports—Willow Run and Detroit-Wayne Major. In the air you have only one."

Some aviation authorities, including airlines, have called for still another Detroit airport to be located somewhere north of the city.

MEADER said he agreed adding: "Both Detroit-Wayne Major Airport and Willow Run for all practical purposes are but one airport now. Another airport for Detroit must be located somewhere outside the overly congested traffic pattern which already exists."

He asserted: "It does not require technical or expert knowledge to conclude that someone blundered badly in attempting to develop a major airport right next to an already existing major airport, both of which would necessarily use the same traffic pattern."

Some sources estimate that from $28 million to $32 million still is required of Federal, State, local, and airline money to make Detroit-Wayne Major Airport suitable for full-scale commercial operation.

MEADER also described as "military dominated" a Federal airport use panel which last June held "public hearings" in Detroit, ostensibly to settle the issue.

The panel last November recommended an airlines' switch to Detroit-Wayne Major with concentration of Reserve military flight activity at Willow Run Airport.

MEADER condemned as a "sham" the hearings charging the panel "knew what it was going to recommend before it ever went to Detroit."

He called its report a "fraud and declared: "Curiously, the report of the panel completely disregarded questions of cost and expressly ignored the problem of air space congestion, the two most important factors in determining the proper use of airports in the area."

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I have been concerned with this problem over a period of time. It is about a year since this matter first was brought to my attention, and I have made a number of speeches in connection with it on the floor of the House.

I have appeared before committees of the House and testified. I have introduced bills. I prepared a list of the references in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD concerning the airport matter and the bills to which I have referred. I ask unanimous consent to insert that list at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

LIST OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD REFERENCES AND BILLS RELATING TO WILLOW RUN AIRPORT PROBLEM

March 31, 1955, volume 101, part 3, pages 4132–4137: Military jets at Willow Run Airport, the Nation's sixth busiest.

April 13, 1955, volume 101, part 4, pages 4388–4392: Military jets at Willow Run Airport, the Nation's sixth busiest.

April 21, 1955, daily Appendix, page A2635: Extension of remarks; Willow Run no proper place for jets. (Ann Arbor News editorial.)

April 27, 1955, volume 101, part 4, pages 5158–5167: Amending the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950.

May 4, 1955, H. R. 6026: Minimizing interferences—amending National Defense Facilities Act of 1950.

June 1, 1955, daily Appendix, page A3793: Attempt to move airline appears blocked for present. (Ann Arbor News editorial.)

June 6, 1955, H. R. 6650: Minimizing interferences—Secretary of Defense.

July 18, 1955, volume 101, part 8, page 10804: Airport aid formula (Public Law 211), interference—MEADER and BENNETT.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, just this month, commencing on February 3, 1956, a Detroit Free Press aviation writer, Jean Pearson, commenced a series of 13 articles in that paper discussing all aspects of the Detroit aviation problem. I have read those articles and I am impressed with the thorough and dispassionate approach of the author of those articles. I think they are very readable and set forth clearly the problem which faces the Detroit metropolitan area with respect to airports.

At this point in my remarks Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate that series of articles.

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

There was no objection.

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 3, 1956]

WILL AIR AGE LEAVE CITY BEHIND?—TRAFFIC ALREADY CONGESTED IN WAYNE-WILLOW HUB

(By Jean Pearson)

Metropolitan Detroit will have a population close to 4 million by July 1960.

Today it's estimated at 3,515,000.

Among the 22 large hubs of air traffic, Detroit now rates sixth in the continental United States.

At present there are 386 scheduled airline flight operations daily at Willow Run Airport.

An estimated 3,100,000 air passengers will arrive or depart on planes in the Detroit area in 1960.

This is well over 1 million more passengers than arrived or departed on planes here in 1955.

By 1965, the number will be close to 4 million passengers.

This is only the air passenger picture.

As one of the largest industrial centers in the world, Detroit has a heavy air cargo business.

Many industries have found it's cheaper to hire a cargoliner to fly parts to an assembly plant in another part of the country than to close down the plant until parts arrive by surface transportation.

It is routine to airship parts manufactured at night in Detroit for use in the morning shift of assembly plants in the South and East.

What does this all add up to?

Trouble—trouble if Detroiters do not take a personal interest in what is being done to meet aviation's future needs and how their money is being spent.

For all intents and purposes—and the millions of public funds spent—Detroit is still just a one-airport town for airline service.

Whether the airlines operate at Willow Run or Detroit-Wayne Major is beside the point.

The reason is obvious. Wayne Major and Willow Run are only 8 air-miles apart and the air traffic above them must be considered as one major air traffic hub.

Yet the traffic generated by them already exceeds the amount the Civil Aeronautics Administration (CAA) considers congested for navigation aids now in operation.

By standards set up by the CAA (published in "The Federal-Aid Airport Program, Policies and Procedures" in October 1955), Detroit should be headed straight for the construction of a second airport far removed from the Wayne Major-Willow Run air traffic hub.

"With present technical know-how," the report says, "an airport with 100,000 or more air carrier operations annually has reached or is approaching the limit of efficient IFR (instrument flight rules) operational capacity.

"A community, therefore, has a potential need for two airports for air commerce when it has 100,000 or more air carrier operations."

Willow Run had over 141,000 operations annually. An "operation" is either a landing or take-off.

Add the more than 70,000 operations now recorded annually at Wayne Major and you have the answer.

You also have the answer to two questions that frequently puzzle Detroiters:

1. Why do the airlines insist the 28 million-plus it would cost to make Wayne Major a commercial airport would be better spent developing an airport north of the city?

2. Why is it claimed development of a Northeast airport should be given No. 1 priority over spending 28 millions to save the 12 to 15 minutes driving time between Wayne Major and Willow Run?

Airport development time is a prime factor.

Optimistically, if construction could begin immediately on the Northeast site, it would be 3 to 5 years before the airport would be ready to receive the airlines.

Pessimistically, if the legal suits blocking expansion of the 74-acre site already owned by the city are dragged out, it would take a good deal longer.

Recently, a spokesman for the airlines said they would begin dual operation at Willow Run and a Northeast port as soon as it was ready.

He urged development of a new airport as soon as possible to handle the rapidly developing air traffic.

But even if the land condemnation suits for the Northeast airport were settled today, construction with Federal, State, or county aid couldn't begin until 1960.

It couldn't simply because backers of Wayne Major development are planning to use all available aid exclusively at Wayne Major until 1960.

For 25 years LeRoy Smith, county highway engineer, has been determined to develop Wayne Major as Detroit's air terminal.

When he began, the development was needed.

But though millions were poured into it, development, for reasons beyond Smith's control, did not keep up with the need.

In 1946, when the airlines were looking for an airport capable of handling their new four-engine planes, they seriously considered Wayne Major.

But it would have been 2 years before it could take on full airline operation.

Nearby Willow Run, however, not only had four runways over a mile long, but the airlines could begin operations there almost immediately.

When the airlines moved to Willow Run, they made it clear that they would not move again until some airport nearer to the population center of Detroit than either Willow Run or Wayne Major became available.

Robert Averill, spokesman for the airlines at that time, said Willow Run was considered only on an interim basis.

At that time the city was considering a northwest site.

Despite the airline's move and clear stand on the matter, nearly $10 million has been poured into Wayne Major since 1946.

The airlines attempted to discourage what they considered unwise use of Federal funds at Wayne Major in 1949.

At that time the city was trying for an international airport at Windsor.

Milton W. Arnold, vice president of the Air Transport Association, told the CAA the airlines believed the international airport merited consideration.

Was the public ever consulted?

Yes, once.

In 1946 the public was asked to approve a $5 million bond issue for Wayne Major. It was turned down.

Still, half a million dollars in county taxes are funneled annually to Wayne Major. The funds don't have to be voted.

Some people believe there has been mutual back scratching by the city and county.

Twenty-five percent of the cost of expressways within the city is paid by the county. The city wants expressways.

The city has backed development of Wayne Major, operated by the county road commission, and common council has designated it Detroit's principal air terminal.

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 4, 1956]

WHAT HAPPENED TO WINDSOR SITE FOR AIRPORT?

(By Jean Pearson)

"Whatever happened," someone always asks when you are talking about Detroit's aviation situation, "to that big airport they were going to build in Windsor?"

Equally good questions would be:

Whatever happened to the northwest sites? To the one at Eight Mile and Dequindre? To the one off St. Clair shores?

Detroit, apparently, has done more dickering than doing in getting a centrally located airport.

Experts have been hired. And experts have given their services free. Study groups, committees, commissions, and authorities have been formed.

Outsiders have been invited in to study the situation and make recommendations. Insiders, with more knowledge of the local situation, have made studies and recommendations.

Unfortunately, too few of the plans and suggestions offered are, or have been, free of political interests of pressures.

More unfortunately, the ultimate users of the airport, the public and the airlines, too seldom have been consulted.

For a while, it looked as though the ideal answer had been found—the international site in Windsor.

Obstacles which would have taken some time to overcome (but which might have been cleared away long before now) and some opposition, both overt and subtle, defeated it.

Approximately 10 years ago, an international site was suggested, but received little consideration. Common council, eyeing several possibilities, turned it down.

When the airlines moved to Willow Run as an interim airport until one more centrally located and nearer to the population center than either Willow Run or Wayne Major was available, they went on record as still preferring a northwest site.

Several northwest sites had been considered. They were blocked by self-interested citizens in the area.

So, about 1948, interest shifted back to the possibility of an international site.

A Detroit metropolitan aviation authority was formed and charged with developing a master airport plan for the metropolitan area.

After a thorough study, the authority's master plan finally came out in 1949.

Twice the Wayne County Road Commission attempted to block publication of the report which recommended immediate action on obtaining the international site and relegated Wayne Major primarily to an air cargo terminal.

LeRoy Smith, county highway engineer, who has never deviated from his desire to make Wayne Major the principal air passenger terminal in Detroit, contended the report would only lead to public confusion.

The authority's staff, however, said:

1. Development of Wayne Major would cost more than twice the estimated $7 million to make it into a major port. (Latest estimate is more than $28 million.)

2. Wayne Major was too far from Detroit and there was no indication that the airlines would move to Wayne Major if it was developed.

Except for Smith and Glenn C. Richards, chairman of the authority and DPW commissioner, who has spearheaded the drive for development of Wayne Major, the authority's report received wide acceptance.

(Richards and Smith are now spearheading a drive for the establishment of a new metropolitan aviation authority.)

Detroit's Mayor Eugene I. Van Antwerp had backed the border port. Windsor pledged full cooperation. Common council supported it. Governor Williams endorsed it. The airlines were unanimous in their approval.

Even the public seemed to like the idea.

It was less than 5 miles from downtown. It was centrally located, so it could serve both sides of metropolitan Detroit equally well.

Finally, it was expected to be less than 15 minutes' driving time from Detroit.

Attorney General Stephen J. Roth ruled that establishment of an international airport would not require a Michigan constitutional amendment.

Roth added, however, that the project would require approval of the United States and Canadian Governments.

Then it was discovered that a Federal ruling would prevent financial aid.

But after investigation it was determined that legislation could be put through Congress that would make financial aid possible. It would be, however, a matter of 2 or 3 years.

In Washington, Paul Stafford, Assistant Administrator of the Office of Airports, Civil Aeronautics Administration, said the CAA favored the site and would support necessary legislation.

Stafford warned, however:

"If there is no major opposition to the project, the legislation for Federal aid and the agreement with Canada might be completed in 2 or 3 years. It would then require another 2 or 3 years for construction.

"If some opposition develops locally it could cause delays before Congress and the project might take much longer."

Two politically powerful men were known to be opposed to the Windsor site. They wanted development of Wayne Major.

Some efforts were made to sound out the Canadian Government. There seemed to be a lot of technical difficulties.

Who, for example, would have the ultimate authority in policing the international airport area?

Would Americans who were flying from one place in the United States to another place in the United States be involuntarily placed under Canadian law if their plane landed in Windsor?

Another complicating factor was that Trans-Canada Airlines, a Government-controlled airline, was happy to welcome the United States airlines—providing they would use and expand the Walkerville Airport.

That was not what the Americans had in mind. Slowly the bright dream faded.

On January 26, 1951, it disappeared.

Common Council, expressing "complete disappointment" at lack of progress, ordered that plans for a major airport in Warren Township be prepared immediately.

The plans were prepared.

A 74-acre center for expansion was acquired.

A $3 million bond issue for purchase of land has been authorized.

The airlines have said they will not move to Wayne Major but will have flights out of both Willow Run and the Northeast site as soon as the latter is ready.

Thursday, a jury turned down Warren Township's move to reclaim the Northeast site as a recreation area. But more legal steps remain.

Presumably, its full steam ahead now for the Northeast site.

But there are many past experiences to remember—and there's also the fact that if Wayne Major remains a No. 1 priority airport there may not be the funds needed to develop the Northeast site.

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 5, 1956]

YOUR STAKE IN THE AIRPORT FIGHT—CHANCES 4 TO 1 NORTH SITE WILL BE TO YOUR ADVANTAGE

(By Jean Pearson)

Mayor Cobo never fails to stress the need for an airport to the north of the city when discussing future aviation needs of metropolitan Detroit.

Anyone with a population density chart of the area and simple compass can tell why.

Flint, which is the third largest city in the State, and one of the fastest growing, could be serviced by the northeast airport.

So could Bay City and Saginaw.

More important, so could the burgeoning industrial and residential areas of Macomb and Oakland Counties, which are expected to double in population by 1961.

But for the most obvious reason, take your population density chart, and compass, and start drawing circles.

With Detroit Wayne-Major Airport as a center, draw circles with a 5 mile, 7½, 10, and 12½ radii.

Do the same with the proposed Northeast Airport boundaries (Ryan, DeQuindre, 12- and 14-Mile Roads), as a center.

What do you have? Graphically, the answer is printed in the chart next to this column. The source is the Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission.

First of all, you find that no matter what radius you compare—the 5, 7½, 10, or 12½—Northeast Airport would serve more than twice the population that Wayne-Major could.

It is because of this population pull that the airlines would consider scheduling flights at both airports, as they do now in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

Though they dislike split operations, because of the added cost and inconvenience to them, they know there is a big untapped customer potential on Detroit's northside.

By operating at both airports, they say, they would be giving more people service.

Secondly, that by the time you get to the 12½-mile radius, the ratio is almost 4 to 1. At the 12½-mile radius, Northeast would serve a population of 2,204,920, compared to only 615,350 by Wayne Major.

Thirdly, downtown Detroit is within 12½ miles of the Northeast site. Wayne Major is well beyond that limit.

Well, you can say, all true. But there isn't any expressway running to the Northeast site. Couldn't one be built?

Not only has Mayor Cobo reiterated the importance of the Northeast development, but the city already has cleared one legal barricade to expansion of the 74-acre airport Detroit already owns there.

If the city gets a legal green light, can it go ahead?

Not for a number of years, if more than $28 million is spent first at Wayne Major.

Not if all Federal and State aid funds available to the metropolitan Detroit area until 1960 go into Wayne Major, as its backers plan.

Delays already have proved costly.

When the city decided to go ahead with the Northeast site, authorization for the issuance of $3 million in bonds for land purchase was made. The bonds were to be issued when the condemnation proceedings were completed.

With the proceedings dragged out, cost of the land needed has risen an estimated one to two millions more.

Last fall, city officials admitted they deliberately had delayed legal proceedings for acquisition of more land at the Northeast site during the spring and summer.

They explained that attention drawn to the Northeast site during the period the Willow Run-Wayne Major airline shift was being considered might confuse the issue.

So now, unless within 6 months all condemnation suits being heard are completed (and Supreme Court appeals heard) the period in which the bonds can be issued will run out. Cutoff date is June 30.

Planned delays, political bickering and behind-the-scene struggles for power have been extremely costly to Detroit's aviation development.

One thing is certain. The rapid growth of air traffic will not stop.

With only 8 air miles between Willow Run and Wayne Major, the air space above those airports in foul weather is one traffic-control center.

By Civil Aeronautics standards, that air traffic hub already is congested.

Another airport, well removed from that hub, should be under construction now.

By even conservative estimates, it will be needed before it is ready.

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 6, 1956]

AIRLINES FINALLY PAY OFF AT WILLOW RUN

(By Jean Pearson)

Are the airlines getting a free ride at Willow Run?

Mayor Cobo says they are and that that's the reason they won't move to Detroit-Wayne Major.

All seven of the major airlines operating at Willow Run have denied the charge.

The truth? It's probably that after losing money for 5 years at Willow Run in giving airline service to the public, the airlines are on a good, sound financial basis.

Seven airlines—American, Capital, Delta, Eastern, Northwest, Trans World, and United—formed into the Airlines National Terminal Service Co., Inc. (ANTSCO), operate Willow Run under a lease from the University of Michigan, owners of the airport.

The lease calls for an annual payment of $15,000 to the university plus 10 percent of all gross income above $250,000 on nonairline revenue.

Last year the university received $44,000, of which $29,000 represented the 10 percent on nonairline revenue.

"There are some who would have you believe that the airlines have been riding some kind of a gravy train, at the expense of the taxpayer, in their operation of Willow Run," Robert J. Wilson, vice president of Capital Airlines, said at the Airport Use Panel hearings last June in Detroit.

"Such a belief," said Wilson, who is official spokesman for 6 of the 7 major airlines, "is completely false."

ANTSCO, he said, has set up a rate of rentals and other fees comparable to other airports and charges each airline fees based upon such rates.

"In addition to such fees," Wilson said, "each airline agreed to share proportionately any deficiencies resulting from the cost of meeting the university lease requirements of maintaining the airport in as good condition as it was received.

"For several years, with rentals comparable to others in the United States, each airline has made deficiency payments until, through good management and promotion of airport activity, the airport is now on a paying basis. Some, but not all, deficiency payments have been returned to the carriers.

"The cost of maintenance and operation of the airport—at no cost to the taxpayers—amounts to about $977,661 a year.

"In addition, the airlines have spent substantially over a million dollars on facilities and intend to spend considerable more to redo the terminal building."

This year, the airlines expect maintenance costs at Willow Run to exceed a million.

There is little doubt, however, that operation at Willow Run is financially attractive to the airlines.

"We don't intend for one minute, though, to apologize for being good businessmen," Wilson said.

"If we couldn't operate economically we'd soon be forced out of the business of providing public air transportation."

"Actually, when it comes to airport-operation costs, it is the taxpayers who are the ones fortunate enough to be getting a 'free ride.'"

Willow Run is one of the biggest airport bargains a community ever had.

As an airline terminal, it hasn't cost Detroit or Wayne County citizens 1 cent in local taxes.

Built as a B-24 bomber plant in World War II, with adjoining field for testing and flyaway operations, Willow served its purpose.

It owed nothing to the public. But it was too good to let it go to weeds and cracked-up concrete—as many wartime airfields have.

Offered as surplus property by the War Assets Administration, however, the $21 million property found few takers.

Any person or group taking over the property not only had to agree to maintain both the landing field and airport in as good condition as it was received, but also to keep it open as a public airport.

None of the local or county governments, who could have had it on the same terms as U-M took possession, showed any interest.

Though it would have cost them only $1, Wayne County officials turned down the offer of Willow Run, an excellent field ready for operation, to pour millions into developing Wayne Manor—only 8 air miles away.

Since 1946, close to $10 million has been sunk into Wayne Major.

It was spent despite the fact the airlines repeatedly have claimed they have no intention of moving except to an airport considerably nearer to the air traffic center of Detroit than either Willow Run or Wayne Major.

What Detroit needs much more than duplication of facilities 8 air miles apart, they claim, is a new airport north of the city to serve the eastern half of metropolitan Detroit.

The airlines assert that they would move into the Northeast site just as soon as it is ready and have flights out of both Willow Run and Northeast.

[From the Free Press of February 7, 1956]

AIRLINES HAD NO ALTERNATIVE TO MOVING OPERATIONS TO WILLOW RUN—WHY THE AIRLINES SHIFTED OPERATIONS TO WILLOW RUN—WAS ONLY SPOT THAT COULD HANDLE FOUR-ENGINE PLANES

(By Jean Pearson)

Why did the airlines settle permanently at Willow Run?

They had little alternative.

Detroit City Airport, with short runways and a gas tank in the middle, was too small for the four-engine planes put in operation after World War II.

Detroit was being bypassed. Air service to the city was not expanding as rapidly as it was in other metropolitan areas.

Wayne County Airport (since renamed Detroit-Wayne Major) was seriously considered.

Even with all the breaks on time and agreement among principals, it would have taken 2 to 5 years to make Wayne Airport suitable for use by commercial airlines serving Detroit.

Willow Run, on the other hand, had 2 runways over 7,000 feet long, 4 over 6,000 feet, huge hanger space, and an excellent business proposition.

Willow Run obviously was the best choice.

There were three factors which resulted in Willow Run becoming Detroit's major airline terminal in 1947.

1. The airlines needed an airport which could accommodate four-engine airliners. Only Willow Run was immediately available.

2. The United States Government had no further use for its wartime, $21 million bomber plant and airport.

It was important that someone keep the airport intact so it could be reactivated at a moment's notice in the event of another national emergency.

3. The University of Michigan, faced with an increasing demand from the Government and industry for an expansion of aeronautical and other types research at a time when it was utilizing every building on its Ann Arbor campus to meet the rising student enrollment, saw Willow Run as a possible answer.

All three problems were solved when the University of Michigan agreed to terms set by the War Assets Administration.

Although the University of Michigan was low on the purchaser priority list, below city and county bodies and war veterans, it was ahead of the airlines.

If the university had not taken over Willow Run, however, the airlines said they would have bid for the airport, paying much more than the nominal fee arranged for a governmental agency such as the university.

The university took over Willow Run on a quitclaim deed for $1, January 15, 1947.

The university had to promise to maintain Willow Run as an airport open to the public in the same good condition in which it was received.

Terms set by the board of regents, governing body of the University of Michigan, also had to be met.

The regents agreed to the acquisition only on condition that it would not be supported by State funds appropriated for the university itself.

The university leased the airport to the Airlines National Terminal Service Co., Inc., reserving certain buildings for use by the university for research purposes. In turn, the airlines were to maintain and operate the field.

The lease calls for an annual payment of $15,000 to the university plus 10 percent of all nonairline revenue in excess of $250,000. Nonairline revenue includes all airport concessions.

The cost of converting Willow Run from a bomber plant to an air terminal has been paid by the airlines since they moved there in 1947.

Seven airlines maintain and operate Willow Run as the company, the Airlines National Terminal Service Co., Inc.

Members of ANSTCO are American, Capital, Delta, Eastern, Northwest, Trans World, and United.

None of these airlines receives any Federal subsidies for service within the United States.

North Central Airlines also operates out of Willow Run. It receives a Federal mail-carrying subsidy.

Two air-cargo lines, Riddle and Slick, also operate at Willow Run.

ANTSCO already has spent approximately $1¼ million on improvements at Willow Run.

Under the Federal Aid Airport program, the university received $154,740 for improvement of the ramps, runways, and instrument landing system, compared with $4 million spent by the Government at Wayne Major since 1946.

What ANTSCO leased from the university was the 1,986-acre airport proper, with 6 runways more than a mile long and 160 feet wide, plus the 18-bay hangar.

In the main hangar is the terminal building with all its facilities, control tower and bays used by the airlines, the university and Great Lakes Airmotive.

A distributor of Cessna Aircraft, aviation products and aircraft services, Great Lakes Airmotive subleases one bay.

Landing fees are charged fare-paying aircraft only. Military, private and executive aircraft land free.

Originally, the fuel storage and pumping facilities cost approximately $200,000. In 1954, the airlines invested another $50,000 in the system, which now has a 290,000-gallon capacity.

In 1954, the airlines turned in from Willow Run to the State of Michigan $225,596 net in aviation gas taxes. In 1955, there was a 29 percent increase, due to bigger planes in service and an increase in the number of flights scheduled.

There now are 386 scheduled airline operations daily at Willow Run.

Within 5 or 10 years, the airlines believe an airport well removed from the present site (to avoid air traffic congestion) will be needed.

If it weren't for the combination of military, private and commercial air traffic in the Willow Run-Wayne Major area, they contend that extension of runways and construction of additional hangars at Willow Run could see them through the next 20 or 25 years.

All traffic in that area already is very heavy, however, so they favor a move to another airport removed from either Willow Run or Wayne Major.

They favor the immediate development of an airport north of the city to serve Detroiters east of Woodward, citizens of Macomb and Oakland counties, and the many people requiring air travel in the tri-city area of Flint, Saginaw and Bay City.

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 8, 1956]

WILLOW RUN IS DUE TO GET FACELIFTING—AIRLINES TO FOOT COST OF $1½ MILLION JOB

(By Jean Pearson)

When columnist Inez Robb was in Detroit recently, she blasted Willow Run Airport by comparing the terminal to a "county carnival."

Robert E. Miller, president of Airline National Terminal Service Co. (ANTSCO), admitted the terminal "left much to be desired."

But he also defended the colorful display and concessions.

They are contributing to the maintenance and operation of one of the Nation's largest commercial airports, he said, thus saving tax money.

Since not a cent of local tax money has gone into the operation of Willow Run, Miller said, perhaps taxpayers can appreciate the concessions' financial value as well as finding them entertaining and useful while waiting for plane connections.

But Miller and the airlines realize much can be done to make the terminal more attractive and functional. And they intend to do something about it.

When 6 of the 7 major airlines decided once and for all to remain at Willow Run, as they recently expressed it, the way was clear to go ahead with an improvement and expansion program.

Approximately $1½ million will be spent in the face-lifting program. The airlines expect to pay for all of it.

On February 16 the board of ANTSCO will meet at Willow Run.

The airlines plan to take up two matters of major concern—extension of their airport lease with the University of Michigan, owner of Willow Run, and authorization of the improvement program.

The current lease expires in 1962.

Both the airlines and the University have said they are interested in extending it.

As for the expansion and improvement program, Robert J. Wilson, vice president of Capital Airlines and spokesman for six of the airlines, says they are all behind it.

Therefore, those voting in favor of improving Willow Run terminal probably will be Capital, Delta, Eastern, Northwest, Trans-World, and United. Doubtful vote will be American, which may move to Wayne Major alone.

Where will the million and a half be spent?

Miller says it will be spent in three stages of development. Completion of the project will take about 2 years. But 2 of the 3 major phases can be finished in the next year, Miller said.

Priority goes to passenger comfort.

Renovation and improvement of the men's and women's public restrooms have already started. An estimated $40,000 will be spent.

Improvement of the terminal will include more comfortable seats, new flooring, an attractive new ceiling, renovation of the baggage area and installation of a self-service baggage system.

Outside of the terminal at the entrance, a canopy will be installed so passengers can step out of cars and airline buses under the canopy.

On the airline loading side of the terminal, the concourses will be improved and probably heated.

All of these improvements are in the first stage of the 2-year program.

Scheduled for the second stage of development is improvement of the coffee shop. This, however, may be speeded up to the first phase.

The catering and food facilities also may be moved. This decision rests upon American Airlines' final decision. If they make a lone switch to Wayne Major, they will relieve a bottleneck in this department. If they do not, the facility will be expanded.

The third stage of the project is on the airfield proper. It will include ramp, runway and taxiway development.

When the bulk of the improvement project is completed, Landrum and Brown, nationally famous airport consultants, of Cincinnati, Ohio, estimate Willow Run Airport should prove adequate to meet the anticipated air needs for the next 10 years or at least until the proposed Northeast Airport is in operation.

Would the airlines be planning such extensive improvements if they had any intentions of moving to Wayne Major?

Since they are businessmen, the airlines representives say, the answer is obvious.

They intend, they claim, to remain at Willow Run. Then, when the Northeast Airport is ready, they plan to schedule flights there also.

As Wilson has pointed out, the airlines expect to have a financial commitment at Northeast. But they believe the business generated by serving a new area in metropolitan Detroit will be worth the additional capital investment there.

To pour millions into Wayne Major, only 8 air miles away, solves neither the problem of growing air traffic congestion in the Willow Run-Wayne Major area nor adds any passenger potential.

Therefore, to the airlines, it doesn't make good aviation or business sense, Wilson says. And he can't see how it could to the taxpayer either.

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 9, 1956]

WAYNE MAJOR STILL NEEDS 19 MILLION—PILOT SAYS "IT STINKS" DESPITE FUNDS NOW SPENT

(By Jean Pearson)

It takes more than flat land and concrete to make a good airport.

Detroit-Wayne Major Airport is proof.

It has 4 square miles of fenced flat land—some of it submerged in spring or during heavy rains—and miles of concrete.

Yet it would take 2 to 5 years and a final investment of more than $28 million to make it ready for full commercial airline use.

Why?

To quote one Air National Guard pilot who flies there:

"The concrete is a roadmaker's masterpiece. But as an airport, it stinks.

"When I'm in No. 1 position at takeoff and a plane is coming in, I not only have to wait for him to land but I have to wait until he stops, turns around, and taxis back up the runway.

"Just burning up gallons of that JP-4 jet fuel because the lousy airport doesn't even have taxi strips off its best runway."

Since 1946 more than $4 million of Wayne County taxpayers' money has been poured into the airport. The majority of all county taxes are paid by Detroiters.

More than $4 million more has come from Federal funds and more than 1 million from State funds.

This still leaves 19 million as a minimum estimate to complete the $28 million postwar expansion.

What is there to show for it?

A jumble of buildings, the longest and widest runway of all civil airports in the Detroit area (but without proper taxiway and an approach to the terminal and executive hangars that rates as high adventure.

To use a favorable phrase of Airport Manager Henry Baker, the airport looks as though it were planned on a we'll-cross-that-bridge-when-we-come-to-it basis.

Actually, there is not 1 airport but 2.

One is the old Wayne County Airport in the northeast section.

On it is the big hangar for small aircraft, flight schools, aircraft dealerships, repair shops and small aviation businesses plus some sheds and miscellaneous buildings.

In that corner, with an entrance from Middle Belt, are the old control tower and terminal building, a well-constructed brick and concrete building that's virtually abandoned.

Next to it are the seemingly permanent "temporaries" of the days when Wayne Major was Romulus Army Air Force Base. These are used by the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Farther down the line, on Middle Belt, is the old, abandoned officers' club. Large, but not a permanent type building.

Next comes the new Air National Guard administration building, paid for completely by Government funds.

Around the bend, on Goddard going west off Middle Belt, there are on the north side the Air National Guard hangars, including the $700,000 one just completed. It was designed for military operations. There are also miscellaneous sheds, loading docks and supply depots built of temporary material.

This, basically, comprises the northern, eastern and southern sides of the old, mile-square airport. In its center is a complete runway and taxiway system of little, if any, use to the bigger one now being constructed in the middle of the field.

In the new section, the terminal tower juts up in the middle, with an assortment of hangars and buildings scattered around it.

Also on the airport are a salt mine, gas-oil drilling and an Army Nike antiaircraft missile installation.

To reach the terminal, you have to drive out on a runway. But cars only get half the runway. Down the middle is a snow fence. On the other side of the fence airplanes are taxiing.

To get to the executive hangars, you have to cross the runway. Companies such as Ford Motor, Holley Carburetor, Wyandotte Chemical and Great Lakes Steel keep their planes in these hangars.

At this crucial point, there is a stop-and-go light.

This of course, as Leroy Smith, in charge of the airport development and operation, and Baker point out, will be changed if the airport is developed for full airline use.

What they plan as a solution is an access road from the Willow Run Expressway.

To reach the terminal, the access road will have to be tunneled under the expressway, the Wabash Railroad track and, in time, under a runway and taxi strip.

At other airports, these runway underpasses have cost $1 million each. They are not included in the estimated 28 million plus development program for Wayne Major.

In February 1947, Smith said that close to 5 million would be spent on improving Wayne Major and that it would be available for use by the airlines in October if they wished.

Further improvements would continue, he said, for the next 3 years. By 1950, he said, the expansion program would be complete and Wayne Major would be one of the finest airports in the country.

In August 1947, Smith said, "It is anticipated that by next July the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport will be equipped to handle all of the major airlines serving Detroit."

Nine years later, it would still take at least 2 years to develop Wayne Major for full commercial airline use.

Yet more than 9 millions of County, State and Federal funds have been sunk into the airport since 1946.

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 10, 1956]

BLANK-CHECK DEAL SHUNNED BY AIRLINES—WOULD HAVE TO MAKE UP WAYNE MAJOR DEFICIT

(By Jean Pearson)

"Would you sign your name to a blank check?"

That's the answer you get when you ask the airlines why they object to the contract offered them for operation at Detroit-Wayne Major.

Before discussing the contract, however, the airlines insist on making it clear that it was not the type of contract offered that caused six of the seven to decide "once and for all" to remain at Willow Run.

Their prime reason for refusing to move, they reiterate, is their sincere belief that the millions it would cost the airlines and taxpayers to develop Wayne Major would be spent best at the Northeast Airport.

Nevertheless, they add, the type of contract offered them was unacceptable.

Reason is a simple one.

To issue revenue bonds to finance Wayne Major's development, the Wayne County Road Commission must have signed contracts from the airlines.

Retirement of the bonds, plus the interest rate, must come from operating revenue at the airport.

If the road commission goes into the hole financially operating at the airport (and past record makes this probable), they have told the airlines they would expect them to make up the deficit.

As a result, the road commission so far has refused to offer the airlines any contracts with fixed fees not subject to change.

If they do give them such a contract, then the taxpayers would have to make up the difference.

So the airlines not only couldn't be certain about what it would cost them to operate at Wayne Major, but they would be expected to make up all of the deficits.

Further, they point out, the deficits could easily come from poor management over which they would have no control.

There is nothing in the history of the operation of Wayne Major Airport during

the last 5 years that would give them any encouragement.

During the last 5 years Wayne Major has operated at a loss of $222,194.

In 1951, the loss was $91,614. In 1952, it made $689. In 1953, the loss was $68,536. In 1954, the loss was $62,733. In 1955, there was a profit—$6,240. Total loss: $222,194.

Two years bear special mention.

In 1952, the Government paid $46,979 for damages done during World War II.

Airport officials say this gives them a profit of $689 for 1952. However, it hardly can be considered operating revenue from good management in 1952.

If it were not classed as operating revenue for that year, the total loss for 5 years would be over a quarter million dollars.

The other year bearing special mention is 1955. It was a good year. The only truly profitable one.

But how much of an annual return on an investment of over $9 million, the amount poured into Wayne Major since it was opened in 1930, is $6,240?

It is pointed out by the road commission that "during the year 1955, an amount of $250,000 was received for salt and mineral rights, which would offset net deficits for the past 5 years."

That's good, everyone agrees. But it is good luck, like finding a diamond.

It's true the road commission hopes to strike oil.

But what assurance do the airlines have that they will continue to be lucky? Or that nonaviation activities will continue to make up possible operating deficits?

In contrast to the Wayne Major picture, at Detroit City Airport there has been an operating profit for every year during the same period.

Total net operating profit at Detroit City Airport for the last 5 years has been close to one-half million dollars.

The net operating profits by year were: 1951, $78,347; 1952, $74,544; 1953, $89,180; 1954, $122,057, and 1955, $113,487—for a net total operating profit of $477,615.

Further less than $5 million has been put into city airport as a capital investment since it opened in 1928, compared to $9 million at Wayne Major.

All profits from the city airport must go back to the city, although anyone who has been out there recently can see easily where they could be spent for airport improvement.

Requests for capital improvement, however, must be made to the city in the annual operating budget for the year.

And when the tax situation is tight, as it is now, airport improvement requests are most likely to be lopped off.

Only one airline, North Central, services city airport, compared to Pan American World Airways and several nonscheduled airlines servicing Wayne Major.

It was not until 1954, when Pan American started operation at Wayne Major, that the airport's annual operating revenue exceeded Detroit City Airport's. It exceeded it again in 1955.

How well was the operating revenue handled? A comparison of figures for both airports is revealing.

In 1954, Wayne Major had an operating revenue of $603,039 with a net operating loss of $62,733. Detroit City Airport had an operating revenue of $588,135 with a net operating profit of $122,057.

In 1955, Wayne Major had an operating revenue of $852,757 with a net operating profit of $6,240.

Detroit City Airport had an operating revenue of $570,912 with an operating profit of $113,487.

Which may explain why the airlines claim signing an "open-end" contract, subject to the operating efficiency or inefficiency of Wayne Major would be "like signing a blank check."

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 11, 1956]

MANY NOW USE WAYNE MAJOR—NAVY WANTS TO MOVE THERE SO ITS PILOTS CAN FLY JETS

(By Jean Pearson)

Detroit-Wayne Major Airport isn't quite so unpopular as the airlines make it seem.

Even though 6 of the 7 major airlines have decided to remain at Willow Run and put future investments in a northeast airport, the county field has its admirers.

It's serving well as an air cargo terminal.

Businesses and industries on the west side, such as Ford Motor Co. and Wyandotte Chemical, base their executive planes there.

Pan-American has one international flight daily and several nonscheduled airlines make it a stop.

The Air National Guard, which has called Wayne Major home for more than 25 years and has leases there until 1980, wants to stay.

Approximately $2 million in Federal funds has been spent on buildings and other permanent improvements to serve the Guard's needs.

Finally, the Navy, urgently in need of a field from which it can fly jets, much prefers Wayne Major to Willow Run.

Rear Adm. Benjamin A. Moore, director of aviation plans for the Chief of Naval Operations, said last June that Willow Run Airport was "unsuitable" as a place to move the inadequate Grosse Ile Naval Air Station facilities.

"The only existing site acceptable is Detroit-Wayne Major Airport," he told the Detroit Navy League board of directors.

In a letter to Representative LESINSKI (Democrat, of Michigan) regarding the Navy's needs, Rear Adm. James S. Russell, chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics, said last spring:

"The Detroit-Wayne Major Airport with its fine runways and approaches and its accessible location is the preferred site."

Then why doesn't the Navy move in? It asked to move there over a year ago.

But Leroy Smith, Wayne County highway engineer, in charge of Wayne Major, refused to let it.

It has been established that it would cost $3 million to set the Navy up at Wayne Major, compared to an investment of 6 to 10 times that amount to develop Wayne Major for commercial use.

Further, as Robert J. Wilson, vice president of Capital Airlines and spokesman for the six airlines, says, if the Navy's need is urgent, Wayne Major would be its best bet.

The Navy could start operations at Wayne Major within a few months.

But at Willow Run it would be at least 2 years and perhaps more before the airlines could move out and the Navy move in. And the six airlines say they have no intention of moving out.

The reason they couldn't share Willow Run is that all hangar and building space already is taken and air traffic would be further congested.

The airlines had more than 141,000 air operations (either a landing or takeoff) last year and the Air Force, which has established a new Reserve squadron on the opposite side of Willow Run, expects to have 22,000 operations annually.

Total annual operations would then top 160,000. According to the Civil Aeronautics Administration, air traffic is considered "congested" when there are 100,000 or more operations annually.

Why does the Navy prefer Wayne Major?

Capt. M. T. Martin, commander of the Grosse Ile Naval Air Station, has mentioned several reasons.

Included among them are:

1. Wayne Major is closer to Lake Erie, over which the Navy conducts most of its combat training.

2. It has cleared approaches for landings and takeoffs and one longer runway.

3. Jet training could begin at Wayne Major within a few months as the airport would be used as a satellite field for Grosse Ile while buildings are being erected.

4. Wayne Major is closer to Detroit and the downriver communities, where the majority of the Navy reservists live.

Further, the Navy believes that additional training benefits could come from working with the Air National Guard on joint tactical problems.

The Navy and Marines have some excellent radar and other electronic equipment not owned by the guard. It could be utilized for training by all three branches of air service.

In addition, the Navy points out, operational savings might be made through combined use of crash, salvage, and fire equipment.

If the Air National Guard stayed, if the Navy moved in, and air cargo and business flying increased, every cent spent at Wayne Major so far would be justified.

With the addition of some taxiways, perhaps the lengthening of one runway, and a new access road, it would be a good airport for such an operation, experts say.

William A. Mara, chairman of the aviation committee of the Detroit Board of Commerce, said last June at the airport-use panel hearings:

"It's a credit to Leroy Smith that he dreamed up Wayne Airport many years ago, because it makes a nice base for the military."

But Wayne Major authorities, who want no part of the military, say all services should be at Willow Run since the Government could recapture it for exclusive use in a national emergency.

Others counter:

"Would county and city official deny the Federal Government use of Wayne Major in a national emergency?"

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 12, 1956]

WILL WAYNE MAJOR BE WORTH THE COST?

(By Jean Pearson)

There isn't any question about the attractiveness and functional quality of the proposed air terminal of Detroit-Wayne Airport.

From all descriptions by Wayne Major planners, it certainly will be handsome.

There isn't any doubt that the runway system planned would be more than adequate to meet the demands of any commercial planes in production or on the drawing boards today.

They would be long enough, heavily constructed, well-lighted and drained and coordinated with modern navigational aids.

But the real question businessmen and many aviation experts ask are:

1. Is this trip to the public money trough necessary?—or wise?

2. Is the financing plan realistic?

3. Does Wayne Major solve Detroit's present and future air traffic problem?

A look at the first question brings up the matter of how much taxpayer money—from county, State, and Federal funds—is involved.

Overall answer is that of the minimum $28 million estimate for the master plan development of Wayne Major, all but $23 million is from public funds. The $5 million difference will be in revenue bonds for a terminal building.

Will this include everything to make the airport complete?

Not by any means.

Not included in the $28 million estimate are:

Hangars (probably about 9 at $1 million each).

Fuel tank farms and storage pits.

An access road (probably about a mile long).

Underpasses under Willow Run Expressway, under the Wabash Railroad, and possibly under a future runway and taxiway.

At other airports, these have run up to $1 million each.

This is the financial background.

Now let's look at question No. 1—Is the trip to the public money trough necessary?

Yes, plus many millions more, probably, if the taxpayers want to develop an airport the majority of the airlines say they have no intention of using.

Is it necessary to solve the military flying needs? Realistically, no.

The Air Force is settled at Willow Run, its prime choice.

The Air National Guard is happy at Wayne Major, where it has been for 25 years.

The Navy wants to move into Wayne Major and could be accommodated there at the expense of only $3 million, compared to the cost of 6 to 10 times that amount to develop Wayne Major for full commercial airline use.

Is it wise?

Yes, if a handsome terminal building and saving 12 minutes driving time is worth $23 million to the taxpayer.

The only catch here is what would you be saving 12 minutes for?

Only one airline, American, has expressed any intention of moving.

Capital, Delta, Eastern, Northwest, United, Trans World, and North Central plan to remain at an expanded Willow Run. Then, just as soon as the Northeast Airport is developed, they say they plan to schedule flights out of there to serve the larger population of metropolitan Detroit.

Question 2: Is the financing plan realistic?

Even LeRoy Smith, Wayne County highway engineer, admitted at a meeting of airline, county and city officials last November, "there are some optimistic figures."

It looks good on paper.

But a great deal of it is based on hopes, expectations and appropriations that are only made year by year in advance.

For example. In the last 10 years, Michigan's Legislature has appropriated only $2,811,727.21 for the entire State as matching funds to Federal and county money.

The largest single State grant during this period was to Wayne Major for $304,647.50.

Yet within the 1955–59 period, Wayne County expects to receive $3,456,178.70 in State appropriations for Wayne Major Airport alone.

Since the metropolitan Detroit area can only receive 50 percent of all State appropriations, it will be necessary for legislature to double that amount for the State—or appropriate approximately $7 million.

It is true that Wayne Major, operated by the Wayne County Road Commission, has perhaps basis for its great expectations.

John P. McElroy, personnel and public relations officer of the Wayne County Road Commission, not only is a registered lobbyist for the road commission in Lansing but is vice chairman of the Michigan Aeronautics Commission.

The areonautics commission appoints the director of the Michigan Department of Aeronautics, who makes recommendations for appropriations to the legislature.

Backers of Wayne Major are planning on getting every bit of the Federal and State airport funds available to Detroit through June 30, 1959.

This means not 1 cent of these funds would go to the development of the Northeast Airport until 1960.

Mayor Cobo has said that the $3 million in bonds authorized for Northeast and the $5 million expected from the sale of Detroit City Airport "will give $8 million that could be matched with Federal funds."

What funds? When?

Of the estimated minimum $23 million in tax funds for the Wayne Major master development plan, $10,940,157.20 would be Federal funds, $4,550,077.54 State funds, and $7,766,848.48 from county taxpayers. Over 70 percent of all Wayne County taxpayers live in Detroit.

Question 3: Does Wayne Major solve Detroit's present and future air traffic problem?

With less than 8 air miles between Willow Run and Wayne Major, the two ports simply make one big air-traffic hub in the sky. It is an air-traffic hub that is already congested by Civil Aeronautics Administration standards.

As one pilot pointed out, moving airline operations from one airport to another makes no difference in the total amount of air traffic in that hub. It's no different than moving from one room to another room in a house. You're still inside the same house.

Perhaps the most revealing answer to this question, however, is in the last paragraph of the letter of transmittal for the November 4, 1955, airport use panel report which recommended the airline move to Wayne Major.

It says: "Nothing in this report should be construed to mean that any airspace problems involved in this matter have necessarily been resolved or that the recommendations contained herein have been endorsed by the members of the Airport Use Panel Advisory Committee."

[From the Detroit Fress Press of February 13, 1956]

AIR CROWDED NEAR WILLOW, WAYNE MAJOR—2 AIRPORTS ON GROUND, BUT ONLY 1 ABOVE

(By Jean Pearson)

On the ground you have two large airports—Willow Run and Detroit-Wayne Major.

In the air you have only one.

The reason is that the airports are less than 8 air-miles apart. Together they make one air-traffic hub.

The more you expand air traffic at either airport, the greater the congestion grows.

Even now, when the weather socks in and pilots are flying on instruments, Willow Run, with its superior navigational aids, takes over and controls traffic for both airports.

Wayne Major becomes a slave to Willow Run.

Both have instrument landing systems (ILS).

But at Willow Run there is, in addition, the finest radar and communication equipment.

In fact, Willow Run was recently designated by the Civil Aeronautics Administration as 1 of 38 busy terminals in the United States to be given a second radarscope to speed aircraft safely in and out of the area.

The electronic eyes of the radar at Willow Run show aircraft from 6 to 50 miles around the airport.

Though extremely valuable, the equipment and its installation is expensive.

But so far, no mention has been made of the extra cost of moving or installing this equipment at Wayne Major if that airport is developed for full-scale commercial airline use.

Seeing traffic 50 miles out might seem like a comfortable margin.

It is for a DC-3. But a jet could cover that distance in 5 minutes, and the 8 miles between Wayne Major and Willow Run in 48 seconds.

During instrument weather, holding patterns for aircraft waiting their turn to land are oval shapes in the sky.

It takes an oval 19 miles long and 8 miles wide to provide a buffer of airspace around each plane.

The planes are then "stacked" above each other as 1,000-foot intervals.

Above 19,000 feet the oval must be 38 miles long and 16 miles wide. Above 29,000 feet, the oval is 57 miles long and 24 miles wide.

By present-day airline standards, a holding pattern above 19,000 feet seems high. But jet airliners are coming and they are different.

Charles J. Lowen, new Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, noted this February 4 when he talked on jet age requirements at the Jet Age Conference of the Air Force Association in Washington.

Lowen said:

"The one feature, other than speed, that most sharply distinguishes the jet transport from current civil aircraft is that this new beast is an inhabitant of the higher altitudes.

"It operates most efficiently at about 30,000 to 40,000 feet.

"When a B-47 makes a missed approach, for example, I understand it consumes some 2,700 pounds of fuel just in descending from and returning to the 1,000-foot level."

Considering these holding patterns, it can easily be seen why, even with the smallest oval, 2 airports less than 8 air-miles apart constitute 1 traffic hub in the sky.

What aviation experts can't understand is how two large airports were allowed to develop so near each other. They ask:

"Will regional CAA officials ever be asked to explain why they approved expansion of Wayne Major (at the cost of many millions to the Federal Government) when it was practically on top of Willow Run?"

Millions were spent on Wayne Major development after Willow Run already was in operation as a major air terminal for all the airlines. The airlines' group never encouraged development of Wayne Major.

Another question asked by those who keep tabs on the local aviation picture is:

"Why hasn't the metropolitan Detroit area air traffic study, requested by the Airport Use Panel last June, been made public?"

They are not as interested in the report sent from Kansas City (CAA regional headquarters) to Washington as the one sent from Detroit to Kansas City and the opinion or conclusion of the local people.

Granted that Wayne Major and Willow Run are but one airport from the sky, what's the answer?"

As mentioned in earlier stories, the CAA has said that when air traffic reaches 100,000 operations (landings or takeoffs) annually at an airport, a potential need for a second airport exists.

There are already more than 100,000 operations annually at Willow Run alone.

Good sense dictates that the second airport be far enough removed to avoid further air traffic congestion.

The proposed northeast site is not only far enough removed but it is also north of the east-west air traffic flow that passes directly over Willow Run and Wayne Major.

Planes headed for Northeast Airport could be "peeled off" the airway some distance away to relieve, rather than add, to the traffic coming into Wayne Major and Willow Run.

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 14, 1956]

MACOMB COULD BRAG ABOUT NORTHEAST AIRPORT

(By Jean Pearson)

Someday, Macomb County may boast about having one of the finest airports in Michigan.

It could also boast that it was the most modern, designed and built from scratch.

Not a "make do" airport. Not a rehash of an airport begun in 1928, but an airport keyed to a new era in aviation transportation.

It would be a modern airport in every respect—two 10,000-foot runways, a helicopter landing area, a handsome, functional terminal building, newest and speediest of baggage handling systems and ample parking space.

It would be an airport serving more than 2 million people of 3 counties in a 12½-mile radius (almost 4 times as many people as served by Detroit-Wayne Major Airport in a 12½-mile radius).

It would be within 13 miles of Cadillac Square in the heart of Detroit. Expressways, such as the proposed eight-lane Hastings superhighway, would speed ground transportation.

All of this would not cost Macomb County 1 cent.

Yet some emotionally aroused people in Warren Township, where the airport is planned, are fighting it with every legal maneuver in the books.

From the time a northeast airport was suggested in the early 1950's, legal skirmishes have been carried on.

Finally, in 1954, the 74-acre Warren Airport was purchased by the city of Detroit for $93,000 as a nucleus for the proposed northeast airport.

Immediately, some Warren Township officials, who opposed what they considered "a big city pushing them around," protested.

The township entered a suit to condemn Warren Airport for a park, despite its drainage disadvantages for a recreational area.

They lost the suit, heard before a Macomb County jury in Circuit Judge James E. Spier's courtroom this month.

Now, the one hurdle remaining before the tricounty airport can become a reality is a condemnation suit filed by Detroit to acquire the land for expansion of Warren Airport.

When completed, the airport boundaries would be Ryan, Dequindre, Twelve, and Fourteen Mile Roads.

The court case is expected to come up this spring. It will be one with sparks flying. And no matter which side wins, it is likely to be appealed to the Michigan Supreme Court.

One of the first steps to blockade the condemnation was taken last Friday when Warren Township paid $234,300 to Poultry Farmer Frank B. Krause for his 71-acre farm.

The $234,300 was taken from a $300,000 fund voted for recreation purposes in the township. A school district, which joined the purchase, wants a portion for a school site.

Township Superviser Arthur J. Miller said bluntly, after the deal had been made secretly, "We're not kidding anyone. We bought the land for two reasons—the park and to stop Detroit."

Detroit Corporation Counsel Paul T. Dwyer said, however, that he did not believe the township's move will make any difference to the airport case.

More emotions than facts seem to have been stirred up in Warren Township over the proposed airport.

Some of the problems concern land values in condemnation, taxes obtainable from the area, school bonds, water, real estate values, schools, and safety.

Taking them 1 by 1, these are the facts:

Condemnation: It has been pointed out that more than a fair price is assured every property owner because the condemnation jury, composed entirely of Macomb residents, will decide the values.

Taxes: At the present time, approximately $12,000 in taxes is levied in this area. A park and school will not increase them.

By comparison, business establishments at Detroit City Airport are now paying twice that amount. All of these establishments and many more would move to the northeast airport.

School bonds: School bonds are now assessed against the 2 square miles that will be condemned.

It has been pointed out that in previous condemnation cases, the city of Detroit has paid off such bonds so there would be no extra burden on taxpayers outside the area.

Water: Warren Township is dependent upon Detroit for its water and some sewers. The township is short of water and cannot develop without it.

It is costing Detroit more than $50 million for the improved facilities that will assure Warren Township and other suburbs enough water for fire protection and normal growth.

Real estate: Impartial surveys show that municipal airports do not adversely affect the value of nearby real estate.

Actually, an airport brings businesses, increases employment, and creates new demands for homes.

Schools: Concern for the safety and scholastic retardation of approximately 15,000 pupils enrolled in schools in a 30-square-mile area surrounding the proposed Northeast Airport has been expressed by opponents.

By comparison, approximately 40,000 public and parochial school students are studying within a 2-mile radius of Detroit City Airport.

And, as has been pointed out, "not once in the 25 years since that extremely busy airport has been operating has a schoolchild so much as lost his hat to a descending airplane."

Safety: A lot could be said to point up the fallacy of hysteria on this point.

Suffice to say that records show a person is safer near an airport than on a railroad or highway.

Safer, even than on a sidewalk. Bicycles kill more innocent bystandars annually than airplanes.

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 15, 1956]

WILL MILLIONS BE WASTED ON WAYNE MAJOR?—NORTHEAST AIRPORT SEEN MORE SENSIBLE MOVE

(By Jean Pearson)

For nearly 2 weeks the Free Press has been printing a series of articles on Detroit's airport situation.

What, in summary, are some of the important points that affect the taxpayer and the way his money is spent?

In this concluding article, some of the highlights are reviewed.

First, by way of background, Metropolitan Detroit is expected to have a population close to 4 million by July 1960.

An estimated 3,100,000 air passengers will arrive or depart in the Detroit area that year.

This is well over a million more than arrived or departed on planes here in 1955.

By 1965, the number will be close to 4 million passengers.

Detroit should be building another airport now.

This does not mean Detroit-Wayne Major Airport.

Whether the airlines operate at Willow Run Airport or Wayne Major is beside the point.

They may be two airports on the ground but they are only one in the sky. Being only 8 air-miles apart, they form one air traffic hub.

The two airports are so close together that in instrument flying weather the Willow Run tower, with superior navigational aids, takes over air traffic control for both fields.

Already this air traffic hub is congested.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration has stated:

"With present technical know-how, an airport with 100,000 or more air carrier operations has reached or is approaching the limit of efficient IFR (instrument flight rules) operational capacity.

"A community, therefore, has a potential need for two airports for air commerce when it has 100,000 or more air carrier operations."

Willow Run now has more than 144,600 operations (either a landing or takeoff) annually. Of these, more than 120,000 are air carrier operations.

Add the more than 135,000 operations annually at Wayne Major to the single air traffic hub and you have the reason why another airport, far removed from either, is needed.

You also have the reason why the airlines insist the minimum of $19 million more needed to develop Wayne Major for full airline use would be better spent developing the Northeast site.

Further, this 19 million estimate (added to the 9 million poured into Wayne Major since 1946) would not complete the airport.

It does not include hangars (about 9 at $1 million each will be needed), fuel storage, an access road about a mile long and underpasses (which have cost about 1 million each at other airports), under Willow Run Expressway, Wabash railroad and possibly under a future runway and taxiway.

To finance this tremendous expenditure for an airport 6 of 7 major airlines say they have no intention of using, an exceedingly optimistic program has been set up.

It was set up by the Wayne County Road Commission, sponsor of the airport under the direction of Leroy Smith, county highway engineer, for more than 27 years.

Total estimated cost for development of Wayne Major (without hangars, fuel storage, access road and underpasses) is a minimum of $28 million, of which $23 million is tax money.

More than 9 million of the total has already been spent since 1946 and still the airport is such a jumble it would take 2 years before it could be ready for full airline use.

Many have wondered how the regional CAA happened to approve development of one large airport practically on top of another large airport.

Millions in Federal funds were poured into Wayne Major after all the airlines were already at Willow Run. Further, all but one had indicated they had no intention of moving to Wayne Major.

Now, with the Federal millions already spent, aviation observers wonder if millions more will be poured in "to chase it up."

They also wonder if eventually the CAA in a face-saving gesture might try, through direct or indirect pressure, to force the airlines to move.

Of the $23 million in tax money for the Wayne Major master development plan, $10,940,157.20 would be Federal funds, $4,555,077.54 State funds and $7,766,848.48 from county taxpayers.

More than 70 percent of the county taxpayers live in Detroit.

Though the legislature has appropriated only $2,811,727.31 for the entire State to match Federal funds for airport development in the last 10 years, Wayne County officials expect legislators to appropriate $3,456,177.70 for it alone during a 4-year period.

Since Metropolitan Detroit may receive only 50 percent of all State funds appropriated, this means the State legislators would have to appropriate nearly seven million for airports during that period.

The road commission expects to get what it asks for. It usually does.

Its personnel and public relations officer, John P. McElroy, is a registered lobbyist in Lansing and vice chairman of the Michigan Aeronautics Commission.

The Aeronautics Commission appoints the director (Brig. Gen. Lester J. Maitland) and he makes the recommendations to the Legislature.

Further, though Willow Run, Wayne Major, Detroit City Airport and the proposed Northeast Airport are expected to share the State funds available to metropolitan Detroit, the road commission expects to get every penny for Wayne Major through June 30, 1959.

Not one cent would be available for the Northeast Airport until 1960.

From Wayne County taxpayers, the county expects to get $3,456,177.70 during the four-year period.

It already receives half a million dollars yearly to sink into Wayne Major.

Ultimate responsibility for making up any airport operating deficiencies might eventually also fall upon the taxpayer.

This would be the case if the county signed contracts with the airlines providing fixed charges not subject to revision or review or tied to some sliding scale.

Since the war, the public has been consulted only once about Wayne Major.

In 1946, a $5 million airport development bond issue was presented to the people.

The county hasn't risked a vote on its airport activities since.

Because this great expenditure is being used to duplicate a large, fully operative commercial airport only 8 air-miles away, the airlines say it doesn't make good sense—for them or the public.

The military Air Reserve program is an important part of Detroit's airport situation.

The Air National Guard, with a $2-million investment in facilities, has been at Wayne Major more than 25 years and holds leases until 1980. It wants to stay there.

The Navy, desperately in need of a field from which it can fly jets (Grosse Ile Naval Air Station is too small for jet operations), always has expressed a preference for Wayne Major.

Not only could it start preliminary jet operations there within a few months, but its installations would cost only an estimated $3 million. This would be from the Federal and residential area of south Macomb County.

For this reason, the airlines have said that investing in the northeast site makes good business sense for them and, they believe, the public.

* * * * *

Finally, the Air Force Reserve is already set up at Willow Run—where it prefers to be.

The airlines say the number of jet operations planned by the Air Force will not interfere with their operations.

The airlines moved to Willow Run when they began using four-engine airplanes in 1946.

City airport was too small.

They considered Wayne Major, but were told it would be 2 years before it would be ready for full airline use.

Ten years and about $10 million later, it still isn't.

At the time the airlines moved, they said they had no intention of moving again until an airport more centrally located than either Willow Run or Wayne Major became available.

Willow Run, built as a testing and fly-away field for the B-24 bomber plant, had served its wartime purpose and owed nothing to anyone.

The fact that it has been put to use and maintained in good condition is a credit to both the University of Michigan, its owner, and the airlines, which lease it.

Willow Run hasn't cost the citizens of metropolitan Detroit 1 cent in city or county taxes.

The airlines pay rent to the university plus percentage of income from nonairlines revenue.

They operate the airport and maintain the field and buildings.

For 5 years they operated at a loss.

The airlines paid for the conversion of the bomber plant to an air terminal.

They also expect to foot the bill for the $1½-million facelifting and expansion already begun at Willow Run.

Nevertheless, they see the future need for an airport north of the city.

More than four times as many persons would be served within a 12½-mile radius of Northeast Airport than would be served in a 12½-mile radius of Wayne Major.

The figures are 2,204,920 within a 12½-mile circle around Northeast compared to 615,350 with 12½ miles of Wayne Major.

Northeast Airport's area of service would extend in every direction:

North, to the area of Flint, Saginaw, and Bay City.

West, to Pontiac, Birmingham and Royal Oak.

East, to Mount Clemens, Roseville, and St. Clair Shores.

South from Detroit and the rapidly expanding industrial area they will schedule flights there.

Then, as they do in Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles, they would operate at two or more fields to provide better air transportation to a greater number of people.

One question remains.

Will millions be spent needlessly (utterly wasteful," as the chairman of the Aviation Committee of the Detroit Board of Commerce has said) at Wayne Major or will the Northeast site be given No. 1 priority?

Politicians may decide the answer—unless the public and legislators have a more powerful voice.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, last year, Leroy Smith, the Wayne County road commission engineer, wrote a letter to Secretary Wilson of the Department of Defense and urged as follows: That Willow Run Airport, now used by the commercial airlines, be converted into a military airport; that the Air Force Reserve jet operations, and the Navy jet Reserve training operations and the Air National Guard, which is now located on Wayne Major Airport, and probably cannot be moved from it, all be transferred to Willow Run; and that the airlines be made to go to Detroit-Wayne Major.

Mr. Speaker, I learned something about the executive branch of the Government as a result of that experience. They have an outfit called the Air Coordinating Committee, which was not set up by the Congress, has no statutory standing or authority of any kind. That Air Coordinating Committee has a variety of panels. It has an airport use panel. It has an air space panel. I think it has a panel dealing with navigational aids and other aspects of aviation.

What is the Air Coordinating Committee? I hold in my hand the Code of Federal Regulations, and on page 162 is Executive Order 9781 establishing the Air Coordinating Committee, signed by Harry S. Truman, September 19, 1946. The members of this Air Coordinating Committee at that time were: the Department of State, War, Post Office, Navy, Commerce, and the Civil Aeronautics Board. That has been added to. There are some more. But for all practical purposes—and it was the case in the airport use panel which held hearings in the city of Detroit—the Air Coordinating Committee is dominated by the military.

At this point in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the entire text of Executive Order 9781.

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

There was no objection.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 9781, ESTABLISHING THE AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE

By virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, and in order to provide for the fullest development and coordination of the aviation policies and activities of the Federal agencies, and in the interest of the internal management of the Government, it is hereby ordered as follows:

1. (a) There is hereby established the Air Coordinating Committee (hereinafter referred to as the committee) which shall have as members one representative from each of the following-named agencies (hereinafter referred to as the participating agencies): the State, War, Post Office, Navy, and Commerce Departments and the Civil Aeronautics Board. The members shall be designated by the respective heads of the participating agencies. The President shall name one of the members as the chairman of the committee. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall designate a representative of the Bureau as a nonvoting member of the committee.

(b) Each officer or body authorized under subparagraph 9 (a) hereof to designate a member of the committee shall also designate one or more alternate members, as may be necessary.

(c) The committee shall establish procedures to provide for participation, including participation in voting, by a representative of any agency not named in subparagraph 9 (a) hereof in connection with such aviation matters as are of substantial interest to that agency.

2. The committee shall examine aviation problems and developments affecting more than one participating agency; develop and recommend integrated policies to be carried out and actions to be taken by the participating agencies or by any other Government agency charged with responsibility in the aviation field; and, to the extent permitted by law, coordinate the aviation activities of such agencies except activities relating to the exercise of quasi-judicial functions.

3. The committee shall consult with Federal interagency boards and committees concerned in any manner with aviation activities; and consult with the representatives of the United States to the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or to the permanent successor thereof and recommend to the Department of State general policy directives and instructions for the guidance of the said representatives.

4. The committee, after obtaining the views of the head of each agency concerned, shall submit to the President, together with the said views, (a) such of the committee's recommendations on aviation policies as require the attention of the President by reason of their character or importance, (b) those important aviation questions the disposition of which is prevented by the inability of the agencies concerned to agree, (c) an annual report of the committee's activities during each calendar year, to be submitted not later than January 31 of the next succeeding year, and (d) such interim reports as may be necessary or desirable.

5. The heads of the participating agencies shall cause their respective agencies to use the facilities of the committee in all appropriate circumstances and, consonant with law, to provide the committee with such personnel assistance as may be necessary.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 19, 1946.*

Mr. MEADER. The Air Coordinating Committee, when this controversy between these two airports developed, ordered its airport use panel to hold public hearings in Detroit, which they did on the 22d and 23d of June of 1955.

I say that the airport use panel is a stacked deck. It had 2 civilians out of the 6 members of that panel, a representative of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and a representative of the

Civil Aeronautics Board. But it had 4 military representatives, a representative of the Department of Defense and 1 each from the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy. In other words, there were 4 military representatives and 2 civilians. That was a 2 to 1 vote in favor of the military on any problem in the Detroit area concerning the use of airports.

I told you this Air Coordinating Committee has no statutory standing, being created by executive order, but it is presumed to bind the executive branch of the Government. Let me tell you that I have come to learn that the executive branch of the Government has come to have a lot more to say about the future of aviation in this country than the Congress does. The Air Coordinating Committee itself signed the report which resulted from the hearings of this airport use panel and that, like the panel, was represented 4 to 2 military over civilian.

What did that panel report? It reported exactly what it knew it was going to report before it went out there. It was going to give the military anything they wanted, and it was going to back up the CAA and its mistaken program of underwriting this huge expansion program to build one airport right on top of another one.

Who was going to fight it? They knew what they were going to do, but they went through the sham of a public hearing and let people come in and talk themselves out, knowing all the time that it would not make a bit of difference. They could have stayed right here in Washington.

There are some curious things about that report. I am not going to ask that the entire report go into the RECORD, because it is too long. But what would you think would be some of the factors you ought to consider in deciding how airports should be used in a particular community? Would you not think that the item of cost would be one that you would consider? Would you not think that the location of airports and the use and development of airports would have some bearing upon the congestion of air space? But this amazing report of the airport use panel, which was decided before they ever heard a word of testimony, says this in their letter of transmittal of November 4, 1955:

> Nothing in this report should be construed to mean that any air space problems in this matter have necessarily been resolved or that the recommendations contained herein have been endorsed by the members of the airport use panel advisory committee.

Just a moment on the significance of that last phrase. The airport use panel advisory committee is not a Government agency. It is composed of representatives of trade associations interested in flying, the Air Line Pilots Association, the Air Transport Association, and so on. There are a number of such associations. They formed an advisory committee. This question was referred to that advisory committee, but they did not go along with the airport use panel. That is why they had to say that the recommendations contained in their report have not been endorsed by the airport use panel advisory committee. But the important thing is their saying themselves that they did not consider the air-space problem.

Here you have two airports that right now, with their present traffic, without the Air Force and the Navy jet training operations, are both operating at near capacity. Would you not think it would be intelligent to consider the air-space problem before you decide about the present and future airport use in the city of Detroit? But this panel did not dare look at that question because it would have directed them not to put more congestion where there is already too much.

Furthermore, there is the item of cost. Let me just read you what they said about the item of cost. They belittle it. The airlines say, "We know what it costs to build airports, we know what it costs to build terminals and hangars and runways and storage facilities, and all those things. We think it is going to cost between $20 million and $30 million."

But what does the airport use panel say? It says:

> While the panel questions the $20 million to $30 million suggested during the hearings as the estimated cost of transferring carriers to the Detroit Wayne Major Airport, it knows, of course, that such a move might very well be costly.

But when the airlines who have been negotiating with the representatives of the Detroit Wayne Major Airport over the years finally got the figures from them; what were they? From $28 million to $32 million.

The panel brushed that off. Congress, or some other public body, has to put up a good share of that money. But the airport use panel does not care about the cost. That again might be because the panel is dominated by the military where cost is not generally considered too important.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this point to put in the RECORD the recommendations of the airport use panel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. SIEMINSKI]. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., November 4, 1955.

ACC AIRPORT USE PANEL MAKES RECOMMENDATIONS ON AIRPORTS IN THE DETROIT, MICH., AREA

The Airport Use Panel of the Air Coordinating Committee today released the following recommendations as a result of a hearing held in Detroit, Mich., June 22 and 23, 1955, to "determine, in the best interests of the public, the most feasible civil/military utilization of the airports, existing and proposed, in the Detroit, Mich., area."

1. That the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport be developed and utilized as the major civil air terminal serving the Detroit area.

2. That the scheduled air carriers now using the Willow Run Airport transfer their operations to the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport as soon as adequate facilities can be made available to serve their needs.

3. That the Willow Run Airport continue to be operated under civil ownership as a joint civil/military airport.

4. That one Air Force Reserve fighter squadron be immediately relocated from Selfridge Air Force base and established on the Willow Run Airport, utilizing present Government-owned facilities and pursuant to existing rights of the Government to use the airport.

5. That the Naval Air Station be relocated from Grosse Ile and established on the Willow Run Airport.

6. That the Air National Guard squadrons now stationed at the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport be transferred to the Willow Run Airport as soon as agreement can be reached between the State of Michigan and the officials of Wayne County for the replacement of Air National Guard facilities now existing or under construction at the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport with equally adequate facilities at the Willow Run Airport.

7. That the proper authorities proceed with plans to develop additional public airports adequate to serve present and future civil aviation requirements in the Detroit area.

8. That, in the event Naval Air Station Grosse Ile is declared surplus to the needs of the military, consideration be given to civil use of this airport for general aviation.

9. That the appropriate local, State, and Federal officials develop, coordinate, and integrate the master plans of all airports in the Detroit metropolitan area to the extent necessary that each airport may be utilized effectively and fully consistent with the recommendations contained herein.

10. That consideration be given to the establishment of a single metropolitan airport authority to administer the civil airports in the Detroit area.

The Airport Use Panel is a component of the Air Coordinating Committee and its membership is composed of representatives of the Departments of the Air Force, Army, Navy, and Commerce, Office of the Secretary of Defense, and the Civil Aeronautics Board. It is responsible for recommending to the Air Coordinating Committee major policies involving airport matters affecting both military and civil agencies and is authorized to take final action for the ACC when in unanimous agreement.

The panel's recommendations pertaining to the Detroit hearing were unanimously endorsed by:

> Fred B. Lee (Chairman), Administrator, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce; Roger W. Fulling, Director of Construction (P. & I), Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense; Maj. Gen. Kenneth P. Bergquist, Director of Operations, Department of the Air Force; Maj. Gen. Hamilton H. Howze, Chief, Army Aviation Division, Department of the Army; Rear Adm. W. L. Rees, Assistant Chief of Naval Operations (Air), Department of the Navy; Joseph P. Adams, Vice Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, on the 29th of December, the airlines met again and said once and for all they were not going to move to Detroit-Wayne Major Airport and they were perfectly happy at Willow Run. They condemned the expenditure of about $30 million at Wayne Major Airport as a waste of public funds.

In addition the airlines said that probably there should be another airport in the Detroit area but that it ought to be away from the Willow Run traffic pattern and that it would be foolish to build one airport right on top of another. As a matter of fact, today, in instrument flying weather, those airports are so close together that landings and take-offs at Wayne Major Airport are controlled by the Willow Run tower.

As Jean Pearson, the Free Press Aviation writer, very aptly said, "You have two big airports on the ground—Willow

Run and Detroit Wayne Major—but in the air you only have one."

But with the increased speed of flying and the increased volume of traffic, it just does not make sense to congest these airports further. That $30 million would be more intelligently spent on the other side of Detroit away from the present traffic pattern of those two existing airports. Certainly, they have thrown in $17 million already, but is that any reason because we have been foolish in the past that we should throw away another $30 million? I would like also, Mr. Speaker, to incorporate in my remarks at this point the letter of December 29 of the airlines addressed to the Honorable Albert E. Cobo and Leroy C. Smith, and the news release accompanying it.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DECEMBER 29, 1955.

Hon. ALBERT E. COBO.
Mr. LEROY C. SMITH.

GENTLEMEN: We the undersigned airlines have given most careful consideration to the proposal that we move our Detroit terminal from Willow Run Airport to Wayne Major Airport. During the past several weeks we have made a thorough analysis and study of the detailed Wayne Major operation as presented by you to us at our meeting of November 17 last, including your proposed rates and fees, required improvement program, time scheduling of such improvements, necessary expenditure of public funds, etc.

It was agreed at that meeting between city, county, and airline officials that it would cost at least $28,265,000 additional to equip Wayne Major for full airline use. Even this sum did not include such other necessary costs as fuel facilities, access roadways, and the movement of navigational aids. As outlined by you this cost would be borne in part by the county, State, and Federal Governments and in part by the airlines, payable in rents and charges.

We fully recognize that Wayne Major is more conveniently located to the center of Detroit and would represent a 10- to 12-minute saving in traveling time downtown. We also recognize that the comfort and convenience of our passenger customers is of primary concern.

Thus the basic question was a balancing of increased passenger convenience against the expenditure of private and taxpayer funds to duplicate at Wayne Major those facilities already existing and being used at Willow Run. In our considered judgment, the benefits to the traveling public are not sufficient to warrant this expenditure.

We have not been unmindful of the requirement that the various military aviation units find a permanent home. Of the three service units concerned the Air National Guard is satisfactorily located at Wayne Major and the Air Force has moved into Government-owned facilities at Willow Run. This leaves only the Navy to be located and it expressed a preference to operate at Wayne Major Airport.

At the airport use panel hearing it was estimated that it would cost only $3 million to establish the Navy at Wayne Major to make it suitable for a military operation. Thus the difference between the cost of $3 million to install a military operation and the $28,265,000 to set up a commercial operation at Wayne Major would be $25,265,000. It was expressed at the panel hearing that an urgency exists for a relocation of the Navy and this urgency could more readily be met by a move to Wayne Major.

We also have before us the need for another airport in the northeast section. We feel that any money spent on further airport facilities in the Detroit area should be invested in the development of the Northeast Airport, as a solution to Detroit's airport needs.

In conclusion we wish to express our thanks to both the city and county officials for their interest in the matter.

ROBERT J. WILSON,
Capital Airlines, Inc.
TODD G. COLE,
Delta Air Lines, Inc.
MAURICE LETHBRIDGE,
Eastern Airlines, Inc.
DALE MERRICK,
Northwest Airlines, Inc.
GEORGE H. CLAY,
Trans World Airlines, Inc.
RALPH S. TWIST,
United Air Lines, Inc.

AIRLINES NATIONAL TERMINAL SERVICE CO., INC.,
Ypsilanti, Mich., January 1956.

Seven of eight major airlines operating at Willow Run Airport today informed Detroit and Wayne County officials that they have finally decided, "once and for all," against moving operations to the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport.

The decision was reached in a special meeting December 28, of member airlines comprising the Airlines National Terminal Service Co., Inc. (ANTSCO). An announcement of the action has been withheld until each airline signed a letter which was received today by Leroy C. Smith, Wayne County highway engineer and manager of Wayne Major.

"In our considered judgment," the carriers told Smith, "the benefits to the traveling public are not sufficient to warrant" the expenditure of some $32 million, the amount in public and private funds estimated necessary to convert Wayne Major.

In their letter, the airlines said their final decision followed a thorough analysis and study of the detailed Wayne Major operation as proposed by the airport's backers.

"We fully recognize that Wayne Major is more conveniently located to the center of Detroit and would represent a 10- to 12-minute saving in traveling time," the airlines said. "We also recognize that the comfort and convenience of our passenger customers is of primary concern.

"Thus the basic question was a balancing of increased passenger convenience against the expenditure of private and taxpayer funds to duplicate at Wayne Major those facilities already existing and being used at Willow Run."

The airline's decision was also governed by the requirements of the Michigan Air National Guard, currently based at Wayne Major, and the Naval Air Station at Grosse Ile. A new Air Force reserve squadron is expected to begin its weekend flying operations at Willow Run later this month.

National Guard spokesmen have said they are "happily located," while Navy officials have expressed a clear preference for relocating all naval flying activities at Wayne Major rather than Willow Run. It has been estimated that it will cost only $3 million to transfer the Grosse Ile base to Wayne Major, a clear-cut savings of nearly $30 million over the cost to convert the Wayne County port for commercial operations.

The letter to Smith was sent by all ANTSCO member airlines except American, which has indicated it is considering a lone switch to Wayne Major. American was represented at the special ANTSCO meeting, but declined to make any comment on the outcome.

The airlines' unified stand apparently spells an end to Wayne County hopes for a multimillion dollar revamping of Wayne Major, but the aircarriers pledged their complete support and cooperation in working toward another Detroit airport in the northeast section to supplement Willow Run.

"We feel," the airlines said today, "that any money spent on further airport facilities in the Detroit area should be invested in the development of the Northeast Airport, as a solution to Detroit's airport needs." Pointing to current air traffic increases of from 10 to 15 percent yearly, they say two airports in the metropolitan Detroit area will be "justified and warranted" by the time a new facility can be constructed.

The "once and for all" decision to remain at Willow Run thus paves the way for the start of a $1,500,000 remodeling and expansion program there, financed by the airlines.

Based on an extensive study by Landrum & Brown, nationally famous airport consultants of Cincinnati, Ohio, the project in its entirety will take about 2 years to complete. Two of three major phases of the improvement program, however, can be finished by next year, ANTSCO president, Robert E. Miller, said today. He added that a detailed explanation of the project will be announced publicly when a date for the start of actual work has been set.

When the bulk of the improvement project is completed, the Landrum & Brown report estimates, Willow Run Airport should prove adequate to serve all anticipated air-travel needs of the metropolitan Detroit area for the next 10 years, and at least until the proposed northeast airport is in operation.

Cost of the revamping would be reduced considerably should American Airlines decide to move, Miller explained, as the remaining seven carriers would absorb space currently utilized by American, which accounts for some 28 percent of operations at Willow Run. This would then cut down planned and needed expansion of the terminal building and hangar facilities.

To back up with action their intention of remaining at Willow Run, ANTSCO officials have been authorized to negotiate with the University of Michigan, owner of the vast airport, for an extension and/or renewal of the current lease, which expires in 1962.

Airlines who concurred in the final decision to remain at Willow Run include Capital, Delta, Eastern, Northwest, Trans World, and United. The seventh, North Central Airlines, is not a member of ANTSCO, but intends to stay. An eighth operator, Slick Air Freight, moved early last year from Wayne Major.

Mr. MEADER. After the airlines said that they were not going to move—this has happened. There have been three attacks in an attempt to force the airlines to move. I have here a letter dated February 14, 1956, from the Department of the Navy addressed to Mr. Floyd Wakefield, the University of Michigan Airport supervisor at Willow Run, in which the Navy says: "We need so much space—please give it to us."

The university has not yet replied to that letter, but I do not know how they could make any other reply than to say, "Well, we are sorry, but there just is nowhere to go. The space is occupied," which it is.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this point in my remarks to incorporate the letter from the Navy Department to the University of Michigan.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF
NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington 25, D. C., February 9, 1956.

Mr. FLOYD G. WAKEFIELD,
University of Michigan Airport Supervisor, Willow Run Airport, Ypsilanti, Mich.

DEAR MR. WAKEFIELD: I am writing in regards to the recent Airport Use Panel public hearing held in the city of Detroit and that panel's recommendation of November 4, 1955, that the Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Mich., be relocated and established on the Willow Run Airport.

It is the desire of the Navy Department to comply with the above recommendation as soon as possible in that the Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, is no longer adequate to support the newer type aircraft planned for that station. Feasibility studies have proven that the cost of expanding the Grosse Ile runway system would be prohibitive as well as requiring excessive fill in the Detroit River. For these and other reasons, no further consideration is being given to the expansion of this facility.

The purpose of this letter is to set forth the anticipated Navy requirements for the relocation of the Naval Air Station on the Willow Run Airport and to request an estimated date and extent of available facilities upon which this Department can plan, and program for, this recommended move. The anticipated Navy requirements for the Willow Run Airport are as follows:

1. Land area—approximately 80 acres.
2. Aircraft parking apron—90,000 square yards.
3. Aircraft hangar: Hangar area, 50,000 square feet; Leanto area, 60,000 square feet.
4. Ground training building, 30,000 square feet.
5. Aviation fuel storage, 10,000 barrels.
6. Supply offices and warehouse storage facilities, 50,000 square feet.
7. Public Works and automotive maintenance facilities, 20,000 square feet.
8. Ordnance storage facilities, three magazines.
9. Personnel and welfare facilities to be constructed.

It is anticipated that Navy aircraft, approximately 60 in number, of which 37 will be jet type, will average 32,000 operations per year.

Your early attention and cooperation in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
E. A. HANNEGAN,
Captain, United States Navy
(By direction).

Mr. MEADER. Meanwhile, almost on the same day, February 13, 1956, the secretary of the Airport Use Panel, this kangaroo court that I have been talking about, wrote a letter to the University of Michigan which is really a masterpiece of Federal bureaucratic arrogance and impertinence.

They wanted to know why the University of Michigan had not answered a letter which, I understand, the university never received. They wanted to know when the University of Michigan was going to start obeying the orders of the Airport Use Panel. If it binds anybody, it binds the executive branch of the Government, but it does not have any authority over the State of Michigan or any agency of the State of Michigan.

They had the impertinence and audacity to tell the University of Michigan, and the regents of that university, that they should not renew any lease with the airlines. I would say they are way out of bounds. It is an ultra vires act and should be ignored.

I think the university is drafting a reply to that letter.

I would like to incorporate the Airport Use Panel letter of February 13, 1956, at this point.

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

There was no objection.

(The letter is as follows:)

AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., February 13, 1956.

Dr. HARLAN HATCHER,
President, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

MY DEAR DR. HATCHER: Early in November 1955, you were furnished a copy of the airport use panel's report dated November 4, 1955, concerning the most feasible civil military utilization of the airports, existing and proposed in the Detroit, Mich., area. That report recommends, among other things, (1) that the scheduled air carriers now using the Willow Run Airport transfer their operations to the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport as soon as adequate facilities can be made available to serve their needs, and (2) that one Air Force Reserve fighter squadron, the Air National Guard squadrons now stationed at the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, and the Naval and Marine activities presently located at Naval Air Station Grosse Ile be transferred to the Willow Run Airport. While these recommendations obviously are of vital concern to the University of Michigan as owner of the Willow Run Airport, the panel, thus far, has received no official indication of the university's position with respect to the proposed changes in the use to be made of that airport.

In approving this report, the Departments of the Federal Government comprising the airport use plan, individually and collectively, committed themselves to implement the recommendations contained therein. Since the issuance of this report, each of the member agencies primarily concerned has further indicated its full intention to proceed with implementation of these recommendations as expeditiously as possible. In this connection, it is understood that both the Air Force and Navy Departments have already been in touch with the university with a view to negotiating agreements for transfer to the Willow Run Airport of the military operations noted above.

It is also pointed out that since the issuance of the panel's report, the panel has been officially advised by the mayor of the city of Detroit, the chairman of the Board of Wayne County Supervisors, and the director of aeronautics for the State of Michigan, acting on behalf of the Governor, that the agencies of government they represent also intend to cooperate with the Federal Government to the fullest extent consistent with their statutory authority, in the implementation of the panel's recommendations.

As the owner of the Willow Run Airport it is recognized that the regents of the University of Michigan are in a position to considerably facilitate the changes in civil and military use of the airport contemplated by the airport use panel. Accordingly the panel has directed me to request, on behalf of all its member agencies, the cooperation of the regents of the university toward that end.

In this connection it has come to our attention that some of the airlines now operating at the Willow Run Airport are reluctant to transfer their operations to the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, as recommended by the panel, and that the Airlines National Terminal Service Co., Inc., acting on their behalf, has proposed to the university a long-term extension of the agreement under which it operates and maintains the Willow Run Airport. Inasmuch as any extension of the ANTSCO agreement might make it more difficult to implement the recommendations of the panel than would otherwise be the case, it is the panel's hope that the university will not concur in any such amendment.

In view of the fact that the action to be taken by the Federal Government and the several other interested agencies will depend, in large measure, on the position to be taken by the regents of the university, the panel has directed me to request an official statement of the intent of the university in this regard.

Your cooperation in this matter will be greatly appreciated by all of the agencies of the Federal Government concerned.

Very truly yours,
JOSEPH W. JOHNSON,
Secretary, Airport Use Panel.

(Copies to mayor of Detroit, Mich.; Governor of the State of Michigan; chairman, Wayne County Board of Supervisors.)

Mr. MEADER. In addition to that, one of the recommendations of the Airport Use Panel was that there be a Detroit Aviation Authority, so Mr. Smith set up a Detroit Aviation Authority which they wanted to make a 9-member board. They are willing to have the University of Michigan be represented by 1 member. That member could be outvoted 8 to 1. They would like to have the University of Michigan turn over the airport to this Detroit Aviation Authority. That is very much like, "Will you please come into my parlor, said the spider to the fly."

The University of Michigan indicated that they had obligations under their lease with the Airlines Terminal Service Co., and although they sent a representative to one of the organization meetings, that did not mean that they were committing themselves to the Detroit Aviation Authority.

Mr. Speaker, what does all this mean in terms of the future of aviation in the United States? We all know how important aviation has become, but I would like to read two paragraphs from the report on aviation facilities of a study group appointed by the Bureau of the Budget. It is popularly known as the Harding report and is entitled "Aviation Facilities." It is dated December 31, 1955.

On page 22 I read as follows:

Since 1948, total United States flying hours have more than doubled, and the air carriers have boosted their passenger-miles from about six to almost twenty billion. Military operations have increased and so have those in the category of general aviation. Controlled traffic is now about equally divided between civil and military.

At the beginning of this period, both industry and Government were predicting airline traffic of only between nine and eleven and one-half billion passenger-miles by 1955. In 1951, the CAA revised its figures and predicted that airline passenger-miles would reach 20 billion in 1960. That traffic volume will be attained this year—5 years ahead of schedule. This, then, is the first major factor having an impact on the problem: Aviation's rate of growth and the load it will put on our facilities are constantly being underestimated in future planning.

But to handle this fantastic growth of air traffic; to build a sound policy for its

continued healthy development the report has this to say on page 30:

In summary, then, the present responsibility for aviation facilities development, within the Government, is distributed somewhat as follows:

The Civil Aeronautics Administration has the responsibility for operating the airways.

The military services fly under Civil Aeronautics Administration's control but must, of necessity, provide certain traffic-control and air-navigation services to meet their own requirements, if the Civil Aeronautics Administration is unable to meet them.

The Air Coordinating Committee has the responsibility for coordinating broad aviation policies.

The Air Navigation Development Board is responsible for coordinating aviation facilities development programs.

The Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics is a Government industry advisory organization with no continuing official Government status which serves upon request.

There are now over 75 committees, subcommittees, and special working groups addressing themselves to aviation-facilities matters. The existence of so many groups is not, in itself, an evil, but it is increasingly apparent that the process of coordination is becoming more and more time consuming, and that preoccupation with current issues tends to obscure forward vision.

Mr. Speaker, however well prepared that report is, I want to call the attention of the House to one surprising statement contained on page 2. The statement answers the following question:

Should a study of long-range needs for aviation facilities and aids be undertaken? * * * it is our considered opinion that there is still no top-level systems study and master plan which would provide the executive branch and affected agencies of the Government with a firm basis upon which to build a comprehensive legislative and fiscal program for aviation-facilities development.

Mr. Speaker, I ask a question in return: What about the Congress? I have long sought better and more adequately paid professional staffs for committees, to enable them intelligently to discharge congressional responsibility as the policymaking branch of Government, the proper branch to formulate aviation policy for this country.

It is not the role of the executive to make policy; it is not the role of some high-powered so-called experts to advise the executive how to make aviation policy; it is not for the executive to write legislation, as the Harding report implies.

It is for us in Congress to do that job. It is my hope that the inquiry of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee will provide a fund of factual information which will enable the appropriate legislative committees and the Congress to discharge its constitutional function in determining policy in the field of aviation. It is my hope that the committee's inquiry will also disclose the extent to which military thinking is influencing national aviation development.

As a result of the Harding report the President has appointed Edward P. Curtis as special assistant for aviation facilities. An interesting sketch on Mr. Curtis and his responsibilities appeared in a recent issue of a newsletter published by the magazine American Aviation, which I incorporate at this point in my remarks:

CURTIS TAPPED TO RUN AVIATION FACILITIES STUDY

Edward P. Curtis, newly appointed special Presidential assistant for aviation facilities, told American Aviation this week he will take over the job with "no preconceived ideas." The 59-year old vice president of Eastman Kodak Co., and a longtime personal friend of the President, views the appointment as a full-time assignment. He said he expects to work with an informally-run advisory board and a "very small staff."

Curtis, executive assistant to Gen. "Tooey" Spaatz, the Chief of Staff of the Strategic Air Force in World War II, will start to work on a long-range plan for easing the congestion in the Nation's airways on March 1.

His appointment is a followup to the Harding report to the Budget Bureau which recommended the study of a 20-year master plan for airways and traffic control.

THREEFOLD RESPONSIBILITY

In a letter to Curtis, President Eisenhower said responsibilities of the new post included:

1. Direction and coordination of a long-range study of aviation facilities requirements.

2. Development of a comprehensive plan for meeting in the most effective and economical manner the needs revealed by the study.

3. Formation of legislative, organization, administrative and budgetary recommendations to implement the plan.

Eisenhower's concern with increasing civilian and military air traffic and the complications likely to be created when commercial jets take to the air lanes was revealed in his letter to the new aviation aide.

"I am taking this action," he wrote, "because the rapid technical advances in aviation and the remarkable growth in the use of air transportation have confronted the Nation with serious aviation facilities problems.

"Modern aircraft can be operated in the numbers required by the National defense and the civilian economy only if airports, navigation aids, air traffic control devices and communications systems are suitable for their needs."

"To delay the formulation of the plan is to invite further congestion of air space," the letter continued, "needless hazard, economic loss, inconvenience to users, and possible impairment of the National security."

The Departments of Defense and Commerce have been instructed to cooperate fully with Curtis. They will probably turn over facts and information they have collected in connection with air traffic facilities and name a top official to work with him.

Curtis joined Eastman Kodak in 1921 and became vice president in 1945. He was an Army pilot in World War I. In the Second World War, he attained the rank of major general, serving as executive assistant to General "Tooey" Spaatz. He owned a private pilot's license some yeargs ago, but CAA records show it expired in 1933.

He is a director of the Air Force Association and a member of the Wings Club.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the committee will meet promptly and act favorably on my request for a penetrating investigation of the Federal airport aid program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

FEDERAL CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, just a year ago I introduced a bill, sponsored jointly by our colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] in this House and by Senators KEFAUVER and WATKINS in the other body, which proposes an important modification in Federal criminal appeal procedures. It would permit any person who has been sentenced in a Federal district court to appeal to the proper court of appeals solely on the question of the propriety of the sentence. This review is not now available in the Federal courts, although comparable provisions have long been observed in the laws of my State of New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Ohio, and several others.

It is a highly desirable curb on the arbitrary discretion of the sentencing judge, not likely to be used except in most unusual cases, but insuring against any miscarriage of justice by its mere existence. The proposal has been sponsored in the past by several attorneys general. Current interest in it extends from addresses on the subject by our present distinguished Solicitor General, Judge Simon Sobeloff.

I am pleased to report that in the course of its midwinter meeting in Chicago this week the American Bar Association, acting through its board of governors and house of delegates, has endorsed this proposal, pending in this House as H. R. 4930, and has recommended its enactment by the Congress. I hope this endorsement will be instrumental in hastening favorable action on the bill. It would represent an important improvement in the administration of justice at the Federal level.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. TUMULTY, for 15 minutes on February 27.

Mr. O'NEILL, for 30 minutes today.

Mr. HOLIFIELD, for 1 hour on Tuesday, February 28.

Mr. SIKES, for 20 minutes on Thursday next.

Mr. MEADER, for 30 minutes today.

Mr. CANFIELD, for 10 minutes on Monday, February 27.

Mr. MEADER, for 30 minutes on Monday, February 27.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina, for 1 hour on Thursday, March 1.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. O'NEILL and to include newspaper articles.

Mr. ENGLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SELDEN and include an address by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. TUMULTY) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILLINGS (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCGREGOR (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HINSHAW and to include a humorous glossary of terms used to keep the wheels turning in Government and industry and to have them printed in separate form as it appears in the dictionary.

Mr. TOLLEFSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LIPSCOMB and to include an article.

Mr. UTT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire (at the request of Mr. MEADER) and include a speech by Hon. CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE.

Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. MEADER.)

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and include two letters.

Mr. COOLEY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and include a speech delivered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] before the national meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Associations.

Mr. KEATING.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1887. An act for the relief of Dr. Tsi Au Li (Tsi Gziou Li), Ru Ping Li, Teh Yu Li (a minor), and Teh Chu Li (a minor);

H. R. 2430. An act to release certain restrictions on certain real property heretofore granted to the city of Charleston, S. C., by the United States of America; and

H. R. 8101. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to give 25 World War II paintings to the Government of New Zealand.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 27, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter, So help me God.

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 84th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress, entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948.

JOHN D. DINGELL,
15th District, Michigan.
JAMES C. HEALEY,
22d District, New York.
ELMER J. HOLLAND,
30th District, Pennsylvania.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1568. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 20, 1955, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on Beaver Slough at Clinton, Iowa. This interim report is submitted under the authority for a review of reports on the Mississippi River between the mouth of the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on April 22, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 345); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1569. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 11, 1955, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Saginaw River, Mich., with a view to determining the feasibility of improving Saginaw River or its tributaries for flood control and other purposes at this time, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted April 19, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 346); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with 25 illustrations.

1570. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 23, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on preliminary examinations and surveys of Bayou Chevreuil, La., made pursuant to several congressional authorizations listed in the report (H. Doc. No. 347); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with 2 illustrations.

1571. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 22, 1955, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a beach erosion control study of the Lake Michigan shore of Manitowoc County from Two Rivers to Manitowoc, Wis., prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 348); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with four illustrations.

1572. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 5, 1955, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a review of reports on Boston Harbor, Mass., with a view to deepening the reserved channel to 35 feet and also with a view to increasing the width of channel for which the Federal Government is responsible. This investigation was requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted April 21, 1953 (H. Doc. No. 349); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 2884. An act to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1807). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 501. Joint resolution to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; with amendment (Rept. No. 1808). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7763. A bill to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to expedite the final determination of the claims, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1809). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 8750. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; with amendments (Rept. No. 1810). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KNOX:

H. R. 9498. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to provide for an addition to the National System of Interstate Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 9499. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to provide for an addition to the National System of Interstate Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 9500. A bill to amend further and make permanent the Missing Persons Act, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 9501. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 9502. A bill to amend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 9503. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that annuities

received under the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. R. 9504. A bill to authorize the transfer to the fund for the payment of Government losses in shipment of certain amounts representing unclaimed payments on United States savings bonds; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 9505. A bill to recognize and confirm the authority of arid and semiarid States relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water within their geographic boundaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 9506. A bill to provide for the conveyance of La Puntilla Military Reservation, San Juan, P. R., to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H. R. 9507. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 9508. A bill to reduce the percentage depletion for oil and gas wells; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 9509. A bill to amend the Agriculture Act of 1949 and the act of June 28, 1937, in order to authorize disposal of surplus farm commodities, and products thereof, to Federal, State, and local penal and correctional institutions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee (by request):

H. R. 9510. A bill to authorize the training of Federal employees at public or private facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. PFOST (by request):

H. R. 9511. A bill to authorize the county of Custer, State of Montana, to convey certain lands to the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 9512. A bill to amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H. R. 9513. A bill to amend Public Law 484, 73d Congress, to provide that in determining eligibility for pension thereunder of widows and children of veterans of World War I, World War II, or of the Korean conflict, commercial insurance on the life of the deceased veteran shall be excluded from income to the extent that such insurance is used to pay the expenses of burial of the veteran; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 9514. A bill to establish corporate income-tax rates of 22 percent normal tax and 31 percent surtax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9515. A bill to amend the laws providing for life insurance for veterans, to permit insured veterans to divest themselves of all incidents of ownership over their policies so that such insurance will not be included in their gross estate for Federal estate-tax purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 9516. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on National Housing Policy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 9517. A bill to amend certain laws relating to the provision of housing and the elimination of slums, to establish a National Mortgage Corporation to assist in the provision of housing for families of moderate income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 9518. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide increases in annuity for persons who have attained age 75 or above; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 9519. A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for certain reservoir projects located in the State of Texas, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 9520. A bill to provide that public lands of the United States shall not be withdrawn or reserved for defense purposes except by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 9521. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a partial tax credit for certain payments made to a public or private educational institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 9522. A bill to raise revenue, assist the American farmer by providing for the use of motor fuels of alcohol manufactured from agricultural products grown upon the farm in the United States, to utilize grains in surplus, to balance consumption with production of certain agricultural products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 9523. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Middle Atlantic interstate forest fire protection compact; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. R. 9524. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Middle Atlantic Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H. R. 9525. A bill to readjust size and weight limits on fourth-class (parcel post) mail matter at the post office at Muscatine, Iowa; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. J. Res. 556. Joint resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to a sound national minerals policy, and directing the Secretary of the Interior to take certain action in furtherance of such policy; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. J. Res. 557. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to restore tobacco acreage allotments to their 1955 level; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 9526. A bill for the relief of Gerardo Maria Ciccone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 9527. A bill for the relief of Miss Pnina Shlapak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 9528. A bill for the relief of Spyridon Tzouris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 9529. A bill for the relief of Arcadio Navarro-Savala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 9530. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosa Ayala de Ortiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 9531. A bill for the relief of Nashat Saadi Zabalaoui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 9532. A bill for the relief of Pak Un Ha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 9533. A bill for the relief of Monica Zatica; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. Res. 406. Resolution providing that the bill, H. R. 7176, and all accompanying papers shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

564. By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. W. E. Hertel, of Blue Earth, Minn., and 121 other signers, protesting the advertising of alcoholic beverages over radio, television, newspapers, and magazines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

565. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of the Townsend plan for National Insurance State Office, signed by many citizens of Jasper County, Mo., urging me to lend my best efforts to having the Townsend plan as defined in H. R. 4471 adopted as an amendment to the Social Security Act in place of the present programs of old-age and survivors insurance and old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

566. By Mr. TAYLOR: Petition, as follows: We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the States under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages. At a time when 1 out of 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic there should be no encouragement to increase the use of such beverages. Children and youth are being misled to consider them harmless, especially by the powerful audio and visual suggestions of radio and television, signed by Mrs. Isabelle F. Wilson and other citizens of Mooers, N. Y.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

567. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the grand knight, Knights of Columbus, Corpus Christi Council, No. 2502, Mineola, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing their support of the principles of the proposed Bricker amendment to our Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

568. Also, petition of the grand knight, Knights of Columbus, Joan of Arc Council, No. 1992, Port Jefferson, Long Island, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing their support of the principles of the proposed Bricker amendment to our Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

569. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of Mr. Albert J. Troyer, of Millersburg, and sundry other signers, requesting repeal of a portion of Public Law 761 and any other social-security laws which contain compulsion for farmers, and so forth; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I am today extending in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a list of the 34 participating projects which are a part of the Colorado River storage project. I am including the construction cost of the projects, the total area in acres each of the projects would serve, the irrigation allocation per acre, and the percentage of the irrigation allocation which would be repaid by the irrigators.

Mr. Speaker, not one single irrigation project in all of the 34 participating projects is financially sound.

If we consider the original 11 approved by the President and Secretary McKay, the cost for area served on the individual projects ranges from $200 to $800 per acre for construction alone. The water users can repay a weighted average of 17.5 percent. This average is that low because the largest of all the projects, central Utah, is the least feasible.

However, Mr. Speaker, these figures of cost per acre fail to represent a true measure of cost, because nearly two-thirds of the acres to be served are already in production and would receive only a supplemental water supply. In most cases this additional supply would be only a few inches in depth per annum, and thus only a small fraction of the amount of water necessary to put arid land into full production.

The real cost of putting enough water on an acre of land in this arid to semi-arid region would on the central Utah project be over $2,600 an acre.

It must be remembered that in these figures I am considering only construction costs. I am not considering interest charges on the Government's investment.

Nor do the figures I am presenting include another legitimate charge for irrigation. This is the proportion of the cost of building the storage reservoirs which should be borne by the irrigation projects.

As many an unlucky farmer has learned by bitter experience, the real value of his land is not what he has put into it in money and labor, but what he can get out for what he produces. The lands proposed to be irrigated in the Colorado River storage project lie at altitudes from 5,000 to 7,000 feet above sea level. They are not in tropical or semitropical latitudes. They have a short growing season and are generally capable of producing only forage crops and grains.

Land in the region, fully irrigated and improved, brings in the market an average of only about $150 an acre.

The list of projects follows:

Colorado River storage project participating projects

Project	Project construction cost	Total area served	Irrigation allocation per acre	Percentage of irrigation allocation to be repaid by irrigators
	Thousands	*Acres*		
1. La Barge	$1,673	7,970	210	29.6
2. Seedskadee	23,272	60,720	383	20.6
3. Lyman	10,564	40,600	260	21.3
4. Silt	3,356	7,300	450	31.1
5. Smith Fork	3,367	10,430	321	31.3
6. Paonia	6,944	17,040	399	35.5
7. Florida	6,942	18,950	343	26.3
8. Pine River extension	5,027	15,150	332	40.7
9. Emery County	9,865	24,080	400	38.6
10. Central Utah (initial phase)	231,044	160,380	794	11.9
11. Hammond	2,302	3,670	627	16.1
Total (11 projects)	304,356	366,290	[1] 545	[1] 17.5
12. Eden	7,287	20,200	361	20.6
Total (12 projects)	311,643	386,490	[1] 536	[1] 17.7
13. Navaho	211,237	137,250	1,530	14.6
14. San Juan-Chama	135,169	225,000	480	25.8
15. Gooseberry	5,761	16,400	350	41.5
Total (15 projects)	663,810	765,140	[1] 694	[1] 18.4
16. Savery-Pot Hook	10,814	31,610	340	12.9
17. Dolores	24,633	66,000	370	6.2
18. Sublette	37,099	84,000	430	3.7
19. Fruitgrowers Dam extension	1,690	3,850	440	27.8
20. Bostwick Park	2,634	6,870	380	26.4
21. Dallas Creek	10,330	21,940	470	9.2
22. East River	212	2,750	80	44.8
23. Fruitland Mesa	11,551	19,400	590	9.2
24. Grand Mesa	20,164	25,300	800	.1
25. Ohio Creek	3,402	16,910	200	1.0
26. Tomichi Creek	11,523	27,580	420	0
27. Battlement Mesa	5,854	6,830	860	11.0
28. Bluestone	3,330	10,875	310	11.1
29. Eagle Divide	3,412	10,875	310	8.9
30. Parshall	11,882	27,510	430	12.0
31. Rabbit Ear	4,733	19,190	250	16.1
32. Troublesome	5,243	13,640	380	13.8
33. West Divide	79,676	65,610	1,220	7.5
34. Woody Creek	178	2,965	60	100.0
Grand total (34 projects)	912,170	1,228,845	[1] 633	[1] 14.8

[1] Weighted average.

The Conservatism of George Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, last evening the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] delivered a very intelligent and informed address on the conservatism of George Washington. The Senator spoke in his usually fine, impressive manner. I think a reading of the address would be of value to Members of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE CONSERVATISM OF GEORGE WASHINGTON

(Address by Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER, of Ohio, before the American Good Government Society, Washington, D. C., February 22, 1956)

I am deeply honored to join with you in celebrating the birthday of our first President. The annual George Washington Day Dinner has become a splendid tradition in the Nation's Capital. These annual observances of the American Good Government Society will, I hope, become a tradition in communities all over the country.

Of all the great men in American history Washington is unique in that he is, and always has been, beyond responsible criticism. Jefferson, Lincoln, Jackson, Calhoun, Hamilton, and Marshall, to name only a few, continue to be somewhat controversial. Washington stands alone, universally acclaimed and unanimously accepted as the Father of his Country.

For Americans of all ages it was ever so. Take, for example, Henry Adams, grandson of the sixth President and great-grandson of the second. Even at the tender age of 12, Henry Adams was urbane, somewhat cynical, an ardent abolitionist, and completely unawed by the power and prestige of Presidents. Adams, in his famous autobiography, The Education of Henry Adams, gives these impressions of his first trip to Washington, made in 1850 at the age of 12:

"No sort of glory hedged Presidents as such, and in the whole country, one could hardly have met with an admission of respect for any office or name, unless it were George Washington. That was—to all appearance sincerely—respected. People made pilgrimages to Mount Vernon and made even an effort to build Washington a monument. The effort had failed, but one still went to Mount Vernon, although it was no easy trip."

* * * * *

"George Washington was a primary, or * * * an ultimate relation, like the Pole Star, and amid the endless restless motion of every other visible point in space, he alone remained steady, in the mind * * * to the end."

Then Henry Adams tells of his trip to Mount Vernon in a carriage and pair with his father, Charles Francis. On the way Henry was tempted to ask his abolitionist father how a slave state could produce such a man as Washington. He never put the question. He wrote in his Education the following words:

"Luckily Charles Francis Adams never preached and was singularly free from cant.

He may have had views of his own, but he let his son Henry satisfy himself with the simple elementary fact that George Washington stood alone."

Daniel Webster expressed this feeling in a single sentence: "Washington is in the clear upper sky." To speak about a man of such great and unquestioned stature is a most difficult assignment. The task is further complicated by the fact that millions of words have been spoken and written about George Washington, the most important of which are familiar to an audience such as this.

Tonight, I shall talk about Washington's conservative political philosophy. Whether or not Jefferson and Lincoln were liberal or conservative, is still a topic of lively debate. To the best of my knowledge, however, nobody has tried to pin the neoliberal label on Washington. Again it is indicative of Washington's unique place in history that even the most militant of modern liberals do not seem disturbed by Washington's conservatism. They appear to assume that the conservative policies pursued by Washington were sound under the circumstances of time and place.

Only when we begin to apply Washington's conservative principles to current problems do we involve Washington in political debate. I have often thought what would happen if God should see fit to return Washington to us for a period of 30 days. Let us imagine that Washington is scheduled to arrive at the National Airport tomorrow in a celestial DC-7.

There would, of course, be a motorcade from the airport to the White House along the route reserved for visting celebrities. Government offices would be closed early. I suspect, however, that few Government employees would use this extra time off for shopping on F Street.

In touring this vicinity, three places would give Washington particular pleasure. First, he could not fail to be deeply moved by the monument erected to his memory and dominating the skyline of the Nation's Capital. No man could ask for more in the way of an official token of gratitude.

Washington would be more pleased, I think, to find that Mount Vernon had become a national shrine. Watching the steady stream of visitors to his beloved acres on the Potomac, Washington would know that he never really died; that he continues to live in the minds and hearts of the common people.

Washington would derive great satisfaction from a visit to the Fairfax County Courthouse. There he would find recorded in the office of the clerk his last will and testament. Dusty records in the clerk's office would convince him that we had taken seriously the advice in his Farewell Address: "To maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property."

Shortly after his return there would be a nationwide TV appearance. Then the American people could judge with their own eyes whether history has been right in painting Washington as frigid and austere. I suspect they would see a simple dignity—a dignity regrettably lacking in many public officials. Our crackerbarrel philosopher, Charles F. Browne, better known as Artemus Ward, showed a keener insight than many historians when he said:

"The prevailin' weakness of most public men is to slop over. G. Washington never slopt over."

The revivified Washington could not wholly despair of America's future after meeting the leading figures in our Government. He would find in President Eisenhower a worthy successor. They have much in common—a military background, an unimpeachable personal integrity, and a deep disgust for those who would gamble with the Nation's security for the sake of political advantage.

Washington would be very proud to find his beloved Virginia so ably represented in the Senate of the United States. No man in public life has done more than HARRY BYRD to implement the conservative fiscal policies which Washington deemed so important. In his Farwell Address, Washington advised us to "cherish public credit" and to avoid "the accumulation of debt," while at the same time making those "timely disbursements, to prepare for danger which frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it." We are indeed fortunate in having as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and as the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee a man so well qualified to strike this delicate balance.

Washington would also be gratified to find as Secretary of the Treasury a man who compares so favorably with his own great Secretary Alexander Hamilton. A greater compliment is not within my power to bestow. We shall, I hope, hear all about Secretary Hamilton's remarkable career in 1957 when we officially observe the bicentennial of his birth.

During his brief visit with us, Washington would certainly discover a close political kinship with Senator GEORGE. The theme of Washington's Farewell Address is the danger of factionalism and "the fury of party spirit," particularly in the conduct of the Nation's foreign affairs. No one has done more than Senator GEORGE to prevent partisan attacks on settled principles of American foreign policy.

Of course, Washington would make a triumphal tour of the United States, culminating, I suppose, in a mammoth ticker tape parade in New York. For Washington this adulation would be no new experience. He would be reminded, I think, of April 16, 1789, and the days immediately following.

George Washington was up before dawn on that eventful day. Martha did not go along with his ungodly hours, so he sneaked softly downstairs and headed for the kitchen. A subdued clatter of skillets assured him that the cook was already on the job, and his nose detected the promising aroma of corn meal hoe cakes.

The vast sweep of the Mount Vernon plantation was still wrapped in slumber, but we can well imagine that a fledgling cockerel was practicing an adolescent crow; that a hungry calf was complaining about the lack of service—and that a reckless foxhound puppy was teasing an irascible and noisy goose.

These were matinal sounds that were dear to the heart of the farmer-general—and he had thought that they would be his own forever. He felt that he had had enough of public life.

Eight years before—at Yorktown—he had said, "The work is done and well done."

Six years before, he had said goodbye to his officers, put away his uniform, hustled home to Mount Vernon and enthusiastically written to Lafayette that, "At length, my dear Marquis, I am become a private citizen on the banks of the Potomac; and under the shadow of my own vine and my own fig-tree, free from the bustle of a camp and the busy scenes of public life, I am solacing myself with those tranquil enjoyments of which the soldier * * * the statesman * * * and the courtier * * * can have very little conception."

The work was done for his muscular and triumphant little army. But the work was not done for Washington, and today, April 16, 1789, he was saying goodby once again—this time to Mount Vernon—as President-elect of the new United States.

He had his hoe cakes—with honey—and a pot of tea, and as he went outdoors, he found his horse, already saddled, full of oats and groomed to a glistening sheen. It nickered a welcome, and his dogs swarmed around his legs—a small and turbulent sea of waving tails and jealous clamorings for his personal attention. There were men in those days who said they could not understand this always dignified, austere and sometimes frosty man—but animals—and children—understood him very well indeed.

The President-elect of the new United States was in no hurry to get going on the long and muddy-roaded journey to the temporary capital in New York City. There was time enough to note that one of his mares had foaled the night before, and the oldest ewe sheep on the place was calling his attention to the charms of her new-born twin lambs. The Presidency could wait a little longer.

There would even be time for a second breakfast of fresh fish, ham and eggs, more corn cakes and more tea, and the President-elect was well aware that neither Col. David Humphreys, his aide, nor Charles Thomson, the Secretary of the Congress, who had brought him official word of his election, would be astir for at least another hour.

Those two men were to accompany him to New York, and it was 10 o'clock before the carriage wheels began to turn. We are given to understand that Washington rode in silence. Possibly he was oppressed by the fact that he had to borrow money to make the trip. As always, he was rich in land, and poor in cash. It is more likely that he was oppressed by the frightful responsibilities that had been thrust upon him by the unanimous vote of the presidential electors. As a commander in the field, he recognized his own abilities. As a military strategist, he had no lack of faith in himself, but his confidence in the future of George Washington as a statesman was almost nonexistent.

It was fortunate, perhaps, that he had little time to brood about it. His first stop was at Alexandria, Va.; there was a public dinner, and a large bouquet of flowery speeches. At Georgetown, there were parading troops in full dress; cannon belched salutes, and bells were tolled.

Baltimore was a mob scene of enthusiastic citizens, delirious with hero worship.

It was a triumphant march. The Governor of Pennsylvania met the carriage at the border with a uniformed escort, and at Trenton, N. J., 13 young girls who were dressed to represent the 13 States, recited a long and fulsome poem in unison.

New York wrapped both arms around him. It was before the days of ticker tape, but our modern parades through the heart of New York have nothing on Washington's reception at the temporary capital. New York had entered into the spirit of the occasion with a fervorous abandon. The city shook with the thunder of gunfire and the peals of bells. Flags and streamers fluttered in the breeze, and the rooftops were black with people—some of whom naively believed that Washington was about to be crowned as a king.

The inauguration took place on April 30, 1789. The Congress was in session. The Government of our infant federation was about to be launched. Three times in the course of his inaugural address Washington invoked the favor of God. Midway in his address he declared that, "no people can be bound to acknowledge and adore the Invisible Hand which conducts the affairs of men more than the people of the United States." If Washington were to speak to us today, he would ascribe to Providence the major credit for America's progress over the past 167 years. In all of his writings, Washington invariably recognized the creative acts of providence.

If Washington were to spend a month with us, the gulf separating him from contemporary liberals would soon be obvious to all. Washington constantly stressed the

need for self-restraint and self-reform. He believed not only that men must act in conformity with ethical absolutes, but that their morality could not prevail in the absence of religious conviction. Washington regarded the Constitution primarily as a restraint on men in their collective capacity. He recognized as the two great constitutional pivots:

"[First] That the general government is not invested with more powers, than are indispensably necessary to perform the functions of a good government."

And secondly, "that these powers * * * are so distributed among the legislature, executive, and judicial branches, into which the General Government is arranged, that it can never be in danger of degenerating into a monarchy, an oligarchy, an aristocracy, or any other despotic or oppressive form, so long as there shall remain any virtue in the body of the people."

In other words, Washington felt that the struggle between good and evil is waged primarily in the individual rather than in society; that the individual's base instincts must be restrained by morality and religion; and that the popular will of the State must likewise be restrained by the immutable political truths of the Constitution.

Contrast Washington's political philosophy with the philosophy recently expounded by a leading Senate exponent of modern liberalism. This Senator recently wrote for publication:

"The one distinctive aim [of liberalism] was the liberation of man from traditional restraints."

This Senator also said:

"The liberal approach must be experimental, the solution tentative, the test pragmatic. Believing that no particular manifestation of our basic social institutions is sacrosanct or immutable, there should be a willingness to reexamine and reconstruct institutions in the light of new needs."

And the Senator concluded:

"We must release ourselves from the shackles of yesterday's traditions and let our minds be bold."

Here we have a difference of first principles—a difference which cannot be composed by mediation and compromise. As a result, we find Washington insisting, "We are not to expect perfection on this world." On the other hand, all traditional restraints are regarded by modern liberals as impediments to achieving paradise on earth.

As Washington went about the United States, he would probably not express himself on specific political issues. After his retirement from the Presidency, he was reluctant to intrude upon what he described as "the experiment intrusted to the hands of the American people." He did not even seek to buttress his place in history by writing his memoirs. He wrote to his personal physician, Dr. James Craik, who broached the subject that "any memoirs of my life, distinct and unconnected with the general history of the war, would rather hurt my feelings than tickle my pride whilst I lived. I had rather glide gently down the stream of life, leaving it to posterity to think and say what they please of me."

How refreshing.

However, Washington might not be wholly successful, if he were among us, in maintaining a posture of political neutrality. Suppose, for example, he were asked about current proposals to amend the Social Security Act. Could he resist repeating what he said in his Farewell Address about "not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear?"

It would be improper for me to suggest what position Washington might take on my proposed treaty-control amendment. He would be keenly interested in this debate, for the Jay Treaty was the most controversial act of this administration. Alexander Hamilton, writing under the pen name Camillus, was his staunch defender in that fight. Hamilton pointed out that all treaties made under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land. He emphasized the power of the Senate to approve or to reject a treaty. And he emphasized the fact that the only constitutional exception to the power of making treaties is that it shall not change the Constitution. Hamilton wrote that "a treaty cannot transfer the legislative power to the executive department, nor the power of this last department to the judiciary; in other words, it cannot stipulate that the President, and not the Congress, shall make laws for the United States; that the judges and not the President shall command the national forces."

In sum and substance, the treaty power as defined by Hamilton was limited to those objects over which neither contracting nation had sovereign jurisdiction. My amendment would merely impose on the treaty-making power the restraints originally intended to govern its exercise.

Could Washington remain silent upon seeing with his own eyes the extent to which political power has been centralized in Washington? There would be those who would explain the altered Federal-State relationship on the ground that "times have changed," or that the "Constitution must evolve to meet new conditions." Washington might remind them of what he said in his Farewell Address:

"If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation."

During his brief visit with us, Washington would certainly be given a reception at the United Nations headquarters. Perhaps he would repeat his warning about "the policy and will of one country (being) subjected to the policy and will of another." He might refer again to the danger of "passionate attachments for others" in foreign affairs.

In many ways Washington was like the great British conservative, Edmund Burke. Both men sacrificed themselves for the masses, but not to them. As representatives of the people, both men insisted on the right to exercise their own best judgment. Like Burke, Washington distrusted the spirit of innovation, and respected custom and tradition. Washington's conservatism explains in considerable measure why the American Revolution bears such little resemblance to the French.

At the end of Washington's imaginary return, I like to think that he would make a second farewell address. However, I do not believe that its content would differ greatly from the one delivered on September 17, 1796. He might point out that his earlier statement in opposition to entangling alliances has been distorted by some. He would certainly say that nuclear weapons and intercontinental bombers have overcome America's "detached and distant situation" which existed in 1796. But now, as then, I believe that Washington would pin his hopes for America's survival on the indispensable supports of religion and morality.

Before Washington ended the visit which I have imagined, I am afraid that he would be a highly controversial figure. We might expect to read snide editorials attacking hero-worship; warning about "the dead hand of the past"; and scoring Washington for doubting both the inevitability of progress and the perfectibility of man. So, it is probably just as well, that Washington will not return to us in person. It is good to have one great American as a fixed and noncontroversial point of reference. So long as Washington remains "in the clear upper sky," the conservative principles for which he stood will never be wholly erased from our political conscience.

Integration of Common Supply and Service Areas Among the Military Departments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I insert two letters concerning plans for the Department of Defense to integrate the handling of certain common supplies and services. These two letters relate to those which I placed in the RECORD on January 16, 1956.

The step which Secretary Wilson has now taken, though belated, is important. It is hoped that he will insure that his directive to integrate these common use items will receive diligent followup lest it suffers the fate of other directives of similar purport. I also hope that this is but one of several steps that will be taken to carry out the full intent of the National Security Act and the O'Mahoney amendment of 1952.

As I have previously stated, the large savings through integration of the common supply and service areas among the military departments will go a long way toward financing some of the things which we so desperately need at this time.

The letters follow:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., February 8, 1956.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: Secretary of Defense Wilson advised you by letter dated January 27, 1956, that I would furnish you complete information regarding our efforts toward improvements in the logistics field. The purpose of this letter is to reply to your letter of December 13, 1955, and to outline our program for supply of common-use items and common services.

The position of the Department of Defense with respect to supply, as discussed in the references cited in the second paragraph of your letter, was based on the supply techniques known to be available and developed as of that time. While it is true that our present plans may seem to change the previous concept, at the same time they reflect our never-ending effort to improve supply management as practical methods for doing so are developed. It is a seemingly simple task to designate that "supply support will be accomplished by single-service assignment." On the other hand, the tools and organizational arrangements to do so and insure adequate support in time of both peace and war must be carefully developed and considered, else we create a situation more objectionable than the one we endeavor to correct. We have vigorously worked on the problem and, among other actions, have developed what we feel is a sound solution—the single manager plan.

A significant factor affecting the previous efforts to solve the supply system problem was unquestionably the lack of the Federal Catalog, and hence, a common identification of items. Despite the sincerity of efforts to develop and further the concept of cross-servicing or making single-service assignments for supply, they cannot be effective

without the common language of the Federal Catalog program. In this regard I wish to point out that all catalog identification is scheduled for completion by September 1956, but it will not be until 1957 that a few more classes will be converted and the balance in 1958. In addition to the necessity of being able to use the common language of the Federal Catalog, we had to await the extension of the principle of stock fund financing in the departments to effect a sound financial basis for furthering our concepts. The military departments have vigorously pursued programs for refinements and improvements in their own military supply systems in a commendable manner, which has further assisted us. At this point I would like to explain briefly what we mean by conversion so that you will appreciate the time required after catalog identification has been completed. Conversion involves the renumbering of all items that are physically in inventories in all warehouses, the reprinting of all stock lists and reference material for procurement, and the revision of operating and maintenance manuals so that new numbers will be used when parts are requisitioned.

At the present time only subsistence, medical, clothing, and petroleum items are completely converted. Following the completion of conversion, the potentialities for cross-servicing become a reality and a major step completed in our efforts to develop single-service supply responsibility.

During the winter and spring of 1954–55, my staff completed the detail analysis of the single manager plan for supply of common-use items. As you know this culminated in the assignment of subsistence to the Army on November 4, 1955. Concurrently, we pursued a very active effort to analyze and develop assignments in other commodity categories. Our actions culminated on January 31, 1956, by Secretary Wilson's decision that the single manager plan be extended in the supply field to petroleum, medical-dental, clothing-textile, photographic equipment, and in the service field to traffic management. A copy of his memorandum to the military service secretaries, together with Department of Defense Directive 5160.12, also dated January 31, 1956, is inclosed. This directive sets forth the policies and implementations of single manager assignments.

I would like to point out the reasons why we selected subsistence before medical supply for the application of the single manager plan. Subsistence represented the commodity that had the greatest degree of single service (Army) integration and the fewest complications with respect to technical aspects of the inventory and the magnitude of mobilization reserves to be repositioned under the distribution policies of the plan. The Army already bought for all services and stored and distributed for the Air Force. Since only approximately 10 percent of the inventory is for mobilization reserve and complicated by many very technical items. A complication regarding distribution of medical supplies, emphasized by Operation Alert in June 1955, is that the need for medical supplies by the civilian population might take precedence over military requirements in the event of attack on continental United States. The need to provide dispersion even at some sacrifice in basic supply economy became apparent. These factors were all considered. As I have indicated, we now are assigning medical and dental supplies under the single manager concept to the Navy.

In our study of the single manager plan for common-use items, it also became quite evident that the same concept could be applied for common services such as Traffic Management, Military Sea Transportation Service, and Military Air Transportation Service. As indicated in the inclosure, this procedure has been approved by Secretary Wilson.

I trust that this answers your question as to our policies and programs. If further information is desired, I shall be pleased to provide it.

Sincerely,

T. P. PIKE.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D. C., February 16, 1956.

Hon. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY WILSON: I am in receipt of Assistant Secretary T. P. Pike's letter of February 8 in response to my letter to you dated December 13, 1955.

I am pleased to learn that you have embarked upon a relatively broad program for the supply of common-use items and services as contemplated by the O'Mahoney Act of 1952. Respecting Mr. Pike's explanations as to the reasons for a change in policy involving the handling of medical and subsistence supplies respectively during the past year and a half, I want to state that my concern is not upon what is past, but what may be done to insure the success of the program that has now been charted. I am not unmindful of the difficulties which confront you in accomplishing this program, which I am sure can bring about tremendous savings.

In order that I may keep abreast of development, will you please send me copies of implementing documents which are issued from time to time? When available, I should like to learn by categories of supply (subsistence, medical, etc.) where the depots will be located and their respective missions, the locations of supply-demand-control points for each category of supply, the prescribed stock levels, what the interval of stock status reporting will be (i. e., monthly or quarterly, etc.), and whether standard forms, procedures, accounting, etc., are planned.

You are to be highly complimented for the action you have taken in this matter, and as stated in my letter of December 13, 1955, I am sending copies of pertinent correspondence to other interested Members in both Houses, and will also insert same in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

Surplus Food for Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I am most happy to see that President Eisenhower is making our surplus food available to western Europe, which has suffered from blizzards and floods in one of the worst winters in 20 or 30 years. I am particularly pleased with his statement, and I quote:

> The United States stands ready to make surpluses of agricultural commodities, which we have in abundance, available for relieving the distress of the people in these areas.

Mr. Speaker, to me this is a great humanitarian deed, and I am one who has always felt that it was ridiculous for us to have surplus food when people in other parts of the world are hungry. I congratulate the President on his immediate action to relieve the distressed.

Upper Colorado Storage Project Scheme Defies Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the proposed upper Colorado River storage project bill, H. R. 3383, is wholly incompatible with the recommendations of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy of December 22, 1955.

If ever a piece of water resources legislation cried for processing under the procedures the Presidential advisory committee recommends, this is it. This would involve an application of benefit-cost principles which would give a more realistic appraisal of the benefits and detriments of this project; and ultimate review by an independent Board of Review which should give the Congress a correct picture of the highly controverted engineering and financial details of the proposal.

Compare just two of the statements of the Presidential advisory committee with the facts of this project:

1. Use of excess revenues:

* * * * *

> The committee believes that such a use of excess revenue from Federal power sales to repay a portion of the costs of other types of projects is a justifiable procedure provided the project to which such revenues are applied is a part of the area from which such excess revenues are derived. However, it should be pointed out that the utilization of excess revenue to aid projects which are in no way related to the facility producing the excess revenues amounts in reality to the operation of a Government facility to obtain a profit to be used for other purposes, and there are obvious limits beyond which such a policy cannot be justified (report, pp. 33–34).

The participating projects to be benefited by the anticipated power revenues are connected in no other way with the power dams. Each one of these irrigation ventures could be constructed without the storage dams. No water impounded by these dams is to be placed on the land. Yet 88 percent of the cost of these irrigation projects is expected to be repaid from power revenues. If such a percentage does not exceed obvious limits, what would? The precedent in this bill would be so enormous for this type of subsidy that we may as well forget a national water policy on this score.

2. Payment of interest:

* * * * *

> The committee recommends that as a general policy interest be paid on all Federal in-

vestment subject to repayment. In making this recommendation the committee recognizes that the provision of interest-free Federal funds for irrigation does not conform to this policy. The committee believes, however, that this provision should not be eliminated but rather that interest should be shown clearly as a Federal cost, as should all nonreimbursable items in all projects (report, p. 34).

The Bureau of Reclamation has admitted that the project recommended by the Secretary—Glen Canyon and Echo Park Dams and 11 participating projects—"would result in a total interest cost of $1,153,000,000 in the year 2032."

This staggering figure has been variously estimated by other sources to run as high as $4 billion, depending on which of the many over-all project plans may be under consideration. In any event, consider the Bureau figure as a minimum. This is not included as a project cost as the Presidential Advisory Committee now recommends. It was brought out only by determined questioning. It gives some idea of the true cost of the project to the taxpayers.

Salute to Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I doubt that there is one among us who is not conscious of the fact that we are in the midst of the annual observance of Brotherhood Week. In the newspapers, theaters, and pulpits of this great land, this wonderful thought—launched by the National Conference of Christians and Jews—has been spread.

It has been reassuring to observe the response of the people of this Nation to the appeals of religious and lay leaders of all faiths. I am sure many have realized that this week is a time for stocktaking and soul searching; a time for rededication to democratic principles and to the principles of our religious faiths.

To me Brotherhood Week is America's positive answer to the greatest challenge of our times—that is, if the human race is to survive there must be established a firm foundation of understanding and brotherhood around the globe. It seems to me that we can make the most significant contribution in the history of man if we can create an atmosphere of brotherhood and love in our world to replace the present aura of distrust and fear.

It is my hope that this week will form another link in what may eventually become part of a powerful chain, not only in the United States, but throughout the world, that will embrace men and women of every race, creed, and color, who will live side by side in a spirit of mutual respect.

Let us all join together and march in that procession which must someday lead us to ultimate victory over the forces of disruption, bigotry, and intolerance. Let us show the world that we Americans do not seek to destroy the beliefs and practices of those not in our own particular faith, but we believe there can be created a genuine spirit of brotherhood among all faiths if we but have the will and patience to bring it about. And let us never forget that in the principles of our religious teachings lie the hope and salvation of this world in which we live.

Upper Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, if the next 25 years are as dry in the western part of our country as the last 25, it will take the whole quarter century to fill the proposed Glen Canyon Dam. Since the financial feasibility of the upper Colorado River project depends upon the power production of this dam there should be no authorization of such a proposal until the question of interpretation of the Colorado River compact is settled in the United States Supreme Court where the issue is now pending.

Article 3 (e) of the Colorado River compact provides:

> The States of the upper division shall not withhold water, and the States of the lower division shall not require the delivery of water, which cannot reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses.

The power production at Glen Canyon Dam therefore depends on whether or not the upper basin States, under the Colorado River compact, have a right as against the lower basin States of Arizona, California, and Nevada, to accumulate and withhold water at Glen Canyon for power generation if the lower basin needs it for domestic and agricultural uses.

Article 4 (b) of the Colorado River compact provides:

> Subject to the provisions of this compact, water of the Colorado River system may be impounded and used for the generation of electric power, but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes.

Governor Johnson, of Colorado, in his statement to the Senate hearings on this project said:

> Furthermore, should the lower basin require an additional supply of water (over and above the award of 1,500,000 acre-feet to Mexico and 1 million acre-feet to the lower basin) for agricultural and domestic purposes, the water stored in these reservoirs (Glen Canyon and Echo Park Reservoirs) must be released.

Governor Johnson further stated that:

> Under the seven-State compact the upper States must deliver at Lee Ferry in each 10-year period 75 million acre-feet to the lower States and 7,500,000 acre-feet to Mexico before they can use one drop of water themselves beyond what they used before the seven-State compact was ratified.
>
> In the current 10-year period that will leave only 3,250,000 acre-feet per year for their total use. In the previous 10-year period they would have had 4,150,000 acre-feet a year. In 1902 the upper basin States under this formula would have had no water at all.

Is it not foolhardy to invest hundreds of millions of dollars in Glen Canyon Dam on a question of interpretation of the Colorado River compact which may be set aside by the Supreme Court in an action which is now pending in that Court? Plain commonsense demands that all consideration of this bill await the Supreme Court decision.

Surpluses for Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, unprecedented storm conditions in Europe this winter have created an opportunity for us to further evidence the humanity of the American people. Suffering among human beings and livestock can be alleviated out of our huge surpluses of foodstuffs.

Actually no physical transfer of foodstuff is believed necessary to relieve outright starvation conditions since the Government already has on hand in Europe millions of pounds of foodstuffs that can be made available immediately. These, in turn, could be replaced by shipments from the United States at a later date.

I suggest that we move immediately to authorize the various American volunteer organizations—some 20 of them with units in Europe—to make distribution of food packages and other essentials to take care of the immediate problem of starvation. This I understand is more real than would seem possible in these times.

However, in addition, it seems to me the problem is much larger than just seeing to it that people don't starve. Our great surpluses of food creates on obligation for us under these conditions—an obligation to help these people in every way we can.

It is already apparent that farmers in many European nations will have to start from what we call scratch in order to bring back their acres to fertility. We can aid them in many ways.

I suggest that we proceed with the utmost dispatch to make our surpluses available to these winter-stricken nations which are still in the grip of an unrelenting winter, the worst in a century.

In addition, I suggest that we consider making available to those nations supplies from such other surpluses as we may have available.

From our tremendous surpluses, generous, unstinting, and immediate gifts would demonstrate once again most clearly to the entire world that we are not the selfish, grasping people we have been pictured in the Communist propaganda mills.

No one under these circumstances could be persuaded that we were dumping surpluses on the world market, for if stories from Europe are true, and I am sure they are, the average European farmer will be lucky if he can just restore his land to normal conditions by the end of the coming growing season.

I believe this is a splendid opportunity to aid a stricken people, create good will for our country, and in a way relieve some of the distress that has occurred economically here and abroad from the storing of such tremendous quantities of surpluses, particularly in foodstuffs.

Of course, President Eisenhower already has ordered some shipments for relief in Europe, but it is my hope that every effort be made to see that these European nations are abundantly supplied in the quickest possible manner with as many of our surplus supplies, as may be necessary to carry them through the 1956 growing season.

International Security and Disarmament in the Light of Present Day Circumstances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in August last it was my privilege to represent the United States Government at the meeting of the Interparliamentary Union in Helsinki, Finland. It was also my privilege to address the group there assembled on the subject International Security and Disarmament in the Light of Present-Day Circumstances.

I have received from Finland requests for copies of the address I then delivered, and inasmuch as the address was rather informative in view of events which have developed since, I ask that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, as I listened to the brilliant report of the Rapporteur, the words of an American poet came to mind:

"Oft to every man and nation
Comes the moment to decide,
In the strife of truth with falsehood
For the good or evil side.
Some great cause, God's new Messiah,
Shows each the bloom or blight,
So can choice be made by all men
Twist the darkness and the light."

And as I thought on these words I remembered what Dante said: "Give light and the people will find the way." I paused and asked myself, what is the meaning of the word "light" to this age, and the answer came—freedom and opportunity of nations and people.

Then a second thought flashed across my mind. It was from an American philosopher, "What you are, speaks so loud I cannot hear what you say." I again paused and applied that maxim to the state of the world today. You all have done the same. We've heard time and again that the world needs deeds that reflect wisdom and understanding, not honey words. Right deeds by the rulers of certain nations would cast out fear and misunderstanding that is so prevalent and dangerous to the peace of the world.

Then the words came to me "Have that mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus." What did the Apostle mean? What is the meaning of that statement to this age? Was it not to build peace and faith in the minds of the peoples and rulers of earth? Was it not a mandate that men and nations should find the way to the light (spoken of by Dante) so that deeds instead of words would reflect the meaning of the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God. Otherwise nations will not "break their swords into ploughshares" and cease to war any more.

I have just come from Geneva and have seen the exchange in a friendly and peaceful manner of ideas about mankind's new servant for peace and war—nuclear power. Today as representatives of the free parliaments of the world, we discuss a related subject, international security and disarmament.

More than 10 years ago when the Allied and Associated Powers met at Dumbarton to consider the first draft of the United Nations Charter, one of the great powers put forth a bold suggestion. It proposed that the postwar international organization be given an international air force to help in the maintenance of international peace. The proposal was never spelled out in detail. But in the light of President Eisenhower's suggestion at Geneva a few weeks ago that mutual air inspection might be a basis for assurance against surprise attack, it would be most interesting if the authors of the international air force proposal—the Russians—were to look back through their files to examine the details of that 1945 proposal.

The years since 1945 have been most disappointing with respect to the control of conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction. The United Nations has had commissions working on these problems constantly. While the United Nations has not had authority to impose any disarmament system on member states, there is nothing in the charter that has prevented that organization from considering any kind of disarmament proposal. And as a matter of fact, the U. N. has done a thorough job of studying, although the results have been nil.

As one looks back at those early years after the war, he cannot help but be amazed at the boldness of some of the proposals that were submitted to the United Nations.

It will be recalled, for example, that at the first meeting of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission in New York in 1946, the United States proposed the creation of an International Atomic Development Authority. It suggested that this international agency be given managerial control or ownership of all atomic energy activities which might be dangerous to world security and that the United Nations be given powers of inspection, of licensing, as well as authority to foster peaceful development of atomic energy. The United States proposal went so far as to call for the relinquishment of the veto with respect to matters relating to the control of atomic weapons and called for the destruction of existing atomic weapons once an adequate system of international control had been established.

Although this proposal became the basis of a plan that was approved by the vast majority of the members of the United Nations, it was rejected by the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union for its part called for the immediate destruction of all atomic weapons as a condition precedent to the creation of any system of international control and inspection.

I need not labor the points of difference between the Soviet approach to the control of atomic and other weapons and the approach of most of the other members of the United Nations. Suffice it to say that the free world was not willing to destroy its stock of atomic weapons while the Soviet Union maintained its massed armies. The Soviet Union was not willing to reduce its armed forces in the race of the atomic stockpiles of the West. Hence it was that the production of and experimentation with atomic and hydrogen weapons went forward on both sides, uncontrolled.

And while this process of competitive arming went forward, it gradually became apparent to more and more of the people of this earth, that a nuclear war might spell the death knell for mankind. It gradually became apparent that a small war anywhere might degenerate into a worldwide nuclear war. The atomic clock ticked faster and faster.

Thus it was that the armaments race went on unabated. Meanwhile, the demands of peoples throughout the world for a permanent and stable peace grew in strength. While tensions increased and armaments mounted, the nations of the world vied with each other in proposing peace plans. The Stockholm peace appeal was signed by millions—but international communism plotted the military conquest of Korea. The Soviet Union called for the abolition and destruction of atomic weapons—but it moved as rapidly as possible to develop those weapons.

The nations of the West united in NATO and perforce by their weakness in manpower, considered the use of atomic weapons should they be required to defend their lands from military attack. Atomic weapons have been included in that arsenal of the West as a substitute for manpower. No less than 175 divisions of soldiers have been mobilized in the Soviet Union. At the maximum, the nations of the West have had in the vicinity of 40 divisions at their service. There have been some who have objected to consideration of the use of atomic weapons in defense against attack. But in the absence of manpower, reliance has necessarily been placed on these weapons.

We know that the free world is spiritually and morally incapable of using such weapons against any people except in a defensive war. The United States never has been and never will be a party to aggression. But atomic weapons have necessarily been held in readiness to deter possible military aggression—a course of action which we know by experience the Communists are capable of following. It was Sir Winston Churchill who some years ago noted that it was the existence of atomic weapons that has prevented the Communists from attempting to capture Western Europe by force.

Fortunately for the state of the world, in recent weeks we have seen some relaxation of tensions. The about-face of the Soviet Union on the matter of the Austrian State Treaty, the relaxed affability of Soviet officials, an apparent willingness to take a fresh look at the disarmament problem, and the announced intention of Soviet reductions in her armed forces, have all been good signs.

But we must never, at our peril, forget the underlying questions. Why this about-face? Is the Kremlin sincere or trying a new tactic to achieve its old goal of domination? Is it sincerely motivated by a desire to coexist? Will the Soviet Union continue on its new course, or is this part of a military

redeployment to put the free world into a position where a dagger may be plunged into the back of freemen?

I speak frankly because for 10 years the Soviet Union has given us reason to be suspicious. Our own interests require that we be skeptical of the motivation of a totalitarian regime famous for the agility of its diplomacy, and unrestrained by responsibility to a free and informed electorate.

There is no check in the Soviet system on the power of the officialdom of the Communist Party. Soviet officials have for years doomed the Soviet people to a distorted view of life. They have denied their people the truth that makes men free. Those in political bondage to the Soviet rulers have been told that Mr. Dulles started the Korean war and that the NATO alliance is designed to serve the purpose of warmongers. These lies have been repeated so often that even should the Soviet officials desire to change the course of their foreign policy, it will be years before they can undo the damage they have wreaked on their own people by denying them the truth.

I fervently hope in the months ahead that the leaders in the Kremlin will see the need for giving the facts to the common man—the man who must bear the burdens of war and whose needs for food and clothing and shelter cannot be satisfied during an armed peace. The common people deserve the truth. A stepped-up program of exchanges of persons and a greater willingness to print the facts in the daily press will help build understanding between the peoples of all nations.

It is essential I believe that in the months ahead we view Soviet proposals for disarmament with a healthy skepticism. The announcement a few days ago that the Soviet Union planned to reduce its armed forces by 640,000 men is indeed welcome. It may be the "earnest of good intentions" which is needed in the interests of the further reduction of international tension. But we must remember that during the last year the United States reduced its own armed forces by some 600,000 men without the flurry of propaganda that his accompanied the Soviet announcement. It must be remembered that the total strength of Soviet forces is not known but that it is estimated that there are still close to 5 million men in those forces and that they are augmented by some 1,250,000 men in the satellite nations. The number still largely exceeds those under arms in NATO.

It would be a fatal mistake at this time for the NATO nations to slacken their efforts to maintain and develop their defensive posture. We must remain strong while we seek in good faith a feasible, reliable, foolproof method of reducing the burden and the dangers of armament.

The heritage we guard is not our own. It is the heritage of individual freedom built on the sacrifices of our forebears and to be cherished and passed on to our children. We have a continuity of freedom to maintain if we are to be true to our trust.

Despite our deepest desires, it would be a most grievous mistake for us to accept without the most searching inquiry the sweetness and light that has exuded in the last few weeks from the Soviet Union. We must not without further proof accept it as an indication of a profound change of heart. As was remarked recently, it is toughness in deeds, not words, that counts. We must not hastily recast the very policies that have finally brought home to the Soviet leaders the dangerous ground they tread.

While Soviet foreign policy can be changed overnight, the policies of free nations based on the fundamental desire of their people to establish a world of peace and security in which individual freedom may thrive, cannot be a will-o'-the-wisp policy. A free nation cannot chart its course by the light of each passing ship. It must not confuse the light of the passing ship with a star. Its foreign policy must be based on the veritable truths that freedom is hard to achieve, and easy to lose—that actions speak louder than words—and that man must be master of the state, not its servant.

There can be no doubt that the United States in reversing the policy held by nations, "to the victor belongs the spoils," to the policy "to the victor belongs the obligation to reconstruct," was searching for a way to peace. The United States will continue to search for a method to reduce international tension, to reduce armament, to control atomic weapons, hoping that a way to peace will open up.

Last spring President Eisenhower created a post in the Cabinet of the United States charged with the one duty of developing practical disarmament proposals. He put in charge of that operation the man who for the past 3 years has been charged with full responsibility for our mutual assistance program.

Even earlier, the President proposed that steps be taken to break the stalemate in the control of atomic energy by his plan to proceed with the exchange of information on the peaceful uses of atomic energy. As evidence of our good faith we have offered to give fissionable material to an international atomic authority.

And most recently at Geneva, President Eisenhower in the utmost candor proposed a system of air inspection of air bases, ports, and rail centers, which might be used as bases for the launching of surprise attack. I have noted in the press of the last few days that General Twining, the highest ranking Air Force officer in the United States—a member of our joint chiefs of staff—has endorsed the proposal, thus indicating the seriousness with which we have entered upon implementing the President's proposal. I am sure that at the forthcoming meeting of the Disarmament Commission in New York we will see further elaboration of this plan.

Finally, the resolution before us recommends to the various parliaments that they keep themselves properly informed on the progress of disarmament negotiations and keep the public of their countries informed of progress in the field. The United States Senate this past session created a special Committee to study proposals for disarmament. That Committee, of which I am a member, will not only keep itself informed of developments in the field of disarmament, but it will actively and vigorously seek, in cooperation with the President, to develop fresh approaches to the control of these weapons which threaten mankind.

We are deadly in earnest in our search for a peaceful world. While, as I have indicated, the American people view recent Soviet turnabouts with a certain skepticism, we will spare no effort in trying to find ways to reduce armaments.

Fellow delegates, I would not want my candor in these remarks to be construed as indicating undue pessimism with the state of the world and the prospects for disarmament. Alexis de Tocqueville, the French philosopher of the last century who wrote so understandingly of democracy in America, said that without common beliefs no society can exist. Common beliefs are basic to a cohesive society.

I believe we may now be in the process of developing common understandings that can be the basis of the peaceful development of an international community. We now understand that modern war does not merely threaten mankind, it can destroy mankind. This is a situation comprehensible not only to good men, but to bad men. It is comprehensible to democracies and to dictatorships, to free men and to men in political bondage. Will the fear of destruction beget the wisdom to outlaw war? Will mankind broaden his horizon to see the grander view of peace?

President Eisenhower has stated that "there is no alternative to peace." It is the basis of Sir Winston Churcill's remarks that the terror of atomic weapons will force peace upon us.

Despite my admonitions and skepticism, we may be in the process of achieving what the scientists describe as a "breakthrough." As a result of the fear of war and mankind's search for a broader view, the way may open up. We must now seek to exploit every opportunity to reach a modus vivendi—an understanding—which will make it possible for mankind to resume his often interrupted climb toward the good life.

I believe I speak for the American people when I say that my country will never cease in its search for peace with freedom.

The words of a great common man of the people, Abraham Lincoln, come to mind: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate for the stormy present."

God grant that the nations will breed leaders who will recognize the truth of this statement as applicable to the changed and changing world of today.

The same American poet that I quoted in the beginning wrote:

"New occasions teach new duties,
Time makes ancient creeds uncouth;
They must upward still and onward
Who would keep abreast of Truth,
And serenely down the future
See the thought of men incline
To the side of perfect justice
And to God's supreme design."

—*James Russell Lowell.*

Glossary of Terms Used To Keep the Wheels Turning in Government and Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following glossary of terms used to keep the wheels turning in Government and industry:

Program: Any assignment that cannot be completed with one phone call.

Channels: The trail left by interoffice memos.

Coordinator: The guy who has a desk between two expediters.

Consultant or expert: Any ordinary guy more than 50 miles away.

Under consideration: Never heard of it.

Under active consideration: We are looking in the files for it.

Conference: Where conversation is substituted for the dreariness of labor and the loneliness of thought.

Committee: A means for evading responsibility.

Board: First, made of wood; second, long and narrow; and, third, sometimes warped.

Reliable source: The guy you just met.

Informed source: The guy who just told the guy you just met.

Unimpeachable source: The guy who started the rumor originally.

Make a survey: Need more time to think of an answer.

Note and initial: Spread the responsibility.

Clarification: Fill in the background with so many details that the foreground goes underground.

Check the files: Ask the janitor to look through yesterday's sweepings.

Finalize: Scratch gravel to cover errors.

Bill of Rights Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1955, I introduced a joint resolution to establish December 15 of each year as Bill of Rights Day, since ratification of that historic document took place on December 15, 1791. This year we shall celebrate the 165th anniversary of this historic event.

The resolution—House Joint Resolution 367—has been referred to the Judiciary Committee, but thus far no action has been taken. I trust the committee will take the necessary action so that the Nation can celebrate the event beginning with this year. The resolution authorizes the President to issue a proclamation each year setting aside December 15 as an occasion for public celebration, urging the display of the American flag on all public buildings, and inviting the American people to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies.

The idea was first suggested to me by Mr. Vincent Rossini, a New York newspaperman, who founded the American Bill of Rights Day Association on December 15, 1941. The association is still very active and Mr. Rossini is its director. In a pamphlet published by the association, the origin of the idea is traced as follows:

It was at the NUIA convention, on September 24, 1938, when there was offered an honor scroll to Gov. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, that Mr. V. Rossini, inspired by Mr. LEHMAN'S speech, spoke on the Bill of Rights, and informed the audience of his sponsorship for a national holiday to be called Bill of Rights Day.

In fact, the NUIA, a well-known organization, dedicated and pledged to the perpetuation of the American principles, on December 14, 1940, passed a resolution—which was introduced at the 1939 annual convention, with Lieutenant Governor Poletti as presiding officer—to promote a movement to have the 15th day of December each year declared a national legal holiday, to be known as Bill of Rights Day.

The American Bill of Rights Day Association adopted a fundamental resolution in 1941 calling on Congress and the legislatures of the 48 States to pass a law declaring December 15 as Bill of Rights Day.

The signers of the above resolution were: Gov. Charles Poletti, Judge Matthew J. Diserio, Judge Anthony J. Di Giovanni, Ada Bess, Rosina Martella, Hon. Victor L. Anfuso, Ada Kellogg Krammer, Albert Clausi, Hon. Nicholas Rossi, John Martignetti, Nicola Perillli, Saverio Monachino, Lillian Mulé, Michael Farinola, Antonio Squillante, Mamie Casablanca, Vincent Rossini, Joseph Susca, Arturo Egitto, and Mildred D. Wilcox.

One December 15, 1941, the first observance of the Bill of Rights Day was held at the Memorial Hall of the YWCA, in Brooklyn under the auspices of the NUIA. Principal speakers were: Hon. Matthew J. Diserio, judge advocate of the American Legion, New York County, and deputy commissioner of the city department of sanitation; Mr. Vincent Rossini, founder of the Bill of Rights Day. Presiding officer was Mrs. Henry F. Kramer, chairman committee of management International Institute of YWCA, assisted by the officers of the Sgt. James Bealin Post of King's County, American Legion.

Statement of Hon. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., of Massachusetts, on Proposal To Amend Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD a copy of my statement before the House Committee on Education and Labor on legislation to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

As a Representative from Boston, Mass., one of the major established seaports of our country, I have had more opportunity than most of you to observe the working conditions, and to really know and appreciate the problems of our longshore and harbor workers. For many years, both as a representative in the State Legislature of Massachusetts, and as a Member of the Congress of the United States, I have worked for recognition and sympathetic understanding of the difficult, dangerous, and yet vitally essential work which they perform. They are a most deserving group, and their interests have long been close to my heart.

I feel that the amendments provided for in my bill, H. R. 9147, are long overdue. It is my hope that you, my colleagues, will assist me to secure prompt and favorable action.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has before it several bills proposing to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. I have before the committee my own bill, H. R. 9147, which is similar to S. 2280, the Magnuson-Morse bill, which passed the Senate during the 1st session of the 84th Congress.

H. R. 9147 would amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act for the first time since 1948. These hard-working men who earn their livelihood on the docks, piers, and ships, perform the second most hazardous occupation in our economy. The statistics show only logging to be more dangerous.

I am one who believes in the principle that the worker is entitled to a family saving wage; i. e., in time of sickness, injury, or unemployment, the employee's average wage should be such that his savings would permit him to carry his household in the accustomed manner until his compensation funds came due. Unfortunately, this is not the case in this industry, and is the consequent urgent need for section 1 of the legislation of which I am the sponsor.

Section 1 of H. R. 9147 recommends that the waiting period be shortened from 7 to 3 days, which is in line with the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. It also proposes to raise the weekly maximum benefit to $50, and provides for a minimum of $20 per week. This amends the current inadequate $35 per week maximum ceiling which was established in 1948. The value of the $35 per week maximum has decreased substantially as the cost of living has increased.

In addition, H. R. 9147 proposes an increase in the schedules of indemnities in cases of partial disability, permanent in quality, and would repeal the present ceiling on death benefits.

I realize that the members of this committee have listened to many witnesses, have gone into this matter fully, and are aware of the many defects and inadequacies in the present law. Having acquired the knowledge of the longshoremen you now possess, it is my earnest desire that the committee will also hear H. R. 833 on safety in longshore and harbor work. As the sponsor of this bill, which provides for safety in longshore and harbor work through a system of safety rules and regulations, I wish to advise the committee that it is my conviction the legislation is just, sound, equitable, and urgent, and it is my hope that you will see fit to work for its enactment.

The REA—Yesterday and Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, Hon. W. R. POAGE, of Texas, addressed the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in its national meeting at St. Louis on January 25. What he had to say is worthy of the attention of all of us who have watched the great contribution REA has made to America's free enterprise system in the last two decades.

Mr. POAGE, as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, has had a large part in promoting this very important program that turned on the lights in millions of rural homes in America, and that has brought to these homes the freedom from drudgery, the conveniences and the comforts that hitherto were shared and enjoyed only by the people of our towns and cities.

I want to commend Mr. POAGE for the great contribution he has made to REA, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be printed in the RECORD.

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

Ladies and gentleman, it has been a number of years since I have had the opportunity to meet with the men and women from all over America who have done so much to improve rural life—the men and women who have built the great rural electric service systems of the United States. Probably nowhere in the history of the world can we find a parallel to the electrification of the American farm. And to you, the leaders of the local rural electric cooperatives from Puget Sound to the Straits of Florida, I unhesitatingly give the credit. Others have indeed come into the picture since you showed that it was a practicable and profitable undertaking, but they stood aside when the whole field was theirs for the taking. You led the way; others followed.

It is with real pleasure that I return to one of your great conventions. It is a real inspiration to work with this group. In it are some of my finest and closest friends. I am proud of every one of you. Had I not been, I am sure I would never have agreed to leave the great agricultural price fight in Congress and to come here and speak on the subject assigned to me this afternoon.

On the other hand, had you been any other than the sincerely dedicated group of public-spirited citizens which you are, you would have never asked anyone to speak on the rural-telephone program. You could have smugly passed it by. You could have talked only of your great and praiseworthy achievements in the field of electrification. That is your especial responsibility. You need not bother with the problems of getting telephone service for farmers; that is, you would not need to do so were it not for the same spirit which makes you co-op managers sit up nights trying to figure out ways whereby you can take lights 2 long miles up the creek to a lonely cabin which will never pay more than a minimum bill, the same spirit which has made hundreds of you board members give the co-op more of your time than you are able to give to your own business, this same spirit forces you, and I believe it forces me, to do what we can to lend a hand to the rural-telephone program.

That program needs a hand. The act of Congress authorizing the REA to make telephone loans has helped. It has helped the situation even more than most of you know, but to be a success, the telephone program needs enthusiasm and cooperation even more than the electric program ever needed it. We started the rural-electric program just as farm income began to move upward from the depth of the depression. The telephone program had hardly gotten off the ground, as it were, when the terrible and relentless price squeeze began to paralyze the farmer. We started the electric work with a program for which we can expect at least 95 percent acceptance when economic conditions are favorable. The telephone program can never expect connections to reach more than possibly three-fourths of our rural homes, even in the most prosperous times. Most people look upon electricity as a necessity to be retained and paid for even after they have lost the family automobile. Many people look upon a telephone as a luxury to be taken out when the going gets hard.

We would, therefore, be unrealistic as well as unfair if we were to expect too much of the rural-telephone program. But let us see just what has been done and what needs most to be done that we may the better appraise the needs of the future:

In order to see what the rural telephone program has done, we must in all fairness, go back to the time when we began talking about REA financing of telephone lines. We must do this because we recognized then, as we recognize now, that one of the greatest contributions of the REA telephone program would be the momentum which it would give to nonborrowers to improve and extend their own rural systems. I recall that during the fight to pass the rural telephone bill, I repeatedly made the statement that I expected such legislation to be of far more help from the standpoint of inducing the private telephone systems that theretofore had refused to give any appreciable rural service, to extend and improve that service. Of course, it worked out exactly that way. For 20 years prior to the discussion of an REA financed rural telephone system, the number of rural phones in America had dropped steadily from 2,498,493 in 1920 to 1,526,954 in 1940. Very few of the independent telephone companies were putting in any new rural lines and, of course, the farflung Bell System was concentrating on the higher returns to be found in the great cities and in the long line service, but once the REA telephone system was proposed and a bill introduced in Congress, even the Bell System undertook to forestall the passage of legislation by constructing lines which it had just a few months earlier declared unfeasible.

During the fall and winter of 1948–49, this legislation was pending in the House of Representatives. The Southwestern Bell Telephone Co., which operates the exchange in my hometown of Waco, was refusing to accept new city subscribers on the theory that the switchboard facilities at Waco were inadequate to care for any more connections. Of course, this was but the predicate for one of their periodic drives for higher rates. Strangely enough, each time the big telephone companies increase the efficiency of their plant, they increase the charges to the public. Be that as it may, the Southwestern Bell picked this peculiar time to vastly expand its rural service in the country surrounding Waco. Hundreds of telephones were connected in the rural areas of the county. They all went on the overloaded switchboard of Waco. I think it is but fair to attribute this and similar activity throughout the country to the pendency of the REA legislation.

Since this legislation was passed, this same Bell affiliate has been extremely anxious to extend its rural lines in another one of my counties where there are two privately owned REA-financed independent companies trying to provide rural coverage, but in still a third county of my district where there has been very little possibility of any well-financed new telephone development, the Bell people have been completely unwilling to give any appreciable new rural service. I have asked them why. Their answer has simply been that they weren't ready to develop the territory. Somehow or another they never seem to get ready to develop any territory until somebody else offers to develop it.

Let us, therefore, start with 1945 when there were about the same number of rural phones as in 1940—roughly a million and a half. By the time REA actually was making telephone loans in 1950, there were probably 2 million rural telephones in the United States. Today, there are about 2½ million rural telephones which means that almost exactly 50 percent of the farms of America today have telephone service, and, of course, the service is available to a good many more who simply feel they can't afford to pay the necessary rates. Probably more than half of these rural homes that have telephone service have modern service, so we can say that while the picture is not all bad, neither have we begun to approach a solution of the problem.

At the same time, we are reminded that in February 1949, speaking on behalf of the Independent Telephone Association, Col. William C. Henry stated:

"There is now available, without construction charges to the subscriber, rural telephone service to between 80 and 85 percent of the occupied farms of the United States. Adequate rural telephone service is not a national problem."

At the same congressional hearing, Mr. E. M. Widen, of the Southwestern Bell Co., of this city, said:

"If let alone, there is no question in my mind but that this problem will be met by my company and other telephone companies."

Most of the older delegates here today will recognize a striking similarity between these statements and those of Mr. Neff who, in speaking for the private power companies in 1935 said that the job of rural electrification was then practically complete.

As a matter of interest, I think we should observe that the loan part of the telephone program has moved rather more rapidly than some of us had supposed. At the end of the first 5 years of electric loans, REA had committed $369 million. At the end of 5 years of telephone loans, it had approved $275 million. Of course, these figures are somewhat like comparing bales of cotton with bushels of corn, but it does indicate that the privately owned telephone companies cannot sit complacently by and assume that their stranglehold on territory which they do not serve will never be challenged. And that, to my mind, is one of the most important features of the whole program.

It is very true that I would feel that the situation were much better if more of these loan funds had actually been advanced to the borrower. Only about one-half of this money has, as of this date, been actually turned over to the borrowers for construction. Likewise, I would feel better if a somewhat larger percentage of these loans were going to farmer-owned cooperatives. As of December 31, 1955, loan allocations had been made to 226 commercial companies and to 189 cooperatives. Just over half of the money was advanced for new construction, most of the remainder for improvements. Again, of the 606,000 subscribers to be served by these outstanding loans, just over one-half, 310,000, will be new subscribers while 296,000 will be customers who had some kind of telephone service but who are now to get improved, modern service.

While the record of repayments of telephone loans is not as good as that of the electric systems, it is certainly not a record of which we need be ashamed. As of November 30, 1955, there were 24 delinquent borrowers. They owed $527,398, but against this, we must note that other borrowers had paid $112,300 in advance of the due date. Most of these delinquencies seem to be due to the fact that the original telephone loans were, in most cases, made before it was possible to secure equipment and before it was possible to establish an earning base on the funds borrowed. I believe that REA has largely corrected this situation and that we can reasonably hope that the record of the next 5 years will be much more favorable.

And what of the needs of the future? Can we by legislation? Can we by administration? Can we, in any other way, increase the efficiency and the progress of the rural telephone program? I have no magic formula. In 1944, the Agriculture Committee of the House was able to so revise the basic REA legislation that the electric co-ops were given a longer amortization period, a guaranteed

low-interest rate, and the assurance of effective help in solving their engineering and operating problems. There is no such opportunity to come to the aid of the telephone borrowers at this time. I have inquired both of borrowers and of the REA as to what, if any, legislation Congress should pass in order to be helpful. I stand ready—and I know the majority of the Agriculture Committee of the House stands ready—to sponsor any sound and reasonable legislation that may be needed. Frankly, there have been very few suggestions made for legislative changes. Possibly this convention may want to offer suggestions. If it does, I can assure you that they will be well received.

What, then, of the administration of the act? Certainly some of our ablest telephone people have contributed to the administration of the program. Certainly both Claude Wickard who launched this program, and Ancher Nelsen who now directs it, have been anxious and determined to bring telephones to our farm folks just as far as they could. I am not here to criticize or condemn anyone, but since it is much easier to sit on the outside and tell someone else how his business should be run, then it is to actually accept the responsibility for running it, and since I am prone to take the easy course, I think that we should at least consider the possibility that we might be able to improve this program by applying some of the techniques that were successful in the case of rural electrification.

Fundamentally, it seems to me that our present telephone program does not have the crusading spirit that was associated with the early days of the electric program. I have tried to determine why this is lacking. I believe that basically it is lacking because the farmers simply have not felt that this telephone program was their program as they did in the case of the electric program.

Now, I am not here to say that I think that REA should make all its loans to cooperatives or even that it should undertake to see that cooperatives handle the bulk of the business. I look upon farmer cooperatives simply as a means of getting something done that someone else won't do at a reasonable price and with reasonable efficiency. There can never be much public demand for an REA financed rural telephone cooperative in an area where a commercial company is providing adequate coverage and satisfactory service at reasonable prices. There would never have been a single rural electric cooperative had the power companies of America met the reasonable needs of the rural areas for electricity. It would not be necessary to organize another rural telephone cooperative in the United States if the existing telephone companies would overnight provide the needed service at reasonable prices, but they haven't done it, and I have no reason to believe they will do it without the nudge that these farmer-owned cooperatives give them. On the other hand, I realize the farmer-owned cooperatives need the competition of the privately owned commercial companies. When you and I were working to get the electric cooperatives established, REA was giving us every kind of help that it could in connection with organization and management of the cooperatives. I think we need that kind of aggressive assistance right now. I fear that REA is not giving it.

The telephone problem is more difficult than the electric problem and the telephone companies are even more obstinate and, in many cases, more reactionary and less inclined to give service than were the electric companies 20 years ago. This is understandable because of the even greater monopoly that exists in the telephone field than is found in the highly monopolized electric field. The American Telephone & Telegraph Co. is the largest corporation in the world. It controls about 80 percent of all of our telephones in the United States and it controls an even larger percentage of the long-distance lines.

The so-called independents who carried on a long, bitter—and almost successful—fight against the establishment of an REA financing system for rural lines have in many cases been even less cooperative with the needs of the people than the Bell System. I am delighted that some of their members have recently seen fit to avail themselves of REA financing. I welcome them into the fold of REA borrowers, but I would say to them as I would say to the farmer-owned cooperatives: I don't want to see any one segment of the industry obtain a monopoly. I believe the whole great work of the REA rests on the fact that it has been able over the years to prevent the development of monopoly in the electric field. I want to see the same thing prevented in the telephone field. One of the ways to do this is to keep a substantial balance between commercial companies and farmer-owned cooperatives. To keep this balance, it seems to me that the REA should give the same kind of cooperation and help to the telephone cooperatives which was accorded to the electric cooperatives in years past.

Along much the same lines, it seems to me that there may be room for substantially more research and development of telephone equipment and facilities than there has been by REA. Again referring to the early days of the electric system, REA carried on the research needed to materially lower the cost of rural systems. That research was just as helpful to the private power companies as it was to the cooperatives, although in the beginning most of the private power companies opposed it. I have a feeling that today the private telephone equipment companies don't want REA to conduct this kind of research. I think it is one of the great obligations of that lending agency.

Two highly controversial fields for a possible speeding up of the telephone work present themselves: Both involve a compromise of the ideal with the practical question of costs to the farmers. One lies in the reduction of the so-called equity requirements. Frankly, I don't know how far we should go. I realize that telephone connections are not as stable as electric connections. I realize we must have some local investment before we can expect the Government to advance the money for entire new plants. This problem of equity investment is possibly more serious with the farmer-owned cooperatives than with the commercial companies. Commercial companies ordinarily have some substantial equity either in money or in kind, but in the case of the cooperatives, the present regulation usually simply means that they must collect $50 per prospective subscriber in cash. This is a far greater sum than I as a householder have to put up as a deposit with any utility company—either in Waco or in Washington. I have at least wondered if it might not be feasible to require each subscriber to furnish his own instrument—of course, buying the instrument from the local cooperative—and to provide that should the subscriber discontinue the service, that the instrument would be reconveyed to the cooperative with appropriate and rather substantial depreciation deducted.

The second closely related field of possible acceleration of the program seems to me to involve the question of the quality of service. We all want good service. We want the best we can pay for, but may it not be that a great many of our people who cannot pay for the kind of telephone service that is given here in St. Louis might be able and glad to pay for something, possibly a little better than the fenceline service that we used to have when I was a boy, but still something less than the best? I know that I would like to have a Cadillac automobile. I am sure it is a good car and doubtless worth the money—if you have the money, but I have never owned a Cadillac. I do own a Chevrolet and I do get a great deal of pleasure out of it. Maybe we are trying to force all of the rural people of America to buy Cadillac phone service when their income won't afford it. If we are really interested in wide coverage, we better give some thought to the statistics on the limited number of Cadillacs as contrasted with the number of Chevrolets and Fords in the United States.

Again, I confess that I am not expressing any matured or well-thought-out conclusions. I am simply offering a suggestion for consideration.

I think, however, that I can, without fear of contradiction, put my finger on the one single factor which more than any other has retarded—and still retards—the development of rural telephone. That is the tragic inadequacy of farm income. If every American farmer were making $10,000 a year or up, we would need no Government lending program; rural telephone service would be so profitable that even the most conservative commercial companies would seek to furnish it. The latest figures indicate that the average farm income is only about $913 per year. This means that vast numbers of farmers who should be consumers of their own local telephone systems simply can't afford the convenience of a telephone, regardless of the fact that they may even now have telephone wires across their front yard.

Farm income, or the lack of it, is unquestionably the most pressing economic problem at this time confronting America. It limits your business—electric as well as telephone. It adversely affects the REA's collection records. It is beginning to throw men out of work in the implement and equipment factories of St. Louis, and sooner or later, it is certain, if not corrected, to lead our high-flying economy over the same kind of brink which so nearly ruined us in 1929. No one knows how long we can "free wheel" down the road. We did it for 7 or 8 years in the twenties. We have done it for 3 years during the fifties. Maybe we can do it for several years to come, maybe we are already on the brink as we were in the spring and summer of 1929—I do not know, but this I do know—that unless we improve farmer income the rest of our great economic edifice is sure to fall.

Nor has the Department of Agriculture or the administration offered us any clear or effective program for an immediate increase in the price of the things farmers grow.

But I resolved that I would not talk any politics at this convention.

The only way I know of to keep that resolution is to stop—so thank you one and all.

Don't Let the House Be Fooled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the impression seems to have been growing that there is a vast difference between the upper Colorado storage project bill passed by the Senate (S. 500) and the measure soon to be considered by the

House, H. R. 3383. The following table is taken from the committee report which clearly indicates the falsity of this impression:

	S. 500 (Senate)	S. 500 (House) and H. R. 3383
Power and storage dams	Glen Canyon, Echo Park, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, Juniper, Navaho.	Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, Navaho.
Participating irrigation projects (authorized).	Central Utah, Emery County, Florida, Gooseberry, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia, Pine River extension, Seedskadee, Silt, Smith Fork.	Central Utah, Emery County, Florida, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia, Pine River extension, Seedskadee, Silt, Smith Fork.
Participating irrigation projects (conditionally authorized).	San Juan-Chama, Navaho, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers extension, Sublette.	Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama, Navaho, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers extension, Sublette, Animas-La Plata.

This table clearly shows that as to projects, there is only this difference between the bills: The Senate has authorized the Echo Park and Juniper Dams and also the Gooseberry project, while the House version eliminates Echo Park and Juniper Dams and conditionally authorizes the Gooseberry project.

There are certain other minor details in which the bills differ but their objectives remain essentially the same and in particular the projects contemplated for the development of water and power in the upper Colorado Basin are exactly similar.

However, of the greatest importance, and I doubly emphasize, should the House pass the measure which will come before it, it is obvious that the principal matter for the conferees to settle will be the three projects—Echo Park and Juniper Dams and the Gooseberry project. Most important of these, of course, is Echo Park. The question I would pose is: Should the House act favorably on the pending bill? What assurance have we that Echo Park and the other projects authorized in the Senate bill will not be restored to the House bill in conference? This becomes especially important in view of the fact that the Senate refused to eliminate Echo Park by a vote of 52 to 30 and would therefore undoubtedly insist on its inclusion. It would therefore seem to be a complete delusion for any Member to feel that merely because Echo Park has been eliminated from the House version that this means that it will not be included ultimately in the legislation.

What's Wrong With Our Propaganda?—Is USIA Adequately Answering the Voice of the Kremlin?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of February 22, 1956, carried an article by one of its foreign correspondents, C. L. Sulzberger, which asks "What's Wrong With Western Propaganda?"

Writing from Berlin, Germany, Mr. Sulzberger states that F. Bowen Evans, in a study of Russian propaganda, concludes that the U. S. S. R. employs 375,000 full-time and 2,100,000 part-time propagandists. He says the Bolshevik Party maintains 6,000 special schools for training professional agents in that field. Former Senator William Benton, who recently visited the Soviet Union, prepared some observations on "the voice of the Kremlin" for the Encyclopaedia Britannica's 1956 Book of the Year. Benton writes:

> At its most ambitious, the aim of Soviet propaganda is so daring that we in the West can hardly comprehend it; so to condition its citizens that they think of their personal freedom and their personal ambitions as identical with the purposes of Soviet society * * * in Russia the rulers seek to convert the total culture into a giant propaganda apparatus. * * *
>
> This is a struggle of a new type, to be waged with new weapons. It is a struggle for which the Western World is little prepared. It boils down to an effort by two great opposing forces to win the faith and confidence of the world's peoples. * * * Russia cannot match us in the export of automobiles, tractors, or business machines. She proposes to beat us with her ideas and her trained manpower.

A FAITH IN ULTIMATE VALUES

Having set forth this information for our consideration Mr. Sulzberger continues as follows:

> But it is questionable whether our propaganda has successfully faced this challenge. The West German Government has published a commentary complaining that we emphasize material things too much. We have allowed the initiative in the realm of spiritual ideas to remain largely in the very materialistic hands of communism. "Are we," asks Bonn, "ready for this spiritual competition? Do we understand the system of thought, belief, and ideology of the East? Do we have any certitude about the basis of our lives and our faith? Ideological faith in the collectivist idea makes the Soviet man capable of achievements and sacrifices that surpass human strength. Only a faith that in no way is dependent on material events, that does not live in expectation of future well-being, can resist this ideology. This faith, this conviction must inspire western man to risk his life for the ultimate values that cannot be abandoned—freedom, personal dignity, the lives of other men, the truth of religion.
>
> There is no sign that the powers of the West have sought seriously to analyze the problem of their propaganda and to coordinate efforts in presenting their case abroad.

THE RUSSIAN CHALLENGE CAN BE MET

In his budget message on January 16 this year the President recommended a modest increase in appropriations for the educational-exchange programs of the Department of State which, he said, "constitute a basic element of our long-term effort to attain a better mutual understanding with other peoples of the world. These programs bring to this country leaders of public opinion and facilitate the mutual exchange of students, teachers, and research scholars. In addition to appropriated funds, part of the foreign currencies received from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities abroad will be used to meet certain overseas costs of educational exchange."

The President's budget request for these strategic and highly important educational-exchange programs of the Department of State which, in the President's own words, "constitute a basic element of our long-term effort to attain a better mutual understanding with other peoples of the world" is being considered by the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives.

In my statement to the House Appropriations Committee on Tuesday, February 21, 1956, I said that I could not personally attest to the exact amount of money needed for this important program. The President's budget request is for $20 million. I am sure that this is not enough, but I hope that the subcommittee will at least give the President every penny he requested.

The New York Times pointed out on December 12, 1955, that the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange recommended $31 million for this program. The distinguished educators and businessmen, appointed by the President of the United States as an advisory body on this program, certainly know what they are talking about. They know the program from a professional as well as an operating standpoint so they are in a position to make an accurate recommendation.

I shudder to think what the Russians and Red Chinese are spending on this type of thing. From all reports I see on their activities it must be a tremendous amount.

We should not attempt to get into direct and blatant competition with the Communists in this field but we should be willing to invest whatever amount is necessary to demonstrate our willingness to carry on our international relations on the highest plane possible.

I do not know what prompted the Secretary of State to disregard the Advisory Commission's recommendation that $31 million be allocated to this important program. I would personally concur in that amount, or even a much larger amount, for these activities.

I hope that the House Appropriations Subcommittee will agree with my estimate of the value of this program to our international relations effort and that it will recommend a substantial increase over the $18 million which it approved last year.

While the President recommended only a modest increase of $2 million for

activities which constitute a basic element of our long-term effort to attain a better mutual understanding with other peoples of the world he recommended that the $89,218,895 available to the United States Information Agency in fiscal year 1956 in appropriations and obligations be increased by $48 million.

The vast difference between these two recommendations which follow each other in the budget message typifies the Madison Avenue approach to the problems of the world, an approach to world problems which is the hallmark and the most distinguishing characteristic of the present Republican administration.

AN ANSWER TO THE VOICE OF THE KREMLIN

Concerned as I am with these exchange programs which include the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Acts, the interchange of persons under the technical assistance programs carried on by the International Cooperation Administration, and the cultural presentations programs of the President's Emergency Fund for Participation in International Affairs, I have developed a measure which I am convinced will contribute importantly to the development of adequate answers to the voice of the Kremlin. This is a joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 474, "to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs."

It gives me great pleasure to be able to say that Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, author of one of the great acts of Congress on exchange of persons, has introduced a companion measure in the Senate as Senate Joint Resolution 120, and that Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY has joined Senator FULBRIGHT as cosponsor of the measure.

In the House Members who have joined with me in sponsoring the joint resolution include Representatives HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, VICTOR L. ANFUSO, THOMAS L. ASHLEY, DON HAYWORTH, THADDEUS MACHROWICZ, GEORGE M. RHODES, PETER W. RODINO, JR., B. F. SISK, HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., and HERBERT ZELENKO.

I include as part of my remarks two articles from the New York Times referred to earlier in my remarks:

[From the New York Times of December 9, 1955]

INCREASE SOUGHT IN EXCHANGE FUND—ADVISERS ASK $31 MILLION TO STEP UP PROGRAM AND OFFSET GENEVA FAILURE

WASHINGTON, December 8.—The Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange recommended today a $13 million increase next year in the State Department's exchange program.

This would bring the total appropriation asked of Congress to $31 million. The recommendation was prompted by the breakdown in cultural interchange negotiations with the Soviet Government at the Geneva conference of foreign ministers.

The Commission, appointed by the President, acts as an advisory body within the State Department.

Rufus H. Fitzgerald, commission chairman, said: "It is evident that the Soviets have not changed their major strategy but are practicing deliberate fraud as shown through their refusal to negotiate on major issues at Geneva.

"This continued attitude increases the challenge to the United States to cooperate with all free peoples in the free interchange of persons and ideas."

He said that by increasing the program the Government would stimulate private organizations and educational institutions to step up interchange programs.

Mrs. Anna L. Rose Hawkes, commission member who is also president of the American Association of University Women, said that the association would increase its efforts along this line. It spent $100,000 this year in bringing 39 women from 22 foreign countries to study in the United States. It also provided 10 graduate fellowships for specialized work by foreign women students.

Mrs. Hawkes said the proposed increase in funds should go largely to projects aimed at bringing to this country leaders of thought and opinion.

"That is the best way to convince them of our motives," she said. "They go back and say: 'The United States is not warmongering. I have been there and I know.'"

The other members of the commission, which has just finished a 2-day meeting, are Arthur H. Edens, president of Duke University; Arthur A. Hauck, president of the University of Maine, and Laird Bell, Chicago attorney.

[From the New York Times of February 22, 1956]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS—WHAT'S WRONG WITH WESTERN PROPAGANDA?

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

BERLIN, February 21—The greatest proof of the fallacy of Marxism is, curiously enough, the existence of the Soviet Union. For Karl Marx foresaw the triumph of his theory first in highly industrial countries like Germany or England. Yet what we call communism came initially to power in underdeveloped Russia, where it assumed the form, not of socialism but of the most massive state capitalism known to history. And the next outstanding triumph of the Marxist legend was in backward China.

Despite such glaring inconsistencies, Marx's latter-day prophets extol the "scientific" immutability of their dialectical materialism and insist it must logically inherit the earth. But the Communists themselves continually modify this "proven" doctrine. Lenin, Stalin, Trotsky, Tito, and Mao Tse-tung have each reinterpreted the credo. Now Khrushchev is the latest to amend accepted dogma.

Nevertheless, by blandly ignoring these constant fluctuations, Soviet propaganda seeks to convey the impression of a basic logic that progresses unalterably toward an inescapable end. Lenin, who brilliantly grasped what was helpful to him in Marx, taught that "propaganda is of crucial importance." Modern means of applying this dictum have been carefully coordinated by the Moscow monolith.

PROPAGANDA BUREAUCRACY

F. Bowen Evans, in a study of the subject, concludes that the U. S. S. R. employs 375,000 full-time and 2,100,000 part-time propagandists. He says the Bolshevik Party maintains 6,000 special schools for training professional agents in that field. Former Senator William Benton, who recently visited the Soviet Union, prepared some observations on "the voice of the Kremlin" for the Encyclopaedia Britannica's 1956 Book of the Year. He writes:

At its most, ambition, the aim of Soviet propaganda is so daring that we in the West can hardly comprehend it; so to condition its citizens that they think of their personal freedom and their personal ambitions as identical with the purposes of Soviet society * * * in Russia the rulers seek to convert the total culture into a giant propaganda apparatus * * *.

"This is a struggle of a new type, to be waged with new weapons. It is a struggle for which the Western World is little prepared. It boils down to an effort by two great opposing forces to win the faith and confidence of the world's peoples * * * Russia cannot match us in the export of automobiles, tractors, or business machines. She proposes to beat us with her ideas and her trained manpower."

A FAITH IN ULTIMATE VALUES

But it is questionable whether our propaganda has successfully faced this challenge. The West German Government has published a commentary complaining that we emphasize material things too much. We have allowed the initiative in the realm of spiritual ideas to remain largely in the very materialistic hands of communism. "Are we," asks Bonn, "ready for this spiritual competition? Do we understand the system of thought, belief, and ideology of the East? Do we have any certitude about the basis of our lives and our faith? Ideological faith in the collectivist idea makes the Soviet man capable of achievements and sacrfices that surpass human strength. Only a faith that in no way is dependent on material events, that does not live in expectation of future well-being, can resist this ideology. This faith, this conviction must inspire western man to risk his life for the ultimate values that cannot be abandoned—freedom, personal dignity, the lives of other men, the truth of religion."

There is no sign that the powers of the West have sought seriously to analyze the problem of their propaganda and to coordinate efforts in presenting their case abroad. We remain constantly on the defensive, permitting the Kremlin's experts to exploit the very evident chinks in our imperfect armor. Thus, the tragic convolutions of the United States attempt to obliterate segregation feature the front pages of the world where Autherine Lucy is now a well-known name. What has already been accomplished in the name of Jeffersonian democracy remains forgotten. Britain's embarrassing attitude on Cyprus erases from popular memory her deeds in India, Burma, and Ceylon.

Only when Moscow acts openly with brutal menace do the free powers respond in concert and remember that the essential contradictions of our time are those between themselves and communism. In periods of relaxation we tend to forget the need to constantly reassert the inner meaning of our ideology. This is a dangerous lack. Surely there are enough beneficial aspects in the democratic system, whatever imperfections it may have, to merit retelling to a redundant point.

Simple facts bear frequent repetition. As Pericles told Athens: "We are superior to our enemies * * * our city is open to the world * * * we live freely, and yet we face the same dangers as readily as they * * * those men surely should be deemed bravest who know most clearly what danger is and what pleasure is and are not made thereby to flinch."

Compulsory Social Security for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I am today inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD petitions signed by many of my constituents of the 17th Congressional District of Ohio. You will note, Mr.

Speaker, that these citizens are asking for the repeal of that portion of Public Law 761, or any other social-security law which contains compulsion for farmers, farmer employer, or the farm owner.

Regardless of the merits or demerits of this subject, I am one who firmly believes that all should be given an opportunity to be heard and their views brought to the attention of this Congress. I respectfully ask that the proper authorities, or committee, of this Congress give every consideration to the request contained in these petitions.

Lincoln Day Speech by Hon. Clifford G. McIntire, of Maine, at Keene, N. H., Before the Cheshire County Republican Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PERKINS BASS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take great pleasure in inserting in the RECORD a copy of a speech given by my good friend and colleague, Congressman CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE, of Maine, before the Cheshire County Lincoln Day dinner held in Keene, N. H., on February 16, 1956:

As Republicans we meet here tonight to celebrate the birthday of a martyred President, and, in so doing, may well consider, for a time, those virtues which he represented. To know those virtues, and to appreciate them, is well. It is not enough.

Abraham Lincoln had an understanding of human nature and a standard of values uncommon to any walk of life, and certainly not often to be found in a President. He was temperate in all things except, possibly, his love of man and his hatred of unnecessary suffering. In an Executive, these things are desirable. They are not enough. Sensitive as a child, he had the rugged strength of your mountains. He was intellectually honest. Morally he was brave. That is enough.

His early failures, his lack of formal education, and his comparative poverty marked him as what one of our major political parties would refer to as "a common man." But for himself, and for all other Republicans—all Americans—he would assert, with Dean Alfange: "I do not choose to be a common man. It is my right to be uncommon. I seek opportunity, not security. I do not wish to be a kept citizen and dulled by having the state look after me. I want to take the calculated risk; to dream and to build, to fail and to succeed. I refuse to barter incentive for a dole. I prefer the challenge of life to guaranteed existence, the thrill of fulfillment to the stale calm of utopia. I will not trade freedom for a beneficence nor my dignity for a handout. I will never cower before any master nor bend to any threat. It is my heritage to stand erect, proud, and unafraid; to think and act for myself, enjoy the benefit of my creations, and to face the world boldly and say, 'This I have done.' All this is what it means to be an American."

Lincoln was born in 1809—21 years after New Hampshire came into the Union—when my State of Maine was still a part of Massachusetts, and this Nation had been in existence only 33 years.

Americans then had all the enthusiasm, vigor, and fearlessness to attempt the seemingly impossible that we recognize in our United States Marines today, and the same amazing ability to accomplish it. The world looked at us with dubious eyes, critical of our unorthodox ways, and with no conviction we would come to other than a bad end—and that speedily.

Lincoln believed that to know what is right is not enough. To dare to do what is right is. Throughout his Presidency, he looked upon our Republican Party as the organization best capable of conducting the affairs of the Nation fearlessly and effectively, and on February 27, in a public address, warned against "groping for some middle ground between the right and the wrong; vain as the search for a man who should be neither a living man nor a dead man."

Believing that "He who does something at the head of a regiment will eclipse him who does nothing at the head of a hundred regiments," his idea of political potency was not to nominate a man because that man would be easy to elect. His philosophy dictated that you find the man who stood for the things in which the party honestly believed, and an army of eager campaigners would arise and exert the necessary energy to elect.

Lincoln was unique, in looks, in personality, and in thought. He has become the symbol of this Nation. He did not write the words, but he of all of our countrymen believed so implicitly that "all men are created equal" that he was willing to trust in God to uphold his stand, and so staked his future and that of his country on that proposition.

Those fishermen and traders who were the early settlers of New Hampshire had those qualities which made possible the breaking away from the known perils and persecutions of the Old World and the setting up of a new organization of States—the knowledge of the past and the vision of the future that inspired those who wrote our Constitution—and such qualities were reliable governors to assure that progress would be steadily upward. Our real danger, from the outset, was that we would travel so far so fast that we would lose sight of the reasons for the grand attempt. It is so easy to forget.

One whose ancestors claimed New Hampshire as their home claimed acquaintanceship with a man who often proclaimed "I know a lot. I just can't remember it." Abe Lincoln would have appreciated such a story.

He is the all-American of all the years. He knew hunger for food, but it was learning for which he thirsted. He toiled and suffered, and he knew defeat intimately. For long years every hope seemed vain, but he persevered in efforts to improve himself and to make the world a better place in which others could live. He might easily have found bitterness in his hard wrestlings with fate, and found excuse, as others have, for settling for the cheap rewards paid to those who practice political expedience. But providence was trying the right man. One who, although beaten to his knees, always staggered back to his feet, and, with eyes raised, pushed forward, would be a worthy trustee for the liberties of a people.

It was almost exactly 100 years ago, at Peoria, that Lincoln said, "If there is anything which it is the duty of the people to never intrust to any hands but their own, that thing is the preservation and perpetuity of their own liberties and institutions."

Here tonight, we should ponder well whether we have been alert in this regard; whether, as individuals, we have been willing to assign our rights and obligations to our own Government; whether, as a Nation, the preservation and perpetuity of our liberties and institutions has been or is being delegated to others.

While Lincoln concerned himself with preservation of our Union, Marx and Engels preached the doctrine of Communist statism and control over the individual, advocating a new and evil system of government and society in the guise of assisting and elevating man.

Communism exerts force, and utilizes a fifth column. Socialism practices a stealthy political maneuvering. Such procedures are as foreign to the Republican Party, as they were to Abraham Lincoln. Such leadership of the world's freedom-loving peoples would never have permitted the deathly cold hand of communism to clutch and hold Eastern Europe and most of Asia as it does today nor have permitted the filching fingers of socialism to perform a sleight of hand on most of the rest of the world, so that the powers of the people became the powers of government itself.

Lincoln neither feared nor disdained wealth. Like each of us, he probably had a wholesome respect for something he had little of. He did not try to discourage its accumulation. At Cincinnati in 1859, and the following year in New Haven, he publicly proclaimed his conviction "That men who are industrious and sober and honest in the pursuit of their own interest should, after a while accumulate property, and, after that should be allowed to enjoy it in peace is right. I like the system which lets a man quit when he wants to, and wish it might prevail everywhere. One of the reasons why I am opposed to slavery is just here. What is the true condition of the laborer? I take it that it is best for all to leave each man free, to acquire property as far as he can. Some will get wealthy. I don't believe in law to prevent a man from getting rich. It would do more harm than good. So, while we do not propose any war upon capital, we do wish to allow the humblest man an equal chance to get rich with everybody else."

Certain self-styled "idealists" would label profit as immoral. But they mistakenly assume that financial is the only kind of profit, or that that is the kind that is immoral. Few persons and corporations can be persuaded to risk capital and few individuals will exert great personal effort without some promise, however remote, of reward of one kind or another. It is through profitable management that plants are expanded, more work provided for our citizens, and an ever higher standard of living enjoyed by all.

In every country where initiative and incentive have been restricted, and success penalized, the standard of living has been lowered, and frequently only grants-in-aid by this country have kept their citizens alive. Communists and Socialists, alike, decry profits, taxes, and individual freedom. But a government that carries on the business of a nation (as Communist and Socialist Governments do) receives the profits, makes the decisions as to what part it shall keep in lieu of taxes, and takes from the individuals their freedom. We know that profits make living possible. Taxes make governments function. But individual freedom is what makes both living and government desirable.

Those who advocate centralization of power have made few converts from among Republicans, for, as a party, now as in Lincoln's time, we are firm for a strong Union of strong States. Similarly, those who would subvert our Constitution, or make of it merely an exhibit for the archives, substituting some world charter as our rule for operation, are certainly a small minority in our party.

Lincoln was truly "of the people" as he was "for the people." While we can readily believe that his impulses were all good, he was not impulsive. He was a thoughtful man, and acted only upon mature reflection. His conduct and record would seem to refute the idea that statecraft is something to be schooled in, and diplomacy the "dexterity

and artfulness of securing advantages without arousing hostility." He was not artful. He overcame the weakness and meanness of his associates by his infinite patience, complete honesty and magnanimity. He was never unduly concerned with the future and fortunes of Lincoln, but he cared passionately that America should be a place where a humble man might find opportunity for happiness—where the courts should be truly temples of justice for all—where people like himself might find possibilities for service, happiness and, even as he did, immortality.

He took his position and his duties seriously. Himself he did not. He was never what we call a "stuffed shirt." His critics decried his lack of what they termed dignity. But Lincoln would be the first to say that for sheer dignity nothing can surpass a body ready for burial.

In all his utterances, witty or serious, Lincoln spoke as the great majority of all good Americans would had it the gift of words. He put into words what many of us strive desperately and despairingly to state as our philosophy of living. Now, 90 years after his death, undimmed by time or the momentary bursts of brilliance from the meaner achievements of the politically expedient, at home and abroad, his name and memory live on.

Republicans created our national banking system; built up the Nation's credit; and made our currency, based on gold, the world's soundest. We demanded respect for our flag and our nationals the world over—the safety of our citizens was guaranteed while they were on the high seas or abroad.

Republicans passed the first Civil Service Act in 1883, and revised it to provide equal pay for equal work.

The Department of Labor in 1884, Commerce in 1903, the Patent Office, Weather Bureau and Postal Savings System all were established by the Republicans, and it was our party that created the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Lincoln recommended establishment of a Department of Agriculture in 1862 and the same year passage of the Homestead Act provided farms for our people and opened the West to settlement. Later, the Morrill Act provided land for agricultural and mechanical arts colleges, such as our University of New Hampshire.

When Lincoln became President, the Democratic Party had been in power for many years, and every patronage job was filled with a Democrat. Republicans then, as now, besieged the White House, demanding appointments. One day a Senator, calling on the President, noticed his dejection and expression of anxiety and said, "Mr. President, has anything gone wrong? Have you heard bad news from Fort Sumter?" The President, still solemnly, replied: "No! It's just the postmastership at Jonesville, Mo."

Our Republican Party is situated today much as it was then. Grave problems face our Nation. Any delegation of our duty and responsibility to try to solve them to another political party is an act of cowardice of which we'll never be guilty. Am I right?

A few short years ago a famous American pondered the question as to whether or not he would be a candidate for the office of President of the United States. Over many years he had worked closely with his Government. One major party had urged him to be their candidate. He gave the matter most serious, and, I am sure, prayerful thought. I believe he looked back over American history and thought in terms of the great men and the things they believed, and the standards that they established. I believe he looked over our great system of political parties. He had never joined one, so he looked objectively. He thought of Jefferson, but concluded that the principles laid down by that great statesman were not those of the leadership of the Democratic Party today. Few men had had the privilege to observe more closely the workings of the Truman administration—its policies—and those in authority. He wanted no part of it. He chose the party of Lincoln, and with the encouragement of you folk in New Hampshire and others across the country became a candidate and was elected President of the United States. That man was Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The leader of the greatest armed might in the history of the world has proven himself the greatest President and world leader we have known in generations.

Nearly 4 years of his leadership are now a matter of public record.

It is a record that renews our faith in America; that proves we can enjoy peace, prosperity, and fiscal integrity, and look upon government as a servant and not the master of the people. We find in public office those who look upon administrative and elective office as a public trust and not just a part of the Pendergast or Hague machines or a part of Tammany Hall. We expect loyalty, justice, and equity, and want no more Hisses or Caudles. This type of government has brought encouragement to our people, renewed our faith in ourselves, and furnished a basis for trust and confidence in representative government.

A great American tonight turns over in his mind the problems and issues associated with another great decision. Again he considers the matter seriously and prayerfully. A matter of party is not involved. He knows which party has helped him build for a greater America. He will make the decision and map the course, and to each of us passes the responsibility of getting out and working in the coming campaign—electing a Republican President and a Republican Congress. To do less will put us back on the road to Trumanism. To those who would do that the road signs should read, "Dangerous; proceed at your own risk."

Daniel Webster has said that "duly performed or duty violated is still with us, for our happiness or our misery." Well, freedom and the future are not for fumblers.

Why Irrigate Poor Land First?—Another Ridiculous Feature of the Upper Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, one of the most ridiculous arguments being advanced in favor of the upper Colorado River storage project is the project's alleged benefits to our Nation's agricultural program. The project would supply irrigation water for high-altitude land in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

Let us see just how ridiculous this argument is.

THE PROJECT WOULD GROW CROPS ALREADY IN AGRICULTURAL SURPLUS

Because of a surplus of agricultural products and depressed prices for such products, the Congress is now considering a soil-bank proposal which would take 40 million acres of agricultural land out of production at a large cost per acre to the taxpayers.

Inconsistently, the upper Colorado River storage project would put new acres into production—also at a large cost to the taxpayers per acre.

Surplus agricultural products already being supported by the Nation's taxpayers—without considering the new costs of the soil-bank proposals—include corn, cotton, wheat, butter, oats, butter oil, cheese, dried milk, wool, rye, barley, dry beans, cottonseed oil, grain sorghum, hay and pasture seeds, and soy beans. Sugar beets are under the restriction program of the Sugar Act of 1951, and the price is held up to a desired level. What are called proportionate shares are established by the Secretary of Agriculture. Thus, if more sugar-beet land is brought into production, shares of all others must be decreased accordingly.

Reports of the Reclamation Bureau reveal that all of the types of crops which would be grown on each of the proposed projects in the upper Colorado River project are already surplus agricultural crops being supported by the Nation's taxpayers. The crops to be grown on these projects will be largely grain and forage crops for dairy cows and sheep which will produce butter, milk products, and wool which are already in surplus and under Government subsidy and in storage at a fantastic cost.

THE PROJECT WILL SERVICE, FOR THE MOST PART, ONLY MARGINAL AGRICULTURAL LAND

The Nation's taxpayers would be forced by the upper Colorado bill to spend hundreds of millions on irrigation projects which will supply water for farmlands of relatively poor quality. The projects will service for the most part only marginal agricultural land much of it at high altitudes suffering frosts each month of the year and having a short growing season at best.

Only 20 percent of the lands serviced by the project are classified by the Bureau as class 1. The lands are at high elevations—as high as 7,000 feet. The growing season on this high mountain plateau is very short. On some of the lands there is frost every month of the year. Low-value feed crops will be the principal products.

It has been demonstrated that these lands, even when fully developed under the upper Colorado bill, will be worth on the average only about $150 per acre. Yet the cost to the Nation's taxpayers to develop them will average $3,000 to $5,000 per acre according to figures of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Such a result cannot be justified in the face of the fact that at a cost of less than $100 per acre fertile lands in the East, Middle West, and South could be irrigated, thus bringing heavier yields than ever from the best agricultural land in the Nation.

There exists at least 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in humid areas of the United States which can be developed for agriculture at a fraction of the cost of the acreage serviced by the upper Colorado storage project.

Contrast the upper Colorado's plan for irrigating marginal high-altitude land at a cost of $3,000 to $5,000 per acre—to produce land which will be worth on the average only about $150 per acre even when fully developed—with the fact that there are at least 20 million acres of first-class land on existing farms in

19 States of the Middle West, South Atlantic, and Southern States that can be placed in production at any time they may be needed at a fraction of the cost. And remember that even much of this first-class land is not "needed" under cultivation in this era of agricultural surpluses.

The Department of Agriculture reports that there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low-cost drainage. Such land is available in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Development costs in these States would be from $60 to $100 per acre for such land—compared with $3,000 to $5,000 per acre for land to be developed by the upper Colorado irrigation projects. The cost involved to taxpayers of the Nation in developing new and supplemental water for the acreage serviced by the upper Colorado project, which amounts in all to only about 600 square miles of new land, would range up to 50 times as much for each acre developed.

MOLEY ARTICLE

The ludicrous picture presented by these bald inconsistencies has been well described by Mr. Raymond Moley in his regular column Perspective, in Newsweek magazine, in an article entitled "New Acres for Old" in the issue of February 6, 1956.

I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues and the taxpayers of our Nation:

In the President's state of the Union message, separated by only a few sentences are two recommendations: "I shall urge authorization of a soil-bank program to alleviate the problem of diverted acres and an overextended agricultural plant * * *" and "I strongly recommend that action be taken at this session on such wholly Federal projects as the Colorado River storage project and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project.

This means that the President is asking Congress to take out of cultivation an immense number of acres at a large cost per acre to the taxpayers, and on the other hand to bring into cultivation or to increase the productivity of over a million acres at a cost in the upper Colorado project of as high as $5,000 an acre and in the Fryingpan-Arkansas project of about $1,400 an acre.

This continues the mad cycle which has been going on for years: The Agriculture Department laboring to curb production, and the Interior Department just as zealously trying to increase production. Of course, this makes no sense. But lots of things in politics make no sense and are paid out of the sweat of the taxpayer's brow.

Nearly 2 years ago, when the gigantic upper Colorado project was presented to Congress by the administration and the Hoover Commission was setting to work to look into all and sundry water conservation projects, the President appointed a committee on the general subject, composed of Secretary McKay, chairman, and the Secretaries Benson and Wilson. This committee has just submitted its report.

In the first place, the report recommends that State and local governments should share the cost of water projects. But the President in his message recommends that the two projects named above be wholly Federal.

Next, the committee recommends that there be set up "an independent Board of Review * * * to analyze the engineering and economic feasibility of projects and report to the President." If any such board were to report independently and factually on these two projects, it can be taken for granted that no President would dream of recommending them. As it happened, the pressure for these projects came from interested Members of Congress and bureaucrats anxious to spend more and more tax dollars. The congressional committees that considered them are stacked with Members from the beneficiary States. In the case of the bill which passed the Senate last year (S. 500), only one Member came from east of the Mississippi, and he represents a State paying a relatively small percentage of the taxes involved. One might as well have a plaintiff pick the jury which would pass upon his claim.

The other notable recommendation is that while the old practice of charging water users on irrigation projects no interest on the money advanced by the Federal Government should be continued, nevertheless interest should "be shown clearly as a Federal cost." This means that when a project is presented to Congress, all the cards would be laid on the table. Hitherto the interest charge has been one of those things that the interested parties never chose to mention. Only occasionally a stalwart champion of economy has pried that cost out of the Bureau of Reclamation.

That interest charge is very important. Since no project except 1 or 2 has been paid for by the water users within the 53 years since Federal irrigation began, the interest charge runs to twice to three times the original cost.

Immediately after the President made the report public, a Congressman from Colorado, WAYNE N. ASPINALL, shouted his disapproval and in so doing let a cat as big as a mountain puma out of the bag. He said that "if they did not favor the elimination of the interest charge immediately after adding it to the cost of construction, there wouldn't be a reclamation project in the United States that would be economically possible."

In short, if the real cost plus interest were considered, none of the presently proposed irrigation projects would stand scrutiny.

That is exactly what I have been saying in this space for 2 years.

Aid for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the backbone of the American economic system is without question, I think, the small-business man. Through the initiative and inventiveness of the small-business man America has grown into the great industrial giant that it is. Because we have had leaders in this field throughout our history, we are in a better position to inspire the free world in the struggle against communism. Without our industrial might, such things as the Marshall plan, point 4, and our other economic assistance programs would not be possible.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the small-business man has his back to the wall today in the struggle to maintain his place against the large corporations. If there be any doubt of the truth of this statement, the statistics of business failures bear mute evidence of its accuracy. In 1945 there were only 809 failures. In 1953 there were approximately 8,862. In 1954 there were 11,086. The latest reports for 1955 indicate that there were almost as many in that year—10,969—as there were in 1954. And this was a year of great boom in the American economy—or at least this is what the economists tell us. Truly, the Nation's small-business men face at least as serious a problem as the American farmer.

Nor are the statistics of failure the only evidence of the threat to our traditional free-enterprise system. Many of us have become increasingly aware of the growth in the size of our already gigantic corporations. Much of this increase has come about through the merger of smaller corporations with larger ones. This merger activity has taken place even between companies in entirely unrelated fields as the larger corporations expand their operations into ever more diversified activities.

Statistics of the Federal Trade Commission show the following trend in the number of manufacturing and mining concerns acquired or merged during the last 30 years. Beginning in 1922, the number of mergers rose steadily from 297 to a peak of 1,216 in 1929. Thereafter the number of mergers leveled off at less than 200 in 1932, and varied within a range from 87 to 419 throughout the forties. However, mergers rose rapidly in 1951, reached 822 in 1952, and stayed at a high level in 1953 and 1954.

The question then arises as to why small business is having such a hard time in keeping its collective head above water in times of supposed prosperity. Put in its simplest terms, the answer lies quite obviously in the fact that small business is small and therefore a much more risky and uncertain affair than the large corporations. This has its most far-reaching effect in the ability of the small concern to secure capital for its operations. The large or giant business only needs to indicate its desires and the money flows in for investors know, or are at least quite certain, that there is little risk. Perhaps the best example of this activity in recent days was the stock issue by the Ford Motor Co. How many small-business men could expect the investing public to respond to a desire for funds in the way that stockbrokers scrambled for Ford stock?

Yet it is almost always the smaller businesses which need capital from outside sources in order to expand operations. Large outfits are able to plow back a certain percentage of the vast profits they make and therefore do not have to go outside their own company for expansion funds. If they want to undertake a really vast program banks are more than glad to loan money at low rates for the security is very good.

In addition, the large corporations are able to siphon off the best of management personnel because they are able to afford much higher salaries for their executive departments based on their ability to earn much greater profits.

Under these circumstances, the management of small business becomes essentially unprofitable and these concerns either give up the struggle and go quietly into bankruptcy or, if they are lucky, they are able to persuade a larger concern to buy them out.

Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it behooves the Government to take whatever action seems necessary to preserve the ability of the small corporations to compete with their larger neighbors. For this reason, I am introducing a bill designed to give some measure of tax relief to the small-business men of the United States. Under this bill, which has been introduced in the Senate by Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT and a distinguished list of cosponsors, the tax on net earnings would be reduced from 30 percent, as it presently is, to 22 percent, and the surtax on corporate income in excess of $25,000 would be increased from the present 22 percent to 31 percent.

This bill would have the following effect on corporate taxes: Corporations with incomes of $25,000 or less would have their tax burden reduced by 26.7 percent. A corporation with income of $100,000 would be given a tax relief of 2.7 percent. Corporations with incomes of $500,000 and over would have increased tax liabilities of from 1.1 percent, in the case of a corporation with that income, to 1.9 percent for a corporation with income of $100 million a year. This bill would result in a net gain in Government income of some $20 million. Its benefits to the small-business man would be much, much greater. With the funds which he formerly had to set aside for Government taxes, he would be able to finance many of the increased activities, enabling him to compete on a much more equitable basis with his large competitor. It would enable him to pay higher salaries to his executive personnel. It would enable him to undertake some of the research activities which are the lifeblood of the modern corporation.

The benefits to the Nation are, I think, quite as great. As I stated at the outset, we are a Nation built on the basis of a free competitive economy. Anything which strengthens this economy is to the benefit of all. In addition, we are today leaders of the free world and we advertise the success of our free-enterprise system. If we are to maintain the position and the strength of the free world in the struggle against the alien system of communism, we must maintain our own concepts. This bill is certainly no cure-all, but it is, at least, a step in the right direction.

The Price of Freedom Is High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am pleased to include a recent speech made by my distinguished colleague, Hon. KENNETH ROBERTS, who represents the fourth Alabama district.

This address was delivered by Congressman ROBERTS at the midwinter conference of the Veterans of Foreign Wars on February 11, 1956, in Anniston, Ala. I am sure that all who read Representative ROBERTS' timely statement will find it of real interest:

The price of freedom is high. All of us in this room are aware that the price of freedom is high because we have already made a substantial payment. Some of the payment has been made in the currency of time from our own lives; some has been made in the currency of dollars and cents; and some of us have had members in our families make their final payment with their life.

When the United States entered World War I, it was with the hope that this was the "war to end all wars." Unfortunately time has cruelly shown us that this was a pious hope. Following the Treaty of Versailles, the United States, searching for the road to peace, participated in a disarmament race. An immature United States danced and drank its way through the roaring twenties, oblivious to world problems; seeking only the gratification of momentary pleasures.

The "crash" which obliterated our dream world of the twenties was a harsh, terrifying experience for America. The long, hard depression had a sobering and maturing effect on our country. During these years of the thirties there was a hard core which felt that the United States Government should devote its foreign policy to staying free from any entangling alliances. Our efforts should be directed toward strengthening our own domestic policy. We had remained out of the League of Nations and we should not now indulge in politics abroad. It was during these years, while we refused to look beyond the gentle rolling surf of our coastlines, that Hitler and Mussolini rose to power. The results of our hope to remain free from world strife by not participating and assuming our role of responsibility took its toll when World War II broke out and invaded the lives of all of us.

I am proud of the mature, responsible role the United States has played since this time. Through the combined efforts of all our citizens the United States did reach total mobilization. The United States contributed her men, her industrial strength, and her philosophy rooted deep in constitutional liberty and respect for the individual. The United States contributed these elements so that the world could live in peace again and be a haven for all freemen everywhere.

Unfortunately once again time did not bring our wish true, at least not immediately. In contrast to previous behavior, however, we have not drawn about us the cloak of isolationism in the false hope that this would provide protection. We have taken a strong stand to see that what we fought for and what many men died for will not be lost. We still must make payments upon the altar of military preparedness if we want to keep peace. And this we are willing to do.

This time the United States took a strong stand to keep faith with those who died so that they may sleep in peace in Flanders Field. You might ask, what has our program for peace been? First, let me say it has been a strong, positive program based on a realistic appraisal of the world—the world's many governments, its peoples, and the intricate struggle being made by some for world control. When I think of what might be called our militant program for peace, which to some may seem a contradiction in terms, I am reminded of a statement made by that wonderful warm, human philosopher, Will Rogers. Will Rogers commenting on the reality with which the Pilgrims faced life said: "When the Pilgrims prayed, they usually had a musket in their hands so they'd be sure to get what they asked for."

Of our immediate postwar action, I think that history will prove that the Marshall plan was one of the greatest and most humanitarian concepts ever conceived and implemented by any conqueror. It would have been quite possible for a nation geared to win an all-out war, while still in the white heat of battle, to have accepted the infamous Morgenthau plan—a plan to completely carve up the carcass of Germany and serve it upon a platter for all the victors to relish. Our philosphy transcended this petty bitterness and embraced a program to benefit free men wherever we could. We had not lost our vision. We had come to the sad realization that though the last shot had been fired in the hot war, the struggle still continued.

It took both courage and vision for our Government to act to aid Greece and Turkey. Time has proved that this decision was right.

Our Government was not flustered by the Russians prohibiting land travel into Berlin. We countered this maneuver with the Berlin airlift.

As the true character and designs of the Russian Bear continued to unfold bit by bit, the United States and our allies adopted a counterdefensive policy. The Western Allies formed the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance. This has been followed more recently by the Southeast Asian Alliance.

The United Nations, with our full support, took the difficult strong stand to meet force with force to halt overt aggression in Korea.

In this tense international chess game being waged between the East and West it is difficult to anticipate where the next move will be made. It is not difficult, however, to know what the aims of our opponent are, and our best defensive is to be prepared and to remain alert.

Congress has been very much concerned about both remaining prepared and alert. Although the present administration in 1953 recommended a New Look for the Air Force, which, translated into simple language, meant a cutback in the number of air wings, Congress opposed this action and appropriated funds to provide us with 137 air wings.

In the 1st session of this 84th Congress the administration moved to cut down the manpower of the United States Marine Corps. Congress opposed this reduction. Congress voted additional funds to increase manpower personnel and to maintain it at combat readiness.

This year I think that either the present administration decided that the people wanted and knew a strong military defense program was essential or the administration feared congressional criticism and opposition, for in the President's budget for fiscal year 1957 the defense budget requests are up over last year's and are higher than what everyone was predicting would be requested. I am not advocating that military appropriations be allowed to break the financial back of the Nation. However, when our national income is higher than it has ever been, and when it appears probably that the budget may be balanced this year for the first time since the Truman administration accomplished this in 1948, it seems only sensible that we make an intelligent investment in those programs which are essential to maintaining world peace. If we do not, it may very well be that there is no peace, no prosperity, no freedom, and very little hope.

It was of very grave concern to me when I read the first of Gen. Matthew Ridgway's story, and I quote: "I felt I was being called upon to destroy, rather than to build, a fighting force on which rested the world's best hope for peace. * * * As Chief of Staff, I quickly learned that though my own recommendations were made on a purely military basis, the decisions of the Defense De-

partment were based on considerations other than clear-cut military needs. They were based on budgetary considerations, on political consideration, on the advantage to be gained in the field of domestic politics by a drastic reduction in military expenditures."

If any of General Ridgway's statement is true, it is a shocking situation. The defense of our country should not become political football considerations. The people of our country who are called up to arms whenever there has been an error in judgment, do not want partisan politics to determine our policy. We cannot afford to be partisan in terms of either money, men, or time. As a Member of Congress, regardless of whatever party-line propaganda may be distributed, I can assure you I intend to support those programs which I sincerely feel will carry us toward peace. This is a matter of world security.

One of the deadly races now being run between Russia and the United States is to develop the ballistic missile. Since the end of World War II, the Kremlin has been striving to narrow the technological gap between the Russian economy and our own. Each year they have challenged us more formidably in our one area of superior strength—our ability to design and put into production superior weapons. The Soviets achieved their first atomic bomb in 1949. In 1953, less than 9 months after the United States first full-scale hydrogen tests, the Russians detonated a hydrogen bomb. The Soviets have developed the Bison x long-range jet comparable to our B-52's. Today our monopoly for delivering atomic bombs no longer exists. There are facts we cannot ignore.

In the hands of a treacherous aggressor, the intercontinental ballistic missile can bring hydrogen warfare's threat of extinction to Main Street, United States of America. And it can arrive in less than 30 minutes, direct from Moscow. To date, there is no known defense against this monster.

During the past few years, Congress has been appropriating increasing amounts of money for the guided-missile program. I feel that this program will have to be seriously stepped-up if we want to win this race. If we do not win, it is possible that Russia will blackmail our allies into inactivity by threat of extinction. It is possible that this program could be quickened, if Senator JACKSON's proposal to remove this program from interservice rivalry were followed and it was established in an independent setup, such as the Manhattan District was created to develop the atomic bomb. I hope that the Senate and House Armed Services Committees will give this deadly matter their immediate attention.

In this race for technical superiority, we cannot overlook the need for brains. Are we winning the race developing and training one of our greatest natural resources, the minds of our young people? In the 26 years between 1928 and 1954 Russia graduated 682,000 engineers as against 480,000 in the United States. Last year Russia graduated twice as many engineers as we did.

At this time I would like to say that I am very much in favor of the stand which the VFW had taken in supporting legislation which would continue GI educational training benefits so long as young men are being drafted. Such legislation seems only equitable to me. I should also like to point out that this program pays for itself in dollars and cents as well as in intangibles. When the trainees of World War II completed their training, their income was below that of nonveterans in the same age group. In 1954, 10 years after the act had been in effect, the veteran's average earning power had gone past the nonveterans, and these men were contributing in income taxes alone approximately $1 billion a year more than the nonveterans. The total cost of the World War II educational program was $14½ billion. This means that the program paid for itself within 14½ years and that the taxes after that are all profit. And it cannot be overlooked that this program trained 180,000 needed doctors, 113,000 research scientists, 450,000 civil engineers and many, many others. I can assure you that I expect to support legislation to continue this very fine program when it comes before the House of Representatives for a vote.

I have spoken of military preparedness this afternoon. But it is in the hearts and minds of men that we shall win our final victory. The success of our great humanitarian concepts—the Marshall plan, the point 4 program, to share the world's abundance—is obvious, if one is to judge by the fact that Russia is now trying to emulate us. World War II cost us $350 billion. Our foreign aid programs have cost less than $65 billion. This is a small investment to make for peace, and the return is incalculable in terms of life, liberty and happiness.

I am sorry if I seemed to have painted you a picture of gloom here this afternoon. I do not feel that way about it. I do feel that it is a realistic appraisal and that a strong portion of our defense depends upon facing reality. I would like to say that I have faith. I have faith in this great Nation of ours. In the heritage bestowed upon us by our ancestors who came to this wilderness to found a nation dedicated to "liberty, justice, and freedom for all."

The West believes in the dignity of man; in human worth; in freedom for the development and expression of man's soul. For these reasons I do not doubt that we shall win ultimate victory in the hearts and minds of men. In Zechariah it reads: "Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord of hosts."

California Witnesses Prove That Colorado River Project Will Not Threaten California's Water Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, It is the duty of those of us who represent California in the Congress to satisfy ourselves that not one drop of water to which California is legally entitled is taken from it by the Colorado River project legislation. That this is at the heart of California's particular concern in this matter is clearly set forth in the following excerpt from the comments of the California State engineer, Mr. A. D. Edmonston, on the report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Colorado River storage project:

> The primary interest of the State of California in the specific projects set forth in the report of the Commissioner of Reclamation as approved by the Secretary of the Interior on January 26, 1951, is that in the construction and operation of any of these projects, California will receive its due apportionment of the waters of the Colorado River system as provided for in the Colorado River compact and related laws, instruments, and documents.[10]

Should authorization of the project prejudice California's legal rights to the waters of the Colorado River, my duty as well as the duty of every other person charged with the responsibility of representing California in or before Congress would be to oppose the legislation with all possible vigor. Conversely, such opposition is out of order if it can be established that authorization would pose no threat whatsoever to California's legal share of waters of the Colorado River, providing the project is otherwise in accord with the general policy of the Federal Government governing water resources development.

I have come to the conclusion that it is possible for the upper basin to develop and use some of the water to which it is entitled under the terms of the Colorado River Compact without impairing its ability to deliver to California and the other lower basin States the water to which they are entiled. That conclusion is based on statements by Northcutt Ely and Raymond Matthew, attorney and engineer, respectively, for the California-Colorado River Board, and on official comments and statements by California State Engineer Edmonston, and by the Colorado River Board of California to the effect that all of the consumptive uses in the upper basin contemplated in current legislation can be made without interfering with the quantity of water which must be delivered to the lower basin. Later[11] in this article evidence will be presented from the official record which establishes that California officials have, first, admitted that water available for use in the upper basin is more than adequate to supply all the requirements of the projects included in the Colorado River storage project without injury to California; second, maintained that large holdover storage in the upper basin is an essential prerequisite to development there in order to assure that California and the other lower basin States will continue to receive the water to which they are entitled under the compact; third, urged prompt construction of the largest feature of the Colorado River storage project, namely, the Glen Canyon reservoir; and fourth, endorsed the generation of electric energy as a necessary and desirable adjunct of upper basin development.

BACKGROUND OF PROPOSALS FOR UPPER BASIN DEVELOPMENT

Basic to any understanding of the rights of the seven States of the Colorado River Basin to the use of the waters of the Colorado River is the Colorado River Compact of 1922.[12] That compact divides the Colorado River Basin into two parts, the upper basin comprising parts of the upper basin comprising parts of the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah and Wyoming, and the lower basin comprising parts of the States of Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah, with Lee Ferry, a point in Arizona, as the dividing point between the two basins. Each basin is defined to include, in addition to the specified States, such other States located outside

---

[10] H. Doc. No. 364, 83d Cong., 2d sess., 297 (1954).

[11] Infra, at p. 17 et seq.

[12] H. Doc. No. 717, 80th Cong., 2d sess., at A17 (1948).

the drainage area of the Colorado River system as are or will be beneficially served by waters diverted from the Colorado River system above or below Lee Ferry, as the case may be.

Article III (a) of the compact apportions to each basin in perpetuity:

The exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum.

Article III (d) provides that—

States of the upper division will not cause the flow of the river at Lee Ferry to be depleted below an aggregate of 75 million acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years.

The Colorado River Compact and the Boulder Canyon Project Act,[13]—which authorized the Hoover Dam and the All-American Canal as its major features—became effective in 1929 after ratification of the compact by 6 of the 7 States of the Colorado River Basin, the enactment of the California Limitation Act[14] and the proclamation by the President. Development in the lower basin proceeded at a fast pace with the construction of Hoover Dam, Parker Dam, Davis Dam, the Colorado River Acqueduct, and other works. Development in the upper basin, on the other hand, proceeded more slowly, due to various factors including the lack of a comprehensive plan for the use of their waters and of an apportionment of the waters among the States themselves, and to various economic, technical, and other problems that confronted it.

The first effective step toward eventual upper basin development came with the enactment of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of 1940.[15] Section 2 (d) of that act provided for a payment of $500,000 annually from the Colorado River dam fund, which was established by the Boulder Canyon Project Act, to a special fund in the Treasury designated the "Colorado River development fund." The first receipts of the fund up to $1,500,000 were directed to be used "for the continuation and extension, under the direction of the Secretary of studies and investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation for the formulation of a comprehensive plan for the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River system for irrigation, electric power, and other purposes" in the upper and lower divisions of the Colorado River Basin. Receipts of the fund through the year 1955 were directed to be used for investigation and construction of projects in the four States of the upper division.

Pursuant to that authorization, the Department of the Interior undertook an exhaustive investigation of potential water resources developments in the Colorado River Basin in Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, the results of which were contained in an interim report of the Secretary of the Interior published in 1947 and entitled "The Colorado River—A Natural Menace Becomes a National Resource."[16] Before publication the report was submitted to the seven affected States and to the Secretary of war, the Federal Power Commission, and the Department of Agriculture, and their replies were included in it. The report contained a comprehensive inventory of potential water resources developments in the Colorado River Basin. In his letter transmitting it to the President, the Secretary of the Interior stated:

Although I cannot recommend authorization of any projects at this time, I am sending the accompanying inventory report forward in order that you and the Congress may be apprized of this comprehensive inventory of potential water resource developments in the Colorado River Basin, and of the present situation regarding water rights in the Colorado River Basin.[17]

The report took cognizance of the fact that while the Colorado River compact divides the water between the upper and lower basins, it made no division among the States within each basin. It further noted that an Upper Basin Compact Commission had been created to apportion upper basin water. The commission reached agreement and the compact became effective upon the concurrence of Congress in 1948.[18]

Following the apportionment of the waters among the upper basin States, various bills were introduced to authorize developments there. Meanwhile the Department continued its studies, and under date of December 1950, the Bureau of Reclamation presented Project Planning Report No. 4-8a-81-1 which recommended approval of an overall plan of development of the upper Colorado River Basin and initial authorization and construction of 5 storage projects and 10 participating or consumptive-use projects. Under date of June 14, 1951, California submitted its views and recommendations on the report, saying, among other things, the following:

The State of California favors congressional authorization of the specific projects set forth in the proposed report of the Secretary of the Interior or as may be modified, and their construction with Federal funds consistent with national welfare if (a) such projects qualify under criteria, policies, and procedures of the Congress, and (b) the diversion and utilization of the waters of the Colorado River system by and through these projects will not impair the rights of the State of California or any of its agencies to the waters of that system as defined and set forth in the Colorado River compact and related laws and documents.[19]

The project was the subject of continuing study by the Bureau of Reclamation on the basis of which a supplemental report dated December 10, 1953, was prepared. It recommended the construction of the Glen Canyon and Echo Park storage and power units and of some 11 reclamation projects. The total cost of the units recommended for authorization was $923,056,000. The report was transmitted to the Speaker of the House.[20] President Eisenhower referred to the report in a press release dated March 20, 1954, which read, in part, as follows:

I have today approved recommendations for the development of the upper Colorado River Basin.

The general plan upon which these recommendations are based has been prepared by the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary's recommendations have been reviewed by the Bureau of the Budget. Legislation embodying the administration's recommendations is being prepared for introduction in the Congress.

This is a comprehensive, well-planned development of a river basin. The close Federal-State cooperation upon which the Secretary's plan is based also carries out this administration's approach to water-resource development.

The development will conserve water, enabling the region to increase supplies for municipal uses, industrial development, and irrigation. It will develop much-needed electric power.

The development calls for sound financing. The legislation now being drafted will set up a fund for the entire project so that it will be constructed and paid for as a basin program.

I hope the Congress will give early consideration to enactment of the administration's legislative proposal. I firmly believe development of the upper Colorado River Basin, in accordance with its provisions, is in the national interest.[21]

The President has repeatedly urged the Congress to approve his proposed upper Colorado River development. In his State of the Union message to the Congress in January 1955, President Eisenhower stated with reference to the project:

The Federal Government must shoulder its * * * partnership obligations by undertaking projects of such complexity and size that their success requires Federal development. In keeping with this principle, I again urge the Congress to approve the development of the upper Colorado River Basin to conserve and assure better use of precious water essential to the future of the West.[22]

In his budget message for the same year the President said:

I also recommend enactment of legislation authorizing the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake construction of two comprehensive river-basin improvements which are beyond the capacity of local initiative, public or private, but which are needed for irrigation, power, flood control, and municipal and industrial water supply. These are the upper Colorado River Basin development in the States of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, and New Mexico, and the Fryingpan-Arkansas development in Colorado. The Colorado River development will enable the upper basin States to conserve floodwaters and to assure the availability of water and power necessary for the economic growth of the region * * * Sale of power generated at these developments will repay the power investment within 50 years and will make a contribution toward repayment of other investments.[23]

In his State of the Union message for 1956, delivered only last month, President Eisenhower again urgently recommended action authorizing the Colorado

[13] 45 Stat. 1057 (1928).
[14] Calif. Stats. 1929, ch. 16, p. 38.
[15] 54 Stat. 774.
[16] H. Doc. No. 419, 80th Cong., 1st sess. (1947).
[17] Id. at 2.
[18] 63 Stat. 31 (1949).
[19] H. Doc. No. 364, 83d Cong., 2d sess. at 297 (1954).
[20] H. Doc. No. 364, 83d Cong., 2d sess. (1954).
[21] Id at 1.
[22] H. Doc. No. 1, 84th Cong., 1st sess. at 8.
[23] H. Doc. No. 16, 84th Cong., 1st sess. at M. 65.

River storage project and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project during the current session of Congress.[24]

THE PROJECT BEFORE CONGRESS

The Senate's bill to authorize the project, S. 500, passed that body during the 1st session of the 84th Congress. It would authorize 6 storage reservoirs with hydroelectric features and incidental works and 12 participating or consumptive-use irrigation projects plus some 21 additional projects conditioned on later congressional approval of feasibility reports on each. The total construction cost of all features in the Senate bill is $1,658,460,100.

H. R. 3383, to authorize the project, was favorably reported.[25] by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on July 8, 1955, and shortly thereafter cleared for floor consideration by the House Committee on Rules.[26] Congress adjourned before the matter was taken up in the House. It is assumed that the backers will press for House action early in the current session of the 84th Congress. As reported by the committee, H. R. 3383 would authorize as an initial phase of the comprehensive plan of upper basin development 4 holdover storage reservoirs and 11 participating projects. The 4 holdover storage units and their locations are as follows:

Glen Canyon, Ariz. and Utah. Flaming Gorge, Utah and Wyo.; Navajo, N. Mex.; Curecantil, Colo.[27]

The 11 consumptive-use projects would bring irrigation to some 132,000 acres of new land and provide a supplemental water supply for an additional 234,000 acres.

The controversial Echo Park Dam, which has been opposed by individuals and organizations on grounds that it would invade the Dinosaur National Monument, was eliminated from H. R. 3383 in our committee, as was the Juniper Dam. The bill would authorize the appropriation of $760 million which is $190 million less than the $950 million recommended for the project by the Eisenhower administration.

Recently an agreement was reached between the governors, Senators, and Representatives of the upper basin to eliminate Echo Park Dam from the project in deference to those who opposed that particular feature because of its location. Based on the elimination of Echo Park, the executive secretary of the Wilderness Society, which is typical of the national conservation societies which opposed the project solely because of Echo Park, advised Congressman Dawson of Utah by letter dated February 1, 1956, that its opposition has been withdrawn.[28] That withdrawal leaves the California opposition as the only objector to legislation to authorize the Colorado storage project.

Although, as has already been pointed out, California's primary concern with legislation to authorize the Colorado River storage project relates to any adverse effect the project may have on its legal shares to the waters of the Colorado River, much criticism has been forthcoming from the California opposition based on the financial aspects of the project. Following is the allocation of costs of the project which would be authorized in the pending H. R. 3383:

Item and allocation	
Nonreimbursable: Flood control, fish and wildlife and recreation	$8,205,000
Reimbursable:	
Power	422,743,500
Municipal water	40,950,000
Irrigation	[29] 282,800,000

Of the total cost of the project less than 1 percent is nonreimbursable and that is for features which have specifically been recognized as Federal expenses such as flood control,[30] fish and wildlife,[31] and recreation.[32] The remaining 99 percent plus of the cost is reimbursable. The entire allocation for municipal and industrial water and power of approximately $463.7 million is returnable to the United States with interest on the investment plus interest accruing during construction. The irrigation allocation of $282.8 million would be repaid in equal installments over a 50-year period plus any development period authorized, but does not bear interest in accordance with a principle that has been a part of reclamation law for over 50 years.

Referring to the application of revenues contemplated from the project included in H. R. 3383, the following is set forth in the committee report:

> In a 50-year period following the last power installation, net power revenues from the power facilities herein authorized are estimated at $1,075 million. Irrigation revenues in 50 years from the irrigation projects herein authorized are estimated at $36.6 million. The $1,075 million from power revenues would be sufficient to pay the power investment of $422.7 million, interest on the power investment of about $320 million to the Federal Treasury, the necessary financial assistance to irrigation of $246.2 million ($282.8 million minus $36.6 million) and leave a surplus at the end of the period of about $86 million. Municipal water revenues would be sufficient to repay the municipal water allocation with interest including interest during construction.
>
> After the project has been completely repaid, the net power revenues amounting to from $15 million to $20 million annually for the units herein authorized will continue to flow into the Treasury. Over the long run, these additional revenues will more than offset the cost to the Federal Government resulting from interest-free financing for the irrigation investment. Thus, it is evident that the repayment plan is sound and that repayment is in accordance with the normal procedure for reclamation projects.[33]

In his testimony on S. 500.[34] Mr. Northcutt Ely decried the fact that the power revenues, in addition to repaying the cost of the power facilities with interest, will be used to pay out the cost of the reclamation facilities included in the project. Yet the use of power revenues for such purposes has been a common feature of Federal reclamation projects financing.[35] It received the endorsement of President Eisenhower's Presidential Committee on Water Resources Policy in a report[36] sent to the Congress on January 17, 1956. The Committee was comprised of the three following Cabinet officers: Secretary of Interior McKay, Chairman; Secretary of Agriculture Benson; and Secretary of Defense Wilson. In their report the members said in part as follows:

> Use of excess revenues: Reclamation law has for many years permitted the application of excess revenue from the sale of power and municipal and industrial water (i. e., revenues received in excess of the amount necessary to amortize the capital cost with interest and cost of maintenance and operation of such purposes) to help repay part of irrigation costs. Such application has been made on numerous projects over many years. It should be recognized, however, that any charge for power above that necessary to repay power costs constitutes in effect an assessment upon the power users, who include practically all of the residents in the region. Thus, it is one method of collecting a share of costs from secondary local beneficiaries.
>
> The Committee believes that such a use of excess revenue from Federal power sales to repay a portion of the costs of other types of projects is a justifiable procedure provided the project to which such revenues are applied is a part of the area from which such excess revenues are derived.[37]

The Californians who object to the project on grounds of subsidy do so in the fact of the fact that the major subsidy to the reclamation projects comes not from the Federal Treasury, but from the power users in accordance with regular principles. The Federal subsidy amounts to only $8.2 million and that for features which are recognized as Federal expenses.[38] Contrast that subsidy with the estimated nonreimbursable Federal cost of $348 million[39] for only one flood control project in Southern California, namely the Los Angeles County drainage area—excluding the Whittier Narrows Reservoir—and you can get some idea of the reaction of Upper Basin spokesmen to challenges to the Colorado River storage project based on economics by the California opposition. Thus a single flood-control project which benefits 1 area in California carries a nonreimbursable Federal grant which is

[24] H. Doc. No. 241, 84th Cong., 2d sess., at 10.

[25] H. Rept. No. 1087, 84th Cong., 1st sess., (1955).

[26] H. Rept. No. 1332, 84th Cong., 1st sess. (1955).

[27] Authorization of this feature was made subject to a finding of feasibility and report to the Congress.

[28] 102 Daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD A1079 (Feb. 2, 1956).

[29] H. Rept. No. 1087, 84th Cong., 1st sess. at 11 and 12.

[30] 49 Stat. 1570 (1936), 33 U. S. C. 701a (1952).

[31] 60 Stat. 1080 (1934), 16 U. S. C. 662 (1952).

[32] The report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission. Vol. 3, Water Resources Law (1950) at 331.

[33] H. Rept. 1087, 84th Cong., 1st sess., at 12 and 13.

[34] Hearings on S. 500, supra, at 572.

[35] The report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission, op. cit., supra, at 296.

[36] H. Doc. 315, 84th Cong., 2d sess. (1955).

[37] Id. at 33.

[38] Supra, notes 30, 31, and 32.

[39] Hearings before subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, U. S. Senate on H. R. 6766, 84th Cong., 1st sess. (1955), at 1886.

over 43 times the subsidy to the Colorado storage project in which 4 States benefit. If it is considered appropriate to take into account the cost to the Federal Government based on the non-interest-bearing irrigation investment, those features of the Colorado River storage projects would cost the United States some $285 million in interest over the 60-year amortization term. At the end of that period, all Federal costs will have been repaid. The nonreimbursable Federal grant for the Los Angeles County drainage area, on the other hand, will over the same length of time cost the United States $570 million in interest alone and this interest cost will continue to mount indefinitely. After 100 years, it will amount to $870 million.

Furthermore, it is difficult for Californians to oppose the upper basin development on economic grounds when the State of California is going to build the Feather River project out of its own funds with no reference to historical standards of feasibility.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA'S POSITION

At the outset I stated that my refusal to join the alinement against the upper basin development which Northcutt Ely and Raymond Matthew—attorney and engineer, respectively, for the California-Colorado River Board—have spearheaded is based on a conviction that it is possible for the upper basin to develop some of its legal share of the waters of the Colorado River Basin without impairing California's rights to its share of the same waters. It is my purpose to now set forth the evidence on which that conclusion is based—evidence assembled from the public record which I believe does not support the stand of those who have fought upper basin development as a "threat to California's vital water and power supplies." [40]

WATER AVAILABLE FOR USE IN UPPER BASIN

It has already been shown that article III (a) of the Colorado River compact apportions to the upper basin the beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum from the waters of the Colorado River Basin. The State engineer of California has stated that the long-term average quantity available for use in the upper basin may be somewhat less than 7,500,000 acre-feet a year due to article III (d) of the compact which provides that the upper basin States will not cause the flow of the river at Lee Ferry to be depleted below an aggregate of 75,000,000 acre-feet for any 10 consecutive years. He stated that studies have indicated that the upper basin during a critical period such as 1931–40 would not have more than 6,077,000 acre-feet available to it, which, together with estimated reservoir losses of 831,000 acre-feet, would result in a total consumptive use of 6,908,000 acre-feet. He then concluded that the long-term average quantity available for consumptive use in the upper basin is between 6,900,000 and 7,500,000 acre-feet per year.[41]

[40] 30 Los Angeles B. A. Bull. 227.

[41] H. Doc. 419, 80th Cong., 1st sess. (1947), at 33 and 34.

There has been unanimous agreement among Californians that the consumptive uses of projects included in S. 500 or H. R. 3383 would not require near the amount of water allotted to the upper basin by the compact. Mr. Ely testified, in part, as follows:

The aggregate consumptive use of these projects is said to range from about a half million to about 1½ million acre-feet. These quantities when added to about 2,500,000 acre-feet, said to be required by projects already constructed or authorized would represent a total use of say 3 million or 4 million acre-feet in the upper basin. The larger of these figures is still within the quantity of 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum, the use of which is apportioned to the upper basin by article 3 (a) of the Colorado River Compact. Moreover, the engineering studies indicate that this total could be permanently put to use without the construction of any new hold-over storage whatever.[42]

Not only did Mr. Ely and Mr. Matthew concede that the consumptive uses of all projects included in the Colorado River storage project legislation is well within the upper basin's entitlement, but they testified such uses were so small that they could be made without the construction of any hold-over storage facilities whatsoever.

Mr. Matthew testified before the House committee, in part, as follows:

Under present conditions of development of the upper basin, the measured flow at Lee Ferry during all periods of 10 consecutive years has always materially exceeded 75 million acre-feet throughout the period of record to date. Studies by the Bureau in the project planning report indicate that in the dryest 10-year period of record, 1930–40, the upper basin could have theoretically used, without holdover storage, about 4,300,000 acre-feet of water, or about 2,300,000 acre-feet more than the present use as estimated by the Bureau.[43]

Mr. Ely referred to the fact that all authorized and contemplated uses in the upper basin would represent a total of from 3,500,000 to 4,500,000 acre-feet in the upper basin and added:

Moreover, the engineering studies indicate that this total could be permanently put to use without the construction of any new holdover storage whatever, and that no hold-over storage would be required for nearly half a century even if other projects were added.[44]

Even the pendency of the case of Arizona against California does not affect the amount of water required for consumptive use by the Colorado River storage project, plus that required for all presently authorized and existing projects. The future determination by the Supreme Court in that case on such important questions as whether beneficial consumptive use as used in article III (a) of the Colorado River compact and the Mexican Water Treaty means the quantity in fact used, measured at the place of use, or the effect of that use measured in terms of stream depletion

[42] Hearings on H. R. 3383, supra, at 825 and 826.

[43] January 26, 1954, Raymond Matthew's statement before the House Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation on H. R. 4449 and others, 83d Cong., 2d sess., at 692.

[44] Hearings on S. 500, supra, at 571.

at Lee Ferry, as well as its decision on other disputed interpretations of provisions of pertinent compacts, laws, and treaties does not warrant a delay in authorization of the Colorado River storage project, since, as Mr. Ely has testified, the amount involved in that litigation vis-a-vis the upper and lower basins amounts to 2 million acre-feet.[45] Thus if all disputed issues in that case are resolved in favor of the stand California has taken in Arizona against California now before the Supreme Court, there will remain 5,500,000 acre-feet per year available for use in the upper basin. This amount is still well over 1 million acre-feet in excess of the 3,500,000 to 4,500,000 acre-feet which Mr. Ely testified could be put to use in the upper basin without any danger to the lower basin.

THE STORAGE DAMS

By far the biggest assault from southern California on the Colorado River storage project has been directed at the storage dams. This is understandable since those dams, which include hydroelectric features, are the "cash registers" of the entire development. This is so because the revenues derived from the sale of power will, in accordance with standard practice, be used to pay off part of the cost of the participating, or irrigation, projects. Without them the irrigation projects canot be built except at prohibitive cost and the waters of the Colorado River apportioned to the upper basin by the compact must remain undeveloped.

The desire of southern Californians to forever preclude or at least delay development in the upper basin is understandable when the effect of such development on lower basin power revenues is taken into account. Manifestly, water which is used in the upper basin will not pass through Hoover and other lower basin dams to generate low-cost power. The power generated from water to which the upper basin is entitled is sold as secondary—undependable—energy at a low rate as contrasted with firm—dependable—energy which is sold at a higher rate. That upper basin Senators are not insensitive to this basis of the southern California opposition is shown in the following colloquy between Senators Anderson, of New Mexico, Watkins, of Utah, and Mr. Raymond Matthew, of the Colorado River Board of California, in the course of the Senate hearings:

Senator ANDERSON. May I stop you there to ask: Since this has been dealing with Hoover Dam, is it or is it not a fact that the Hoover Dam contracts are all set up on a basis of gradual reduction of power quantities dependent upon the development of the upper basin?

Mr. MATTHEW. That is correct.

Senator ANDERSON. Then why should you suddenly complain about it now, if what you anticipated takes places?

Mr. MATTHEW. Well, this is far more than was anticipated. The firm power is defined in the contracts starting with 4,330 million kilowatt-hours a year, reduced by 8,760,000 kilowatt-hours a year, due to depletions in the upper basin.

[45] Hearings on H. R. 3383 et al., at 991, 992, and 993.

Senator ANDERSON. Would the projects involved in this bill reduce it more than that?

Mr. MATTHEW. Yes, these storage projects would——

Senator ANDERSON. But, surely, you would not contend that it was anticipated that the flow at Lee Ferry should be above 7½ million acre-feet, and keep Hoover Dam going to capacity?

Mr. MATTHEW. Not just necessarily for that. I am merely pointing out that under the contracts as set up, in order to deliver that firm power at Hoover, it would require the larger quantity. And if there was only 7,500,000 acre-feet at Lee Ferry, then the firm power output would be reduced 26 percent, and they would not get any secondary.

Senator ANDERSON. I am trying to get down to bedrock, but you insist on these interpretations of the contracts requiring the delivery of 7½ million acre-feet at Lee Ferry. Now, if we live up to that part of the compact, and that results in any cutting down at Hoover Dam, do you think that is wrong?

Mr. MATTHEW. Yes, we do.

Senator ANDERSON. You do. Therefore the Hoover Dam situation is more important than that section of the compact?[46]

* * * * *

Senator WATKINS. I am just wondering how they can lose when, as a matter of fact, they have been getting the benefit of a gift, in effect, from the upper basin States all these years in the way of secondary power, and, of course, firm power, much more of it than you could ordinarily guarantee unless you counted on having the water from the upper basin States run there personally (sic).

Senator ANDERSON. That is the loss, Senator. The loss he is talking about is a loss that they would obtain if somebody stopped all the water in the Colorado River Basin from flowing down there.

Senator WATKINS. If we stop giving our water to them.

Senator ANDERSON. Yes. That is the loss.

Senator WATKINS. I have had people make gifts to me once in a while, and if they stop giving me those gifts I have lost (sic).

Mr. MATTHEW. As was testified to yesterday by Mr. Tillamn, of course, that secondary power and firm power was not guaranteed.

Senator WATKINS. It was not. That is true.[47]

It is clear, as brought out in the foregoing colloquy, that the reduction of energy available to allottees of Hoover Dam power which will result from the use by the upper basin of its share of the Colorado Basin waters has been anticipated since consummation of the compact. The Hoover Dam energy contracts with California public agencies and companies such as the cities of Los Angeles, Pasadena, Glendale, and Burbank, the Metropolitan Water District, and the Southern California Edison Co., and the California Electric Power Co. each contain the following express condition and covenant:

Delivery of water for generation of electric energy:

10. (a) Subject to—

* * * * *

(ii) the further statutory requirement that this contract is made upon the express condition and with the express covenant that the rights of the * * *, as a contractor for electrical energy, to the use of the waters of the Colorado River, or its tributaries, shall be subject to and controlled by the Colorado River Compact.

The United States will deliver the State energy in the manner required in this contract.[48]

Although Mr. Ely's position is that all the participating projects in the upper basin can be built "without the necessity for any storage whatever,"[49] and Mr. Matthew has stated that "storage units should not be built in the upper basin in advance of their need in connection with consumptive-use projects,"[50] the California State engineer and the Colorado River Board of California included the following recommendations in their comments on the Secretary of the Interior's report on potential upper basin developments:

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The following comments and conclusions are submitted with respect to the proposed report of the Secretary of the Interior entitled "The Colorado River," approved June 7, 1946.

* * * * *

6. Large holdover storage as indicated in the report is required in meeting the requirements of the Colorado River compact and in conserving and utilizing as far as it is ultimately possible the waters of the Colorado River system.

* * * * *

RECOMMENDATIONS

C. That prior to determination of the allocation of the waters of the Colorado River system among the States of the upper basin, new consumptive-use projects in that basin be authorized under the following conditions:

(a) That the consumptive use of each project be assuredly within each water allocation as is considered the minimum for the State for which the project is to be constructed, after due allowance for all existing and authorized projects.

(b) That, concurrently with the construction of any new projects in the upper basin which involve large additional use of water, holdover storage capacity be provided in that basin, to such an extent as may be necessary to assure that the flow of the river at Lee Ferry will not be depleted below that required by article III (d) of the compact.[51]

The largest in physical dimensions and cost of the storage dams, which is included in both the House and Senate bills, is Glen Canyon with a total cost allocation of $421,270,000. It represents 55 percent of all the recommended appropriation for units authorized in H. R. 3383. The reservoir storage capacity of Glen Canyon would be 26 million acre-feet and the total installed power capacity, 800,000 kilowatts. This dam would be located on the Colorado River in northern Arizona about 13 miles downstream from the Utah-Arizona State line and 15 miles upstream from Lee Ferry, which divides the upper and lower basins.

This dominant financial and physical feature of the entire Colorado River storage project was endorsed as late as February 15, 1954, by the State engineer of California in his official comments on the administration's report on the project, which comments were approved by Fred W. Simpson, chairman, the Colorado River Board of California. They were, in part, as follows:

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

* * * * *

10. The early construction of Glen Canyon Reservoir would be justified from the standpoint of other immediate advantages. Based upon the cost analyses in the report, the Glen Canyon Reservoir and power development could be constructed and operated on a sound financial basis and therefore merits authorization at this time.[52]

Testifying on H. R. 3383, Raymond Matthew endorsed Glen Canyon thusly:

Of all the proposed units of the storage project, the Bureau's cost estimates indicate that the Glen Canyon Reservoir and power development is the only one that can clearly stand on its own feet as a financially sound project unit.[53]

It might be expected that after a clear endorsement of Glen Canyon by the State engineer, the chairman of the Colorado River Board of California, and by Mr. Raymond Matthew, the chief engineer of the board, as an economically feasible and even desirable development, that Mr. Northcutt Ely would follow the official State position. Instead of doing so, he opposed the Glen Canyon development as unsound.[54]

Much criticism on the project is based on an allegation that the storage dams may be operated in such a manner as to be detrimental to the rights of California, particularly during the period when the reservoirs are being filled. The Department of the Interior has repeatedly emphasized that the filling of the reservoirs will be accomplished in a manner to minimize any adverse effect on Hoover Dam power. Commissioner of Reclamation Dexheimer testified that during many years they have had to release flood waters from Hoover Dam to make space. He continued:

That water is wasted. Every year we are wasting water into the gulf because we do not have adequate storage now to take care of it.

If we could have stored water a few years back from excess, it would have been available now and would certainly be beneficial not only in the upper basin but in the lower basin.[55]

Dead storage can be built up during the long construction period by impounding what would otherwise be run-off or waste waters from Hoover Dam. In that manner the heads for initial power generation would be accumulated over a long period of time without affecting the production of power at Hoover. The time required to fill the reservoirs would, of course, depend on the amount of run-off in the river. Under unfavorable conditions, filling could be achieved in 5 years, but it could be much longer in the event of drought. In short, the Department of the Interior has given every assurance that it will adapt initial

[46] Hearings on S. 500, supra, at 517 and 518.

[47] Id., at 519.

[48] See, e. g., power contract, city of Los Angeles, dated May 29, 1941, H. Doc. 717, 80th Cong., 2d sess., at A361. See also the agreements with other contractors in the same volume.

[49] Hearings on H. R. 3383 et al., supra, at 982.

[50] Hearings on S. 500, supra, at 526.

[51] H. Doc. 419, 80th Cong., 1st sess., at 51, 52 and 53.

[52] H. Doc. No. 364, 83d Cong., 2d sess., at 19.

[53] Hearings on H. R. 3383 et al. at 912 et seq.

[54] Id. at 987.

[55] Hearings on S. 500, supra, at 28.

filling to the amount of run-off and the downstream demands for water and firm electrical energy. By the way of further protection for the lower basin, section 15 of H. R. 3383 directs the Secretary of the Interior to operate the facilities authorized in the bill in compliance with the compacts and acts which comprise the so-called law of the river and permits any State of the Colorado River Basin, in the event the Secretary fails to so comply, to maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States and gives the consent to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit.

One further consideration relative to the upper-basin storage is that the benefits will not accrue only to that basin. California and the other lower-basin States will likewise share in the benefit, since it will be assured of a regular supply in accordance with the terms of the compact. Thus, in years of low flow in the river caused by drought, water will be released from the reservoirs to satisfy California's rights.

GENERATION OF ELECTRIC POWER IN THE UPPER BASIN

The importance of the installed electrical energy generating capacity at the storage dams as a means of financing part of the cost of the irrigation works has already been discussed. There will be no problem whatsoever in marketing the energy to be generated by the Colorado River storage project in the power-hungry area it will serve. Ten private power companies have offered to purchase any available power above that required by project or other Government contracts.[56] Referring to the private power companies' proposals, our committee stated in its report:

The committee finds that this project is unique in that there is no public versus private power controversy involved. Representatives of the 10 private power companies operating in the area presented testimony before the committee indicating their desire to cooperate with the Federal Government in the transmission and marketing of electric power and energy from the Colorado River storage project. Their proposal provides essentially that the Secretary construct the backbone transmission lines connecting major powerplants of the project and that use be made of the existing systems of the companies and additions thereto to market the power.

* * * * *

The proposal by the power companies seemed entirely reasonable to the committee.

The Department of the Interior advised the committee that it was sympathetic to the private power companies' proposal and indicated that the suggestions would be given studied consideration if the project were authorized. Therefore, the committee expects the proposal by the private power companies for cooperation in the development to be carefully considered by the Department of the Interior and the electric power and energy of the project to be marketed, so far as possible, through the facilities of the electric utilities operating in the area, provided, of course, that the power-preference laws are complied with and project repayment and consumer power rates are not adversely affected.[57]

[56] Hearings on S. 500, supra, at 30.

[57] H. Rept. No. 1087, 84th Cong., 1st sess., stet at 16 and 17.

Not only the private power companies, but the REA cooperatives,[58] and the State of California are anxious to secure the power. The State engineer of California, Mr. Edmonston, and Mr. Matthew and Mr. Edmonston, the chief engineer and chairman, respectively, of the Colorado River Board of California stated as late as February 15, 1954, in their official report on the project as follows:

11. Glen Canyon power could be readily disposed of in the lower basin where there is a great need for additional power. The question of policy regarding its disposal merits the special consideration of the Executive and the Congress.[59]

California's official position has always been favorable to the development of the power potential of the upper basin. In its official comments on the Secretary's interim report on the Colorado River appears the following with respect to the development of electric power in the Colorado River Basin:

ELECTRIC POWER

Full development of the water resources of the Colorado River necessarily include the production and transmission of hydroelectric power made possible by the construction of storage works for the regulation and utilization of the waters of the Colorado River and its tributaries.

An initial construction program could and should include hydroelectric power developments when found needed and justified. Such projects are nonconsumptive in effect.

* * * * *

RECOMMENDATIONS

A. That an immediate and intensive investigation and study be made and reported upon by the Bureau of Reclamation, in cooperation with interested agencies, concerning possible hydro-electric projects upstream from Lake Mead on the Colorado River with a view to authorization and construction at the earliest practicable date; provided, it be found that such projects are of nonconsumptive-use character, are feasible from engineering and economic standpoints, are consistent with the primary purpose of furnishing water supplies for domestic and irrigation uses in accordance with the Colorado River Compact, and will not be inconsistent with a comprehensive plan for progressive development of the Colorado River system.[60]

Disregarding this fair and reasonable recommendation of the State of California, California opposition has stood steadfast against the storage dams and appurtenant power facilities proposed for initial authorization in pending legislation to authorize the Colorado River storage project. As already indicated, if they succeed, they will foreclose upper basin development since the power dams are the cash register that make that development possible.

CONCLUSION

It would appear to be an inescapable conclusion from the evidence assembled from such official California sources as the California State engineer and the chairman and chief engineer of the Colorado River Board of California that authorization of the Colorado River storage project will not deprive California and the other lower basin States of the waters of the Colorado River Basin to which they are entitled. Not only have those officials approved the development generally, but they have specifically endorsed the construction of storage reservoirs in the upper basin as a necessary protection for lower basin water supply. The major storage facility of the project, the Glen Canyon Reservoir, has been twice officially endosed by two successive California State engineers, Mr. Edward Hyatt and Mr. A. D. Edmonston, by the last two chairmen of the Colorado River Board, Mr. Evan T. Hewes and Mr. Fred W. Simpson, as well as by Mr. Raymond Matthew, chief engineer of the Colorado River Board of California. In view of the stand taken by these responsible State officials, I fail to see the basis for opposition on the part of California to the Colorado River storage project.

[58] Charles J. Fain, hearings on S. 500, supra, at 329 et seq.

[59] H. Doc. No. 684, 83d Cong., 2d. sess., at 19.

[60] H. Doc. 419, 80th Cong., 1st sess., at 47, 48 and 53.

Conservation of Marine Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, at the recently concluded meetings of the Inter-American Council of Jurists in Mexico there occurred an action which has been interpreted as a severe setback for United States diplomacy. There was passed a resolution dealing with the breadth of the territorial sea and the principle of freedom of the seas. If carried to its logical conclusion the resolution would split the oceans surrounding the Americas into segments of sovereign territory stretching to sea as far as the coastal country thought was necessary to protect its interests. The implications of such a radical change in practice upon the defense, merchant marine, and air commerce of the hemisphere are so far reaching that they defy immediate assessment.

Hardly less shocking to United States diplomacy than the substance of the resolution was the way in which its passage was accomplished. The Department of State has worked with some degree of urgency and energy in recent months to explain and rationalize the position of the United States on the doctrine of the freedom of the seas to our southern neighbors 1 by 1 and in groups. But in the last analysis nations who have already laid claims to 200 miles and more or high seas prepared a resolution without asking the United States to participate in its drafting, and ramrodded it through the meeting without analysis, discussion, or study. The vote was 15 to 1 against the United States. Four other countries tempered the defeat lightly by abstaining from voting.

This is not the first time that this subject has been brought to the attention

of the Congress nor do I suppose it will be the last. The topic has been fermenting in Latin America for 10 years. The last time it bubbled over was at the 10th Inter-American Conference at Caracas in the spring of 1954. In reaction to that the Congress enacted Public Law 680, 84th Congress, 2d session, which among other things provided for the United States Treasury standing good for any fine when a vessel of the United States was seized pursuant to rights and claims not recognized by the United States.

This is a complicated subject and there are undoubtedly some aspects of it of which I have no clear understanding. I say this advisedly, because I am certain that no rational person knowing what little I do about the subject would have voted for such a resolution, and I am sure that the delegates there assembled were rational persons and represented rational governments. A large component of the problem, however, is concerned with the conservation of fishery resources lying in the high seas and this is a subject about which I do have some knowledge and understanding.

The development of fishery conservation theory and the application of it to the practical problems of conserving marine resources has been advanced substantially in my State during the past 30 years. Such eminent scientists in the field as M. F. Thompson, F. Harvard Bell, H. A. Dunlop, Richard VanCleve, W. C. Herrington, Lloyd A. Royal, J. L. Kask, and M. B. Schaefer have come from the school of fisheries of our University of Washington to contribute mightily to theory and practice in the field. Such eminent public-spirited laymen as Edward W. Allen, the late Miller Freeman, Harold Lokkon, and others are known nationally and internationally, with their Canadian counterparts across the border, for the skill with which they have translated these scientific activities into practical diplomatic, economic, social, and political accomplishments.

I hope that it is with pardonable pride that I relate the achievements which the United States has made in the conservation of fishery conservation in the past 30 years, which are unequaled by any other country, and the part that citizens of my State have played in that achievement. I do this not for the glorification of our State or Nation but to illustrate to our neighbors to the south that the objectives they seek in this complex matter can be accomplished quite adequately, practically, economically, and quickly by peaceful international collaboration and cooperation, which strongly promotes international good will among the participants instead of generating chaos in international relations as would the resolution adopted at Mexico City if it were put into practice.

During the First World War there was much the same shortage of protein food in the world as we remember from so short a time ago in the Second World War. Fishermen and farmers were exhorted to produce more and more food. Under this impetus the halibut fishermen of the State of Washington, British Columbia, and Alaska expanded their fishing effort as rapidly as possible until it spread all over the Northeast Pacific and out along the Alaskan Peninsula. During the entirety of the 1920's, the intensity of the fishery continually increased, but just as steadily the total catch of halibut by Canada and the United States declined.

By 1924, the direction of decline was so apparent to the industry leaders on both sides of the border that they knew something had to be done about it, but they knew not what. Now, of course, we know that the resource had been overfished during the intensive harvesting of World War I, but a short 30 years ago this thought was not widely harbored. Most people still considered that the fish of the sea, like the sands of the beach, and the stars in the skies, were unlimited in number and inexhaustible in supply. There was no science of applied fishery biology as such, and oceanography was a fancy name some Navy people used to refer to the study of wind, wave, and weather at sea.

However, something was required to be done or the whole industry would go broke. The leaders of the industry finally prevailed upon their governments to negotiate a treaty under which a joint commission could be appointed to study the matter. The treaty was signed and put into effect in 1924.

The newly appointed Commissioners had no better knowledge about what had happened to the halibut than did the fishermen. To get started they hired a bright young man who did seem to have some ideas on the subject. He is now the world-renowned Dr. W. F. Thompson, director of applied fishery research, University of Washington. He hired a group of young graduate students, none of whom had had fishery training, and put them to sea with the fishermen to study, observe, and report upon the ocean, the fish, the fishery, the fishermen, and the observable relations between them. This was the International Fishery Commission, and it was the first venture of the sort that nations had embarked upon.

Results did not come quickly or easily, but after 6 years of the most rigid examinations of the facts available to them, Dr. Thompson and his young men had put together a theory to account for the diminished catches of halibut despite the intensified fishery effort. It ran, in essence, like this:

Fish are continually entering the fishery from the newly born crop that comes along each year, and the weight of the fish in the stock was increasing as the individual fish in it grew. On the other hand fish were leaving the stock steadily by death. In a state of nature these forces were in equilibrium and the ocean was supporting the maximum population of halibut it was capable of doing.

When a fishery was started on such a virgin stock of fish three things happened: First, the total abundance of fish in the stock began to decrease; second, the average size of fish in the stock began to decrease; and, third, the productivity of the stock in terms of pounds of fish it would yield to the fishery began to increase. All three of these things continued to happen until a maximum point of productivity was reached. This corresponded precisely with a certain, determinable level of fishing effort. If the fishery was increased in intensity beyond that level the catches would actually decrease, and the more you fished beyond that point the less you caught.

Essentially there was a point of fishing effort at which the stock of fish would produce the maximum sustainable yield. If you held the fishery at that level the production could be had year after year indefinitely. If you let the fishery go beyond that point you were wasteful of the resource, because less fishing would catch more fish. On the other hand it was just as true that if you did not fish that hard you were just as wasteful of the resource, because part of it was being lost by natural deaths to no man's use.

If all of this theory was correct then all that had to be done to restore productivity and prosperity in the halibut fishery was to cut back the fishing effort to below that point which in any season it would produce a little less halibut from the stock—when taken together with natural deaths—than natural growth had added to it.

While all of this sounds logical, coherent, and sensible in 1956 it was nothing but radical theory, unsubstantiated by experience, in 1930. The International Fisheries Commission had no authority to establish the regulations anyway. The Canadian Government could not regulate American boats. The State of Washington could not regulate Canadian boats. Catches were steadily falling off. Fishermen had to fish steadily the year around throughout the bitter winter to scratch together a meager living. The whole industry was going broke and the outlook was bleak.

So after a year or so of wrestling with the problem the industry on both sides of the border decided to take the gamble. Things could not be much worse anyway. So, accordingly, their leaders went once more to Washington, D. C., and to Ottawa and asked their Governments to renegotiate the treaty establishing the International Fisheries Commission so as to give the Commission regulatory authority over the halibut fishermen of both countries. This was done, and in 1933 the regulation of the fishery was begun on the basis of the scientific information gathered by Dr. Thompson and his young men.

The thing was a success almost from the start. Within 2 years fish were enough more plentiful on the banks that even the fishermen could tell the difference. Fishing was easier, catches were had more quickly; it was soon possible even to increase the permissible quota of catch for the season and still keep the stock increasing. In 1937 the treaty was renegotiated again to give the Commission more regulatory authority over the fishery. This still worked good and catches were increased steadily. This has kept right on year after year until last year the catch was more than twice as great as it had been in 1933, it was greater than it had been at the height of the unrestricted fishery of World War I, and the catch was taken in 2 months of fishing instead of 12 months. The stock was producing pretty close to the maximum quantity of

halibut each year that the North Pacific was capable of doing. Friction between the governments and the fishermen of the country was almost nonexistent. The industry in both countries was stable and profitable.

While this great experiment was going on the salmon fishermen of Puget Sound and nearby British Columbia, who depend on the production of salmon from the Fraser River, began to suffer the same troubles that the halibut fishermen had gone through during the twenties. The harder they fished the less they caught. The example of what was going on in halibut was under their eyes. They asked the two governments to do the same for them that they were doing for the halibut fishermen. As a result a treaty establishing the International Salmon Fisheries Commission was signed by Canada and the United States in 1937. After a period of several years of scientific research, as provided for in that treaty, that Commission began the regulation of the fishermen of both countries. The results over the past 10 years have been, if anything, more spectacularly successful than was the case with halibut.

World War II brought the same aftermath of hunger as did World War I and similar increases in fishing intensity. But now theory was available, experience and practice had been gained with such problems, and trained scientists—mostly from Dr. Thompson's brood—were available. The tuna fishermen of California had watched the halibut and salmon fisheries go through periods of great growth, overfishing, short resulting catch, scientific research, economic distress while the resource was rebuilding, and then again stable catches and prosperity. They determined to avoid this cycle by getting their research done before overfishing came, to get the facts in hand with which to build adequate regulations against the date they were needed. So they came to Washington and asked their Government to do for them what it had done for the salmon and halibut men. From this grew the highly successful Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission established under treaty among the United States, Costa Rica, and Panama.

Next the New England fishermen came asking the same thing. Haddock and cod were getting hard to catch and small in size. This was a much more complicated problem than had been tackled yet. Several different kinds of fisheries were being fished in the area by several types of gear. The citizens of 10 countries—Canada, Iceland, Norway, England, Denmark, Italy, France, Spain, Portugal, and the United States—fished together in the area. This was just about as complicated a set of economic, social, legal, political, and diplomatic problems as can be conceived in a fishery problem. Yet the 10 nations—working on the example of the now old halibut commission—did sign a conservation treaty, establish the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, conduct their researches jointly under it, and finally began to jointly regulate their fishermen. My friends from New England tell me that progress under this multilateral commission has been most satisfactory. International friction over the fisheries has quite died away, and the haddock and cod are getting larger and easier to catch again.

Now a similar treaty has been signed between the United States and Canada to cover the fisheries of the Great Lakes. Another signed a few years ago between Canada and the United States and Japan to cover all their joint fisheries in the North Pacific has materially reduced friction over fisheries in the area and Russia has even asked for permission to attend the next Commission meeting. For some years 19 nations have been engaged under similar treaty to study and regulate the whale fishery of the whole world under the International Whaling Commission. Although the United States has not had a whale fishery for a generation it took the initiative and leadership in establishing the International Whaling Commission and has actively participated in its work and deliberations. Negotiations are now under way among Japan, Russia, Canada, and the United States to draft a conservation treaty covering the fur seals of the North Pacific. A similar treaty has been proposed by the United States to Mexico to cover the shrimp fisheries of the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, this mixture of industry, scientists, and Government officials in international fisheries conservation commissions works. In all cases where it has been tried, and these are now too many to be regarded as accidental, the resource has been conserved, the industry has been made economically sound, and international friction has diminished or quite disappeared.

What was novel 30 years ago when the citizens of my State first got into such problems has now been recognized as sound practice by the majority of nations. In April of 1955 the fishery experts of 50 countries gathered together in Rome under the auspices of the United Nations in the "International Technical Conference on the Conservation of the Living Resources of the Sea." After 3 weeks of meeting, during which some of the sessions were quite stormy, the conference adopted a report which contained these general conclusions:

> The conference notes with satisfaction conservation measures already carried out in certain regions and for certain species at the national and international level. International cooperation in research (including statistical investigation) and regulation in the conservation of living resources of the high seas is essential. The conference considers that wherever necessary further conventions for these purposes should be negotiated.
>
> The present system of international fishery regulation (conservation measures) is generally based on the geographical and biological distribution of the marine populations with which individual agreements are concerned. From the scientific and technical point of view, this seems, in general, to be the best way to handle those problems. This system is based upon conventions signed by the nations concerned.
>
> From the desire expressed during this conference by all participating nations to cooperate in research and from the guidance given by existing conventions, it appears that there are good prospects of establishing further conservation measures where and when necessary.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, there is a system of international cooperation adequate to provide for the full conservation of fish resources lying in the high seas. It has been tried successfully time after time on a great variety of such problems to the satisfaction of the nations involved and their fishermen. It has the stamp of approval of most of the maritime nations. It is to be hoped that our Latin American neighbors, who are not fishing people, and who have no more trained fisheries scientists than we had 30 years ago, will give this method thorough study and evaluation. It is certain that the United States would give the utmost cooperation in following such a method in their area. It is equally certain that the destruction of the doctrines of the freedom of the seas which they propose to accomplish this end will not prevail.

SENATE

Friday, February 24, 1956

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

Eternal Spirit, who dost bring forth Thy righteousness as the light and Thy judgments as the noonday: In the presence of the ageless realities which the blasphemies of deluded men cannot touch, we pause in reverence, with a deep sense of responsibility as servants of the public welfare, praying for courage to attempt, power to achieve, and patience to endure. In these days of dire perplexity we would commit our way unto Thee, fretting not ourselves because of the men who imagine a vain thing and who attempt to bring wicked devices to pass. Steady us with the assurance that evildoers shall be cut off and that those who wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength and shall inherit the earth.

Our eyes having seen the glory of a government of law bringing peace and prosperity to many States and to men of all colors, creeds, and races, within our own Nation, give us an unshakable faith that a lawful order can be established for the whole world. In this faith steel our hearts to march forward toward the clean world our hands can make. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Johnson of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 23, 1956, was dispensed with.