

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Program

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1958

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered before the World Trade Club of Cincinnati, Ohio on May 20, 1958:

I was particularly pleased to receive your kind invitation to speak before the Cincinnati World Trade Club.

I need not emphasize the vital importance of the reciprocal trade agreements program to your area, and it is on this subject that I should like to address my remarks today.

We must look at our trade policy in the perspective of the times. The Soviet Union is challenging us in the struggle for men's minds everywhere. Significantly, the new Soviet Ambassador to the United States is an expert on trade and equally significant, the number two man of the Soviet Union, the Deputy Premier, Mr. Anastas Mikoyan, is a trade expert. It has been Mikoyan who has used trade to get a grip on the economies of such varied countries as Egypt, Syria, Burma, Iceland, and now missions are to be found all over Latin America negotiating for Brazilian coffee, Argentine wheat and beef, Chilean copper, wool from Uruguay, and similar raw materials.

The events of the last fortnight in Latin America demonstrate more eloquently than any words that I may command the efficiency with which the Communists exploit our trade difficulties. Of course, all of the demonstrations in Latin America against our Vice President were Communist inspired. But, had it not been for festering discontent caused by our lack of policy in trade matters toward many of these countries, I doubt if the Communists would have been quite so successful.

In this connection let me read a quotation from a recent article in Business Week magazine concerning the Soviet trade offensive:

"The Communists, for their part, are playing the political angles just as they did in 1955 before the last summit meeting. Soviet leaders keep stressing that 'mutually advantageous economic ties' will help ease international tension. From more normal trade relations the Communists obviously hope to gain political respectability.

"That would speed their political penetration of the Free World and help promote their already fast-expanding trade with the underdeveloped countries, including Latin America. In addition, the Reds probably stand to gain some real, if marginal, economic advantages from increased trade with the West."

Just a few months ago Mr. Khrushchev told American reporters in Moscow: "We declare war on you—excuse me for using such an expression—in the peaceful field of trade.

"We declare a war we will win over the United States. The threat to the United States is not the ICBM, but in the field of peaceful productions. We are relentless in this and it will prove the superiority of our system."

How shall we respond to this new challenge? How do we propose to fight this new kind of war and with what weapons? Can we afford to throw away what weapons we

have or let them rust into uselessness? That surely would be the height of folly and irresponsibility. And yet that is what would happen if we scrapped the reciprocal trade program or crippled it with protectionist amendments. I am pleased to report to you tonight that the Committee on Ways and Means, on which I am privileged to serve, has resisted these pressures to destroy or cut the program. We have reported a good bill that is faithful to the principles of our program. I say we do have weapons to fight this war, weapons that are battle-tested and ready and the trade-agreements program is one of these.

We must recognize, however, that there is an important difference between what we can do through our trade policy and what the Soviet bloc can and is doing with its trade policy. In the case of the Soviet bloc it is the Government that is engaging directly in foreign trade, making deals designed to exploit weak points in the Free World economic picture. The basic philosophy of our trade program is that governments should progressively remove barriers to trade so that it will move in response to the needs and decisions of thousands upon thousands of individual businessmen conducting their businesses in an atmosphere of freedom of enterprise. That is the fundamental difference that reflects the basic philosophies of our two systems and it is a difference that needs emphasis. If we really believe in free societies and associations of men, of which free enterprise is one of the cornerstones, then it is important to put freedom to work for us in the field of trade relations.

This long-run contest is, after all, a contest of ideologies, of economic and political systems. We seek to unleash the energies, the initiative, the ingenuity of freemen throughout the Free World for the purpose of developing the economic life of that world so that the benefits of increasing productivity and growth can be shared by all. Trade, and expanding trade, in an atmosphere of greater and greater freedom is a vital means of accomplishing that objective. Our greatest strength, therefore, is also our greatest weapon. It is strange then that so many leaders of business at home who believe in free enterprise call for Government interference the moment trade crosses a national frontier.

There is a second important characteristic of the trade policy that deserves more attention than it has received. Unlike other proposed solutions to the difficulties that beset us, such as greater military expenditures and increasing foreign aid, trade is a weapon that brings us good returns today and in the future. By making trade freer and permitting it to expand, we are not only letting it go to work as an effective instrument of foreign policy and as a tool for strengthening the Free World and, therefore, indirectly weakening the Soviet bloc, we are also—and this is fundamental—adding to our own economic strength, improving our own economic productivity, giving better and more jobs to people in the United States, providing ourselves with increasing raw materials at lower costs and giving the consumer a greater break in terms of the range of things he can buy and the prices he has to pay for them. Viewed entirely from the point of view of our selfish economic interests as a nation, freer and expanding trade would be a policy that is very desirable to follow. But when in addition to purely selfish economic interests, we add the dimension of foreign policy and the contribution that trade can make to the economic health and prosperity of the Free World, then the development of an effective and sound trade policy becomes

overwhelmingly essential. It seems to me that this is the proper perspective in which to view the reciprocal trade program and to weigh the many arguments pro and con that will fill the air over the next few months.

These, then, are the essential issues as I see them.

We must be frank about it. This program may cause competitive disturbances and injury to small segments of the American economy. But that is no reason to throw over the big idea, the good idea. The benefits from our trade policy both in terms of the benefits to our own economy as well as in terms of our national security, are so overwhelming that they cannot possibly be permitted to be reversed by the special interests of a few. The United States economy makes adjustments each year to changing competitive circumstances that dwarf into insignificance the kinds of adjustments that would be required in response to a more liberal trade policy. By and large I feel that the future growth potential of the United States economy will permit these adjustments to take place without any undue burden on any segment of the economy or any group of individuals or individual businesses. Nevertheless, we cannot afford to undermine our program because of the fears, either real or imaginary, or what the adverse consequences of that program might be on the few. Indeed, where problems do arise it seems to me that we can exercise our imagination sufficiently to devise other ways of treating these problems, ways that would not undermine or do violence to the basic policy we wish to pursue.

The greatest danger to the trade-agreements program, however, does not come from those who would like to throw it overboard, and who would vote against any extension of the program. Rather it comes from those who are willing to vote for extension of the trade-agreements program if—and that is a pretty big if—if amendments are made in it that will take care of certain groups who want protection, or if some of the procedures under the program are changed, or if the period of extension is something less than 5 years, or if the authority to reduce tariffs is something less than 25 percent. It is from this kind of alleged proponent of the program that the greatest danger to the program lies.

I think our committee in reporting the bill that we have, has served the interests of our foreign trade program well. We have recommended a 5-year extension of the reciprocal trade agreements program and authority for the President to reduce duties by 25 percent, as the President requested. We have made some other amendments in the legislation, many of which are of a technical nature. There is one amendment that I am sure you have already read about and that you will hear more about in the future. That is an amendment which would permit both Houses of Congress by a two-thirds vote of each House to put in effect recommendations of the Tariff Commission under the escape clause after the President has refused to do so. I am frank to say that I did not like this amendment, for I think there are sufficient procedures and provisions in existing law that can offer remedies for domestic industries that are seriously injured as a result of import competition. I do think that the amendment that the committee accepted was carefully worked out to be consistent with the basic framework of the trade-agreements program. Although I think that our committee's bill is a good bill, and I should point out that all its amendments have been accepted by the administration, I must say in all candor that it is a

basic minimum that should not be compromised if we are to have a meaningful trade-agreements program in the years ahead. I say this for reasons that are very important. Let me cite one that relates to the extension for 5 years and authority to reduce tariffs by 25 percent. I believe that this feature of the bill is absolutely essential.

One of the leading amendments being talked about most provides for a 3-year extension. Now it is perfectly true that in the past the trade agreements legislation has been extended for a maximum of 3 years from time to time. Why then, should it be extended for 5 years as the President has asked? The answer is very simple. Through a 5-year extension we hope to accomplish something that could not be accomplished by a 3-year extension. We hope to enter into a meaningful trade agreement with the six countries that make up the common market in Europe and possibly with several of the other countries who make up the larger free-trade area in Europe for the purpose of reducing the tariffs that they will be imposing against goods from the outside, particularly from the United States. A 5-year extension is necessary so that such an effective agreement can come into being. The timing of the common market is such that the first adjustment in the external tariff of the 6 will take place in 1962, that is, 4 years hence. That will be the time to effect a change in their external tariffs to the advantage of our trade. Now it takes time to negotiate a trade agreement and more than that we need preparatory time so that the six will be on notice of our intent to enter into a trade agreement with them. With a 3-year extension of authority, the President would find himself without authority to enter a trade agreement just at the time when he would be able to use that authority in making a trade agreement with the common market.

There are other amendments that will be pushed by the opponents of the trade-agreements program both in the House and in the Senate after the House completes action, which I hope and expect will sustain the decisions of our committee. Many of these amendments would, in effect, return the whole process of fixing rates of duties to the Congress without regard to the President and without regard to the obligations that we have undertaken in trade agreements negotiated under the program so far.

Such amendments, of course, turn the clock back to the Smoot-Hawley days. This means that Congress would be attempting to write thousands upon thousands of tariff rates. Imagine, if you will, the log-rolling and back-scratching which would be substituted for a constructive foreign-trade policy.

The late Senator Arthur Vandenberg, after the tremendous labors of the Smoot-Hawley tariff, commented that never again should the Congress attempt to write a general tariff bill. He pointed out the utter futility of this attempt and since that time the number of commodities subject to tariff rates has increased by many, many thousands.

A third type of amendment that is being proposed would provide for the extensive use of import quotas as a means of regulating manufactured imports. This is to my mind a most curious and dangerous kind of proposition. One of the major arguments that I have heard the opponents of this legislation make over the years is that the reciprocal trade-agreements program has not been reciprocal enough. The argument is that foreign countries have used import quotas, licensing arrangements, and exchange controls to regulate imports into their countries and that the use of these weapons tends to reduce or eliminate the tariff reciprocity that we expected to enjoy as a result of the trade agreements that we have entered into with them. Now, of course, as every businessman familiar with foreign trade knows,

these restrictions against United States imports are very burdensome on our export trade, and progress has been made in their removal over the last few years. But they were put on and they exist today because of the need to protect the balance of payments and foreign-exchange reserves of these countries. The dollar shortage is still a problem that confronts a great many countries. If you don't have enough dollars to pay for all the goods you want, you have to ration the supply of dollars for use on goods that enjoy the highest priority.

The fact is that in 1957 our exports of merchandise exceeded our imports by \$6 billion and foreign countries lost some \$800 million of reserves in that period.

Surely the best way to gain the removal of these restrictions against United States exports is to increase the dollar earnings of foreign countries, to close that \$6 billion gap by increased trade. Instead of taking the constructive route that offers a long-run solution to the problem, the protectionists want to imitate these varied devices that will further burden international trade.

These are just some of the amendments to the legislation that are now being proposed. There will certainly be others. There will be many ingenious attempts to scuttle and undermine the reciprocal trade-agreements program. These have to be fought and defeated if we are to have a program that makes sense in terms of the position of our country in the world today.

Yes, I think we have a crisis in our trade policy today. I think it will still be difficult to obtain a strong new law, although the action of our committee is very encouraging in this respect.

But at the same time I am confident—I am cautiously confident—that we will succeed, for I believe that the American people recognize what is at issue in this fight. We have an awesome responsibility. One that must be shared by every citizen, by every Member of the Congress, and not the least of all, the President of the United States, whose position will be crucial in the course that this legislation follows through the Congress of the United States. The stakes are therefore high and we have to play to win. If we do, we will win, and the rewards will flow for many years to come.

### Armenian Independence Day

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1958*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, May 28, 1958, marks the 40th anniversary of Armenian Independence Day.

Armenian Independence Day is not marked as a great, or significant event in world history, but that day marks a momentous landmark for the Armenian people. That day stands for the rebirth of Armenia as a nation after the lapse of more than 500 years. The Armenian people had lost their national independence long before the discovery of America, but they had succeeded in keeping alive their national consciousness for freedom and independence. And for holding to these ideals they were massacred by their implacable enemy, the Turks. During the First World War nearly 1 million Armenians lost their lives, and the survivors of that holocaust

gathered in their homeland, at the foot of their historic Mount Ararat, and proclaimed their independence on May 28, 1918.

The newly born state began under severe handicaps. Economically it was in ruins; politically it was insecure. Nevertheless, in the course of about 2 years a democratic government was instituted there. It was recognized by the leading powers of the West, and it succeeded in maintaining the country's precarious independence. In the fall of 1920, however, the enemies of freedom and independence were readied to attack Armenia. The combined Communist Russian and nationalist Turkish forces put an end to Armenia's independence early in December of 1920. Since then, independent Armenia lives only in the memory of freedom-loving and patriotic Armenians. They celebrate their independence day in due solemnity wherever they are permitted to do so. I join them in the celebration of the 40th anniversary Independence Day.

### Dedication of the Shippingport (Pa.) Atomic Power Station

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1958*

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 26, the world's first full-scale atomic power station devoted exclusively to peaceful uses was dedicated at Shippingport, Pa., in accordance with the following program:

12:50 p. m.: Welcome, Philip A. Fieger, chairman of the board, Duquesne Light Co. 1 p. m., dedication (on television): Remarks by Philip A. Fieger, chairman of the board, Duquesne Light Co.; Mark W. Cresap, Jr., president, Westinghouse Electric Corp.; Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission; the Honorable James E. Van Zandt, member, Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Dedication (from Washington) by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. (At the conclusion of his dedication speech the President will wave a neutron wand over a neutron counter which, by remote control, will open the main valve on the turbine generator at Shippingport and raise the electric power load to full capacity, 60,000 kilowatts, sending electricity into homes, stores, and industrial plants in the Pittsburgh district. Both the wand and the neutron counter were used by the President for the Shippingport groundbreaking, September 6, 1954.)

Representing the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, it was my privilege to deliver the following brief address titled "Shippingport—Our Answer to the Russians":

#### SHIPPINGPORT—OUR ANSWER TO THE RUSSIANS

(Speech by Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, at ceremony for dedication of Shippingport plant on May 26, 1958)

It is a distinct honor for me to have the privilege of representing the Congressional

Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on this important occasion.

From the standpoint of the Joint Committee, our eyes have been focused on this project from its inception and this project is truly considered one of our favorites.

Already you have heard from distinguished guests on this program and you have been furnished with many of the details of this, the world's first commercial atomic power-plant.

Therefore I should like to touch briefly on another aspect of this tremendous accomplishment in the field of atomic energy.

Just 2 weeks ago the Soviet Union launched Sputnik No. 3, a 3,000-pound satellite, which is now circling the earth every 106 minutes.

The Soviets are tremendously proud of their sputniks and, shortly after Sputnik No. 3 was launched, Soviet Premier Khrushchev boasted to the world that Russian advances in modern science and engineering were superior to those in the United States.

We are here today, in my home State of Pennsylvania, to give the American answer to Mr. Khrushchev in dedicating the Shippingport reactor which will be used for peaceful purposes and as the first step in the development of atomic power to benefit the consumers in our country and in the Free World.

It is true that the Soviets have made tremendous accomplishments in modern rocketry, obtaining a thrust which many experts have estimated to be around 500,000 pounds.

But of what value are the Soviet rockets to Ivan consumer, who is still enjoying an inferior standard of living?

While the Soviets have been working on their rockets we in the United States have been working on a vigorous defense program, and, at the same time, have been making a reality of President Eisenhower's pledge of atoms for peace.

Last October I visited Soviet Russia for 6 days, together with some of my colleagues on the Joint Committee, and inspected Russia's atomic energy research centers.

Again and again we asked to see the large-scale atomic powerplants which the Soviets had previously claimed to be under construction.

We were given evasive answers, delays, and refusals.

Does this mean that the Soviets have abandoned their atomic-power program and are doing little or nothing to develop atoms for peace?

Shippingport to me is a good answer to the Russian sputniks, since in this country we have built an atomic powerplant that is exclusively for peaceful purposes.

This reactor is the first of a series of large-scale atomic powerplants—from which will stem the secrets of the art—as far as atomic power is concerned.

In addition, this reactor is a good example of Government and private industry pioneering together in a new field of great technical difficulties. Truly it is free enterprise at its best.

Therefore, the Russians should take a good look at private industry in this country, and carefully examine this partnership between Government and business.

In Russia, the Government owns everything, and there is no competition with the Government, as Mr. Bulganin, General Zhukov, Mr. Malenkov, and scores of others can testify.

But here things are different.

Even in this very first reactor private industry participated and I would like to congratulate the Westinghouse Electric Corp. and Duquesne Light Co. for helping to share part of the cost burden for this first prototype reactor.

In this country we believe in private industry and in competition.

We believe that through the normal American incentives and the desire to make the

best mousetrap, and make an honest dollar in the process, we will develop atomic power.

If we encourage private industry and help it to get started for just a few more years in this new and difficult field we will lead the Russians.

This, then, is our answer to the Russian sputniks.

We are developing the atom for peaceful purposes and we are doing it by means of partnership between Government and industry.

All of us, the Atomic Energy Commission, Admiral Strauss, Admiral Rickover, and the Atomic Energy Commission laboratories, and the Duquesne and Westinghouse Co.'s can be justifiably proud of this, the first all-commercial reactor.

Let us consider it as a monument to American genius and our system of free enterprise, which is the envy of the world.

Yes, Shippingport is our answer to Mr. Khrushchev and his sputniks.

### Some More Stories That Tickle—Excerpts From Broadcast, June 15, 1958, New York Station, WINS

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in one of my previous broadcasts, I included some stories and witticisms. I also told of the gentle art of insult. There has been a considerable number of requests for more. This, therefore, is sort of a repeat performance.

I have been reading John Gunther's *Inside Russia*, and he tells of a gathering at the Turkish Embassy. Former Ambassador Bohlen introduced John Gunther to Khrushchev as a writer and journalist. Thereupon, Khrushchev gave it as his opinion that journalists were an extremely low breed of cats. This strong remark was as unexpected as it was boorish. Gunther saw a few feet away Shepilov, who was then foreign minister. He was conducting some sort of press conference. Gunther remembered that he had been editor of *Pravda*. Gunther then responded to Khrushchev, "If you have such a low opinion of journalists, why did you make a journalist your foreign minister?" Khrushchev reddened. He replied, "He is the only good journalist in Russia, so we had to give him a job." That must have made the faces of many other journalists red.

It is said that when Stalin died and Khrushchev was on his rampage of de-Stalinization he did not know what to do with the body of Stalin. He cabled Eisenhower whether he would want the body of Stalin. Eisenhower cabled back, "We don't take Commies, dead or alive." Khrushchev then cabled Eden. Eden said he was embarrassed enough by Suez and, therefore, would not take Stalin. Khrushchev then cabled Ben Gurion of Israel, asking him to take Stalin. Ben Gurion replied, "We will take the body but remember Israel is the land of resurrection." Khrushchev cabled Ben

Gurion, "Never mind. Have decided to keep the body in the Kremlin."

Now that we have mentioned Israel, it might be appropriate to call attention to the fact that Israel is hemmed in closely by enemy states. Wherever you are in Israel, you can well nigh see a border. Conductors on the railroad that goes to Tel Aviv from Jerusalem, go through the cars and yell, "Ladies and gentlemen, please don't put your head out of the state."

The other day in my desultory reading, I ran across a few Scotch jokes. You know a Scotch joke is as persistent in growth as is the thistle; as universal as whisky; sometimes as difficult to understand as the bagpipes.

It is said that the kilt was invented because it had no pockets and what use have the Scotch for pockets?

I am told that in the treaty which concluded the union with England way back in 1707, the Scotch retained the right to manufacture whisky. That may be the reason why there is no English whisky—only Scotch whisky. Speaking of whisky, I recall the story of Lady Astor speaking in the interests of temperance. It was during the time of our "noble experiment"—or shall we say ignoble experiment, namely, prohibition. She was addressing a group of rough and grimy London dockworkers. In speaking of the perils of drink, she said, "I'd rather commit adultery than drink a glass of beer." The dockworkers with one voice yelled, "Who wouldn't?"

Now back to Scotland again, I am told an example of rigid economy is a dead Scot. And of course, there was the Scotchman who sent his pajamas to the laundry with a sock in each pocket.

The Scotch doctor lay dying. After 50 years of helping others into and out of this world, he himself was to be called to face death, the noblest experiment of them all. With almost his last breath he said to his wife, the faithful companion of his joys and sorrows: "When I'm to be buried I want a nameplate on my coffin." "Ye shall have it," assured the widow-to-be; and contentedly, the ancient physician turned his face to the wall. And on the morning of his funeral the passersby noticed that the polished brass plate which had graced the doctor's doorpost was missing; and the graveside standers read through their tears, as they lowered the casket into the earth, "Angus Abernethy, M. D., office hours, 9 to 11 a. m."

It was a Scotchman who walked into a dairy and asked for a pound of butter wrapped in today's paper.

"Jock, why are you beating your little boy?" "He bought an all-day sucker at 3 o'clock in the afternoon."

When they reduced the carfare in Glasgow from eightpence to sixpence the natives were furious. It enabled them to save only sixpence instead of eightpence by walking home.

One cautious Scotsman refused to go to a banquet because he did not know what the word gratis on the invitation meant. Next morning he was found dead before an open dictionary.

Sandy pulled out his handkerchief and a set of false teeth hit the deck. "They are the auld woman's," he explained,

picking them up. "I caught her eating between meals."

Sandy's wife lay very ill. In fact, the doctor had as good as said that the end was only a question of time. Beside the bed, by the light of a single candle, Sandy kept watch. Eventually he found it necessary to leave the room for a short time.

"Are ye all right, Maggie?" he questioned.

"As right as I can be this late along," came the hoarse reply.

"Well, I am leavin' ye for a minute or so. But Maggie—if ye feel yersel' slippin', will ye blow out the candle?"

Now back to England. The English are sticklers for protocol. I journeyed to London some years ago with an important piece of legal business. My solicitors were the firm of Littleton, Littleton, Littleton & Littleton. I sought to phone one of the partners. After reaching their office on the phone, I asked for Mr. Littleton. The voice on the other end said with a decided English accent, "Sorry, sir, but Mr. Littleton is grouse hunting in Scotland." I then asked again for a Mr. Littleton. "Sorry, sir," said the voice again, "Mr. Littleton is on vi-cation." "Well," I rejoined, "I'd like to speak to Mr. Littleton." I fear you cannot," replied the voice, "for he's ill in the 'ospital." I finally added, "Well, can't I speak to a Mr. Littleton?" "This is Littleton speaking," finally said the voice meekly on the other end of the phone.

Do you know where the word "tip" originated? Of all places, Scotland. A Scotchman originated the custom of tipping.

In the early days the English railroad trains stopped at the stations for meals. Naturally the travelers had to dine quickly. And once a Scotchman placed a sixpence beside his plate to attract attention of the waiter. The habit spread quickly and soon the owner of the tavern placed a sign over the door, reading: "To insure prompt service, pay the owner." The first letters of the words "to insure prompt service," make up the word "tips."

## We Can Do a Good Job of Foreign Aid

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

### HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1958

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, We are all relieved over the release of the American mining men kidnaped in Cuba by revolutionaries. They have been returned to their jobs and homes in good health and apparently none the worse for wear.

The news was especially welcome to us in Louisiana, for the great industrial project on which these men were working—and are now again working—is partly a Louisiana venture, and the captives have many friends and neighbors in my State.

It is difficult to read any sense into this strange, nightmarish episode. But

it does draw our attention sharply southward once again—toward Latin America, where only a few months ago our prestige and our pride were heavily hit by the reception accorded Vice President Nixon.

At the time of that violently anti-American outbreak, this country began some earnest soul searching about our Latin American policy—where it had failed and what direction it might now take—with the aim of restoring some measure of Pan American amity. One thing was clear then. One thing is clear now. We must make absolutely certain that our aid programs do not simply enrich the already rich, to the neglect of the poor. We must endeavor to help raise standards of living for the mass of the people, and avoid contributing to the imbalance of wealth which is already so prevalent in the area.

In our consideration of ways and means to achieve this much-to-be-desired end, it would seem to me to be fruitful to examine those United States projects in Latin America which appear to be already accomplishing our purpose and which may therefore have a lesson for us in our future efforts to mend our badly damaged fences. The kidnaping in Cuba puts the spotlight on just such a project. The scene of the crime was a place in northeast Cuba called Moa Bay, where a vast nickel- and cobalt-mining venture is taking shape—a venture which, to my way of thinking, represents the best kind of aid to Latin American countries.

Let me give you a thumbnail sketch of the project, which is being conducted by Cuban American Nickel Co., a subsidiary of Freeport Sulphur Co., and which is creating for the United States a major new source of strategic nickel and cobalt.

The first step will be the mining of ore from the hills above Moa Bay. The ore will then be concentrated in a large plant near the mine, and the concentrates will be shipped to Port Nickel, near New Orleans. There the concentrates will be treated in a refinery to produce nickel and cobalt in metallic form. The annual productive capacity will be 50 million pounds of nickel and 4,400,000 pounds of cobalt.

A total of \$119 million is being invested—\$75 million of it in Cuba—to bring this project into being. It represents the largest single privately financed industrial enterprise in the history of Cuba.

Construction is currently underway, and production will begin in the summer of 1959. There now are some 2,500 Cubans employed on the job, and when the construction phase is over and the operation settles down to commercial production, there will be permanent, year-round employment for more than 1,000 Cubans. This is tremendously important to a country which is built almost entirely on a seasonal sugarcane economy, and which must wrestle everlastingly with an employment problem.

In addition, many millions of dollars will accrue to our Cuban friends through taxpayments and purchases, and through the growth of service industries. And this is no one-shot proposition. This is the creation of a new and en-

during basic industry in an area of Cuba which is almost literally a wilderness. It is a major breakthrough in the development of Cuban minerals, and it may very well herald a future for Cuba as one of the principal mining centers of the world. For the same ores which yield nickel and cobalt may also one day yield iron, chrome, and other valuable metals.

Of course, the main question at issue—in the light of our difficulties elsewhere in Latin America—is what do the Cubans think of all this. And, on this question, the kidnappings shed considerable light. Throughout this ugly interlude, virtually all of the Cubans employed by the project stayed right on the job. Though the entire top management had been spirited away, the construction crews kept the work going on schedule. Such was the loyalty of the Cubans to this American undertaking that a group of foremen stranded in Santiago during the trouble actually undertook to charter a plane to the job site so that the work would not suffer.

This, I submit, is a sound tribute to the project and to the Americans who, despite formidable difficulties, are bringing the project into existence. It is tangible evidence that we can do a good job of foreign aid.

Yet the project does not come under any foreign-aid program as such. Actually it was made possible as a result of the Defense Production Act. Here is a little of the background.

The United States has little nickel of its own. The Nation has been dependent on imports—mainly from a single company in Canada. These imports for years have been inadequate to meet our defense and civilian needs. Congressional committees repeatedly have urged that the Nation's nickel supply be increased. The United States is by far the largest user of nickel—and would be strategically helpless without it. Nickel is essential for defense—in radar, in the Bomarc missile, in atomic-fleet units, in the B-58 bomber, in the experimental X-15 aircraft for space exploration. Accordingly, the prime objective of this Cuba-Louisiana project was to enable the Office of Defense Mobilization to reach its nickel expansion goal—an objective, I might add, which has been attained.

The project is an interesting example of cooperation among governments, private industry, and financial institutions. In the first place, the United States Government, acting through General Services Administration, entered into a contract with Cuban American Nickel Co. under which the Government agreed to buy, at the market prices in effect at the time of the agreement and within certain limits, the nickel and cobalt tendered to it during the early years of operation. The Government also granted accelerated tax amortization with respect to a substantial portion of the cost of the facilities. The Cuban Government, in turn, accorded the project the special tax status to which new industries are entitled under Cuban law.

On the strength of these arrangements, Cuban American Nickel Co. was then

able to borrow from a group of banks a substantial part of the capital requirements. The remaining requirements were supplied by Freeport and by six steel and automobile companies, all large consumers of nickel. The six companies also agreed to purchase substantial amounts of nickel under certain conditions and received the right to purchase additional amounts.

The United States Government, thus, is being called upon for very little. There is no direct foreign aid involved at the expense of the United States taxpayer. There is no United States Government money risked in loans. In fact, the Government may never participate even to the extent of buying nickel and cobalt. It is quite possible that all of the output will be sold to private industry.

To sum up the significance of the undertaking, it is providing the United States with a new source of strategic nickel. It has helped enable the Office of Defense Mobilization to meet its nickel expansion goal. It not only is helping Cuba but also is providing some 600 jobs in my State and is contributing in many other ways to Louisiana's better-than-average strength in the current recession. Most important, projects in Latin America such as this are helping to create friendly relations with our neighbors to the south and a solid front of good will.

## Republicans Face the Future

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1958

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio, the Honorable JOHN W. BRICKER, on May 24 addressed the Ohio State Convention of Young Republicans, and it is with great pleasure that I bring to the attention of my colleagues his remarks. The address follows:

#### REPUBLICANS FACE THE FUTURE

(Address of Senator JOHN W. BRICKER before the Ohio State Convention of Young Republicans, Cleveland, Ohio, May 24, 1958)

This is a campaign year. This is a Republican audience. But in discussing the future with you this evening, I am going to look beyond November, 1958.

There are several reasons why I take the long view. In the first place, I suspect you are not interested in hearing a political pep talk. You know the record of this administration. You know its frustrations in dealing with a Democratic Congress. You know that President Eisenhower deserves a Republican Congress during his last 2 years in office.

Also, I suspect you are more concerned about the next generation than about the next election. If you are not, you certainly ought to be.

And finally, I think you may be fed up with political panaceas, including those advanced by Republicans. The huffing and the puffing of the great game of politics is tolerable, even amusing, in tranquil times. However, the perils of the hour do not permit us to play with trifles.

Politicians in both major parties have constructed dream worlds to accommodate the faithful who are afraid to face reality. In the Democratic dream world the Federal Treasury is an inexhaustible horn of plenty; progress is inevitable, A- and H-bombs to the contrary notwithstanding; and self-reform follows automatically on the heels of social reform.

The Republican dream world, followed by but few, looks more to the past than to the future. In this dream world national isolation is a practical foreign policy; the rugged individualism of the long gone frontier is a cherished ideal; and all the anxieties of the modern age are ascribed to some political plot or conspiracy.

The Democratic dream world is commonly called liberal; the Republican, conservative. Neither label quite fits. Both major parties have usually managed to satisfy members of widely varying political coloration.

Leaving the dream world of politics, we find many real problems for which a liberal philosophy of government will provide one answer and a conservative philosophy another. However, there is a rapidly growing number of crucial issues for which no answer can be found in either liberal or conservative doctrine. A political party which has the courage to face these new problems and the intelligence to solve them holds the key to human survival and human freedom. I hope, and I believe, that the Republican Party will assume this grave responsibility.

The first necessity is a searching reappraisal of the goals of our society and the relationship which ought to exist between our society and that of other peoples. In suggesting that neither liberalism nor conservatism provides any rule of thumb for salvation, I do not mean that we should scuttle the traditional tenets of either philosophy. In the future, as in the past, we shall need the conservative's reluctance to fling away the lessons taught by the long struggle of human beings to free themselves from despotic or paternalistic authority. We shall need also the conservative's disinclination to accept, in the place of these lessons of history, the slogans used to justify the vesting of authority and responsibility in a centralized bureaucracy.

In the future, as in the past, we shall need the liberal's compassion as reflected in the abolition of slavery; the liberal's tolerance for unorthodox views, as evidenced by opposition to censorship; and the liberal's insistence on political equality, as shown by extension of the franchise to women. Unfortunately, we live in a time when words are mercilessly abused and, often, deliberately distorted. Traditionally, "liberal" referred to persons who wanted to emancipate individuals and groups so that they might freely exercise their powers, so far as this could be done without injury to others. Nowadays, liberal, more often than not, identifies a particular type of collectivist.

Nine years ago Bob Taft said, "the battle between liberty and totalitarian government permeates every problem of life." That is even more true today.

We like to think that men and women will never surrender the idea of freedom without some struggle, big or little, before they admit defeat. Yet numerous Americans by their failure to vote seem to be admitting defeat. The admission stems from a paralyzed acceptance of the idea that a complex web of circumstances—the bomb, big government, the spread of communism, and so forth—taken altogether, constitute a process of change so profound and so revolutionary that individuals have no choice but to resign themselves to whatever the future may bring.

Already we are hearing the rationalization for throwing in the towel before the fight for freedom is won. Freedom in America, we are told, was simply a piece of accidental and transitory good fortune, dependent upon an

almost empty continent, and upon the thought and labor of a group of exceptionally gifted men, dead more than a century ago. Fighting stoicism and apathy should be the most important duty of young Republicans. No person has any moral right to sit on the sidelines and view with sardonic detachment a world sinking into barbarism and decadence.

There are many reasons why numerous Americans are worried about the submergence of the individual by the state. Time permits me to mention only a few.

Consider, for example, the capitulation of many schools to what is called progressive or life adjustment education. This is by no means the exclusive concern of conservatives. Almost as many liberals have warned about the proliferation of courses having little or no intellectual content. You can't bring a girl into contact with our cultural heritage by having her write essays on how to clean up the city dump or how to hem a dress. You can't teach a boy chemistry or physics if he prefers to get equal academic credit for playing in the school band or for learning how to drive a car.

It is on the quality, I repeat, on the quality, of American education that the long-range effectiveness of our foreign and national defense policies wholly and absolutely depends. I will concede that on this issue of so-called progressive education the differences between the Republican and Democratic parties are somewhat blurred. But differences do exist. Republicans are not so foolish as to believe that the ills of our educational system can be cured by bandages made of greenbacks; or that some good doctor in Washington has a sovereign remedy. We know that a decent respect for learning must be won at the local community level, not only in the local schools, but in homes and churches as well. We know also that if parents expect something for nothing from Washington their children will naturally believe that their teachers, not they, must bear the laboring oar in the classroom.

Liberals and conservatives, Republicans and Democrats, seem equally disturbed about an obvious decline in morality and by what seems, in spite of increased church attendance, to be a weakening of religious faith. Obviously, there is no political solution. We may well be concerned, however, about the steady expounding of a collectivist social gospel. It was this gospel to which Dr. Henry Wriston referred in his convocation address several years ago at the Yale Divinity School. It is easier, said Dr. Wriston, "to ride the crest of the new wave of the future of social reform and legislative equalization than to preach individual responsibility." The Republican Party has been less willing than the Democratic Party to supply the surfboard.

There has been, in general, a dangerous weakening of political, social, and moral traditions. The results are reflected in increased juvenile delinquency; in growing rates of divorce; in disrespect for the constitutionally reserved powers of the States; in a shrinkage of the sense of individual initiative and responsibility; in dehumanization of labor; in increased pressures toward conformity; in widespread social boredom; and, as I have previously mentioned, in anti-intellectualism. But what I especially want to emphasize is that our cherished traditions have been weakened much less by conscious design than by strong impersonal forces. Among these strong impersonal forces are a mushrooming population growth, rapidity of transport and communication, and fantastic economic and scientific progress.

The future of this great country of ours, assuming we can avoid atomic annihilation and Soviet conquest, will depend on how successful you young people are in reconciling the powerful impersonal forces of

which I have spoken with the political, economic, and social institutions essential to the preservation and perpetuation of human freedom. I assure you that this will be no easy task. The answer does not lie in any body of political doctrine. It has not yet been written into any party platform. But perhaps I can indicate by a few questions that the challenge to you young Republicans is greater by far than any presented to your elders.

How long can you gobble up 1,100,000 acres of farmland every year for highways, factories, and subdivisions without destroying needed agricultural production or national elbowroom in the great outdoors?

How are you going to close the gap between technological power, increasing on a nearly vertical curve, and the relatively constant supply of human wisdom and morality needed to control that power?

How are you going to adapt the organic law written for a nation of 3 million people to a nation that may become almost as populous as India or China?

If people do not sink deep roots into relatively stable communities, what substitute for community censure will you devise to check crime and immorality?

Without abridging freedom of speech how are you going to cope with the political and social dangers inherent in mediums of mass communication concentrated in a few hands?

If the Republican Party does not have the answers to these questions on the horizon, at least it has the honesty not to pretend to have them. We can tell the voters in all honesty, however, that unless the cold war is honorably and peacefully ended there will be no opportunity for free Americans to grapple with the problems of the future. And this brings me to the most immediate concern of the American people—the power of the Soviet Union and the moral irresponsibility of its leaders.

Foreign policy ought to be a major issue in this campaign year. I am not one who believes that politics should stop either at the water's edge or outside the doors of the Pentagon. The people have a right to know and a duty to decide. It is unthinkable to stifle political discussion of issues intimately related to the survival of the human race.

As Republicans we can be very proud of the record of the Eisenhower administration in avoiding war while at the same time confining communism to virtually the same territory it held 6 years ago. We can be sure that President Eisenhower, notwithstanding extreme Soviet provocation, is not going to abandon the quest for peace. Moreover, the Republican Party will never launch a war, or permit the Nation to be dragged into war, for the purpose of solving domestic unemployment.

President Eisenhower and Republicans in the Congress have avoided two extremes in foreign policy. The adoption of either extreme position would be calamitous. The first extreme is that we should not negotiate with the Soviet Union except on the terms of its dissolution. The overwhelming majority of Republicans and Democrats have rejected the idea that the only alternative to the cold war is the unconditional surrender of the Soviet Union.

At the other extreme is a will to believe, in spite of a multitude of broken promises, that the rulers in the Kremlin can be trusted to carry out agreements to end the threat of mutual annihilation. This sentimental view is largely confined to Democratic circles. Not many Democrats actually say we ought to rush headlong into a summit conference, but many of them condemn as rigid and inflexible the conditions imposed by President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles. Those conditions are that adequate preparations be made; that an agenda for the summit be agreed to; and that the Soviet Union

provide some evidence of its willingness to negotiate in good faith. Those who argue for a summit conference without these conditions being met have substituted wishful thinking for prudent logic.

An even more dangerous manifestation of sentimentality is on the subject of nuclear weapons testing. You will recall that the Democratic Party's candidate for President in 1956 called for stopping these tests without any enforceable agreement to insure Soviet compliance. Since then, the hazards of radioactive fallout have been grossly exaggerated. The gush of sentimentality on this subject has been so great as to partially obscure these facts:

First. There is no real health danger in the present rate of atomic-bomb testing.

Second. The problem of antimissile defense is insoluble if we halt these tests;

Third. We have learned, as a result of these tests, how to make clean bombs, which means that if global war cannot be avoided the human race will still have a fair chance of survival;

Fourth. We have learned, as a result of these tests, about many peaceful applications of atomic energy;

Fifth. If we unilaterally stop our tests, the Soviet Union can continue some of theirs without detection; and

Sixth. Communist Russia has violated almost every major international agreement it has signed.

Young Republicans in company with other young Americans face a difficult and challenging future. You and your friends, as reasonable and honest men and women, may well disagree on how to solve problems without precedent. But I hope you will tell as many people as you can during this 1958 campaign in Ohio that there will be no future at all if the balance of political power in this country passes into the hands of those who are willing to sign a suicide pact with the man who has sworn to bury us all.

### Congresswoman Edith Green's Report on Russian Education

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1958

MR. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, following her return from a recent trip to the Soviet Union, Congresswoman EDITH GREEN prepared a series of articles highlighting her impressions of Russia and of its educational system. While these articles have already been published in the Oregon press, I feel that they are of nationwide importance and that they will be of special interest to my colleagues.

As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, Mrs. GREEN has been directly confronted with the educational challenge facing our Nation. She and other members of the committee have examined with close attention the educational system of the Soviet Union, considering both the benefits and shortcomings of that system.

I wish to take this opportunity to commend Mrs. GREEN for undertaking her long and arduous trip. The firsthand knowledge which she has gained, coupled with her close familiarity with education in this country, provides a background

which will be much needed as Americans move forward to cope with their current educational problems.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

#### SOME IMPRESSIONS OF RUSSIA

(By Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, of Oregon)

(Pt. 1, April 24, 1958)

The one overriding impression I had as I left Russia was that it was a country of startling contrasts—a country where the dead hand of the past still shows its control in unexpected places but where over 200 million people are directed—and, more often than not, dictated to—by a government that not only puts 5-year plans into operation but also fully expects to see long-range plans materialize.

A country with an educational program, immediate and long range, that is most impressive—almost unbelievable—with a government not only interested in launching sputniks but also in launching a generation of highly educated citizens and millions of skilled technicians.

A country where the government is actively antireligious but where, despite the government's activities, the churches are crowded, and at the Easter service, thousands of young and old were on the streets vainly trying to enter but being unable to find room in the Greek Orthodox churches.

A country where long lines form for 350 rubles (\$3.50) tickets to superb opera and ballet performances at the Bolshoi Theater every night except Monday but where long lines also form to buy bread and other foods which they carry home without benefit of any wrappings.

A country that can successfully launch a good-size satellite and build the magnificent University of Moscow 33 stories high but builds "10 grade" schoolhouses that look 40 years old after only 2 years use.

A people with tremendous interest and enthusiasm for music, dancing, and painting, but who can give little, if any, expression to their artistic tastes in their dress, their personal belongings, and their homes.

A people who lay great stress on the place and importance of women but who have crews of older women repairing streets, throwing bricks into trucks, and shoveling dirt.

Moscow—a city where countless families live in 1-room apartments and where several share kitchen and bathroom facilities, but a city with a tremendous housing program underway with miles of eight-story apartment houses newly constructed.

A country which encourages its students to seek the truth in scientific matters and encourages investigations into the unknown in all the physical sciences, but which teaches the "party line" only in Communist ideology.

A people who claim they have complete freedom, but who must get a pass to go to the library, school, or the Kremlin.

A country where the older people, by and large, are uneducated and untrained by American standards, but where this generation is given educational opportunities undreamed of by their parents.

A country which has undergone a violent revolution and has seen its cities, towns, and much of its industrial potential destroyed by war, but by 1958 launched the first satellite, has jet passenger planes in operation and is ahead of us in the development of the ICBM.

What is the potential for 20 years from now of this country of strange contrasts when it is today spending 11 to 15 percent of its national budget on education?

What is the significance of this for the United States and its educational system?

## SOME IMPRESSIONS OF RUSSIA

(By Congresswoman EDITH GREEN of Oregon)  
(Pt. 2, April 29, 1958)

Russia is making a tremendous investment, not only in the sputniks today, but in the leaders of tomorrow. They obviously think it worthwhile—to the tune of 68 billion rubles a year; this means about 12 percent of their national budget is spent on education. An additional amount is spent on science, estimated at 15 billion rubles. (The current rate of exchange is 10 rubles for a dollar.)

Moscow Middle School No. 6 is probably a little above the average for the 600 10-grade schools in the Soviet capital. But the educational system is so standardized that there isn't too much difference between the best and the poorest. By a more concentrated curriculum and a 6-day week, the subject matter covered in 10 years corresponds roughly to what we teach in 12 years of elementary and high school.

I visited kindergartens, middle schools, internats, House of Pioneers, pedagogical institutes and universities. The libraries and laboratories I saw were exceedingly well-equipped. I don't pretend to be an expert in Soviet education; I was there only long enough to scratch the surface. However, I did take with me the knowledge and observations made over several years of actual teaching in Oregon schools, plus a great amount of study and testimony given before the House Education and Labor Committee in regard to education in the U. S. S. R. It is impossible to compare all aspects of American and Soviet systems of education. Each system has its own strengths—its own weaknesses.

It is well established that all Russian schools are teaching foreign languages—English, German, or French and, in some experimental schools, Chinese, Hindi, or Arabic. I am told there are 41,000 English teachers in Russia; in every school I visited there was at least one who spoke English very well. Ordinarily the fifth grader starts the study of a foreign language, but in Middle School No. 6, English is studied in the second grade. A second grade class of 38 is divided into 3 small groups to study a foreign language. In second to fifth grades, they have reading, writing and conversations in English. In sixth and seventh grades this program is expanded. In the eighth grade they have a study of world geography in English. In the ninth grade history and literature in English, and in the 10th grade a study of English literature. Tenth graders carried on 15-minute discussions in beautiful English. Their counterparts in other schools spoke German or French just as fluently.

At School No. 1, I followed these 10th graders around for the better part of a day. There is very strict discipline in the classroom—absolutely no funny business, no whispering, no joking, no laughing. Education is very serious—they know that if they have high marks, the doors of the Institute or University will be open to them. Otherwise they will go to the technicum or join the labor force. Between classes they relax.

Besides studying English, the 10th graders were completing their fifth year of physics, their fourth year of chemistry; they had completed 5 years of biology and were also studying math, Russian language and literature, astronomy, history of the U. S. S. R., and gym. (In schools visited in the Ukraine, the same course of study but with the mother tongue added.)

Adequate school construction is a problem there as well as in the United States. Double shifts are well known.

An undetermined number of students at the seventh grade are transferred to the technicums, or they may go to a trade school, or they may join the labor force. So, in the middle schools beyond the sev-

enth grade, attention is concentrated on the academically inclined. All studying is done at home; in talking with the students I thought this averaged 4 hours a day. Teachers in middle schools or at the Pedagogical Institutes with whom I talked knew nothing about achievement tests or IQ tests. Pure accomplishment is the yardstick. A new program has recently been started for the "wonder kids," a special training for the most talented.

In the 10-grade schools, lunch is served at 2:40 for the upper grades. The student either brings his lunch or he can buy it for 1½ rubles (15 cents). The parents committee of the school arranges to give lunch to the poor. The doctor and dentist come to the school three times a week; the nurse comes every day.

After 4 o'clock those students with the best grades may take additional classes at the House of Pioneers. This 35-year-old program is an expansion of the school program after school, in the evenings and on Sunday. The Palace of Pioneers has 3,000 members. Each student is limited to two "circles." This may be a circle for advanced study in chemistry or music or foreign languages, or it may be a circle for special lessons in ballet or speech or painting or chess or any one of a dozen other activities. The emphasis is not confined to science and mathematics. Great emphasis is put on languages and the fine arts. Many of the statues around the city are of famous poets or painters or musicians, as well as the statues of Lenin and Stalin. At the House of Pioneers, the school uniform is not required. Originally the Pioneers were organized as a Communist youth group. Now, more emphasis is placed on Communist indoctrination for those a little older in the Young Communist League.

Life is extremely serious for Soviet youth—although juvenile delinquency is a problem there, too. Communist youth leaders are discouraging rock and roll, and talking about the rise in "hooliganism."

With all the grimness and the relatively low standard of living, the Russians are not without a sense of humor. I attended a puppet theater one evening. The opening act was a choir of 60 voices—60 robed puppets on the stage singing in beautiful harmony: "We eat vitamins; we eat vitamins A, B, C, and D; we eat vitamins; those who eat vitamins will be healthy and live until they die."

## SOME IMPRESSIONS OF RUSSIA

(By Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, of Oregon)  
(Pt. 3, May 1, 1958)

In the colleges and universities in Russia there are 2 million students. The Minister of Higher Education told me that not less than 75 percent are studying English. In the technicums there are an additional 2 million students.

Moscow University is one of the show-places of the city. The main building is a magnificent structure 33 stories high with 22,000 rooms in it. There are other buildings for chemistry, biology, the humanities, etc., altogether 40,000 rooms with 6,000 for dormitory facilities. There are 24,000 students. No one over 35 may be enrolled as either a full-time student or for evening classes. The 40th university is just being completed; it is in Siberia and will be the second scientific center of all Russia. There are 727 institutes which are schools of special study, such as law, medicine, engineering, teaching. At least 96 percent of all students enrolled in higher education are there on scholarships or have all university expenses paid. Those students who get excellent marks receive 300 to 800 additional rubles a month. However, if they receive the stipend, the Government then dictates the kind and place of work for the next 3 years. There were many pictures on a bul-

letin board outside the auditorium of students pioneering in the "Virgin Lands" (Siberia).

My student guide took me to classrooms, assembly halls, little theater, swimming pool, cafeterias, and laboratories. She said there were 1,700 laboratories; I saw several that seemed to me exceptionally well equipped and also a fabulous museum in the geology department.

About 25,000 students in Russia took postgraduate work this year. A new policy is in effect requiring graduates to work for 2 years before taking postgraduate courses; this is in all fields except theoretical sciences. Quotas at graduate and undergraduate level can be and are manipulated according to "the plan." Next year, for example, they will admit only 200 biology students. From observation and conferences, it was my impression that a very large percentage of the graduates go into the teaching field and this might again indicate that education is the key to the whole Soviet program and that the cold war has been shifted by the astute leaders in the Kremlin from competition in physical strength to competition in brains.

In the 3,642 technicums, technicians are being trained—technicians who can speak English, German, French, Chinese, Arabic, or Hindi. I was forced to ask myself many times, what is the Russian plan 10-20 years from now especially in the underdeveloped countries of the world. I visited a pedagogical institute and talked with the head of the pedagogical branch of the Academy of Scientists; this institution is concerned only about pedagogical research.

I asked about teacher training and was told they require practice teaching for 8 weeks; about 25 percent of the courses are on methods and psychology and about 75 percent on subject matter.

I visited with many teachers who spoke English. A tenth grade beginning teacher is paid 900 rubles (\$90) a month for 18 hours work a week. If that teacher works 27 hours a week she is paid 1,350 rubles a month. The 27-hour week includes time spent correcting papers or in extracurricular activities at the House of Pioneers. Those who supervise are paid more. University professors may be paid 5,000 rubles a month. Teachers may retire at 40 percent of their salary or after 25 years they may continue to teach part or full time and draw in addition a pension equivalent to 40 percent of their basic salary.

In the schools in Kiev and at the University of Kiev, it seemed to me there was much greater freedom; teachers were anxious to visit and had many questions about American schools. Second grade and tenth grade teachers asked me if I knew of students in Oregon who would want to correspond. The head of the zoological museum at Kiev had exchanged exhibits with 51 other countries. Did I know of American Universities who would exchange exhibits? Their museum had been completely destroyed in the war; he apologized it was not as good as it used to be—now they had only 1 million specimens. But they would soon build it to what it once was.

In spite of seemingly more freedom, yet I never felt that either the students or teachers really let down their guard. There was a shield of conformity—a sense of civic duty. Daily routines and long-range plans seemed geared to the demands of the system.

As I left the country, it seemed to me the Russians were putting more emphasis on their education for their purposes than Americans are putting on our education for our purposes. Our immediate security needs must be met, but we should also be concerned with our rate of achievement and with the Soviet rate 10 to 20 years from now. In large part the levels of achievement in the future are being determined in the classrooms now—in their schools and in ours.

**Federal Usurpation—Address by Hon.  
Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1958

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therewith, an address made by the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina, the Honorable STROM THURMOND, to the corps of cadets of The Citadel on March 29, 1958, titled "Federal Usurpation."

Mr. Speaker, during his public life, STROM THURMOND has been one of the most ardent defenders of the basic conception of our Constitution which guarantees to the States that self-autonomy, which we refer to as States rights. As a distinguished jurist, as a distinguished lawyer, and as Governor of the State of South Carolina, he has passionately defended this principle. I know of no person of my acquaintance, nor of the long and illustrious lists of those statesmen who have defended this Republic, who is more capable or qualified to occupy such a position. STROM THURMOND is a scholar and an authoritative student on the Constitution of the United States. As a jurist, some of his finest opinions were on this, the most precious of our constitutional concepts. STROM THURMOND led a fight on this principle in 1948 and received the electoral votes of four States for the Presidency of the United States. He is the only man in the long and illustrious history of this Nation who has ever been elected to the Senate by what is known as a write-in vote, and he later resigned and offered for reelection and received no opposition. STROM THURMOND is respected and admired by men and women of this Nation who love the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, he is a qualified person to speak on the question of Federal usurpation, and he took as his forum the corps of cadets at The Citadel, Charleston, S. C., the greatest military college in this or any other nation. Mr. Speaker, the speech follows:

**FEDERAL USURPATION**

(Address by Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, at The Citadel, the Military College of South Carolina, Charleston, S. C., March 29, 1958)

I wish to speak to you today on the subject of a clear and present danger to American freedom.

I am not speaking of the threat posed by any foreign nation.

I am speaking of a grave domestic problem: Usurpation of power, the arch threat to individual liberty in America. I am speaking of a two-pronged attack on the Constitution of the United States, an attack which has already achieved an alarming degree of success, and which, if not checked now, will result in the complete extinction of individual freedom in this country.

This is, I assure you, no exaggeration. We are faced with an issue the gravity of which cannot be overemphasized. Our free institutions are in critical danger. Yet the American people are tragically unaware of

just how great, and how imminent, is the danger. This is in part because so many of our people are also tragically unfamiliar with the Constitution, not versed in its meaning, its aims and its purposes.

In order to show how vital is the maintenance of our constitutional structure to the preservation of our individual freedom, it will be helpful for us to go back for a moment to the time of the framing of that basic document. By examining the fears and the purposes of the framers, we can more clearly see the enormous threat to our liberties which is posed by this dual assault on the Constitution today—this usurpation by the Federal Government of the rights and powers of the States and, within the Federal Government itself, the usurpation by one branch of powers rightfully belonging to the other two branches.

The men who framed the Constitution knew full well that the greatest potential threat to the liberty of the individual lay in government. That is why they were insistent that the government they were setting up be limited and decentralized. They were determined not to create a power apparatus which, however well it might work and however beneficent it might prove while in their hands, would someday become an instrument of tyranny over the people should it fall into the hands of evil or power-hungry men.

And, being realists, they knew that the power of government would—on many occasions, at least—fall into the hands of evil men of boundless ambition. They knew that the idea of benevolent government, without checks, is a delusion. They knew the utter folly of setting up a government without limitations, in the reliance that good men would control it. Listen to the words of Patrick Henry:

"Would not all the world," he asked, "from the Eastern to the Western Hemisphere, blame our distracted folly in resting our rights upon the contingency of our rulers being good or bad? Show me that age and country where the rights and liberties of the people were placed on the sole chance of their rulers being good men, without a consequent loss of liberty. I say that the loss of that dearest privilege has ever followed, with absolute certainty, every such mad attempt."

Or as Thomas Jefferson later expressed it, in his famed Kentucky Resolutions:

"It would be a dangerous delusion were a confidence in the men of our choice to silence our fears for the safety of our rights: that confidence is everywhere the parent of despotism—free government is founded in jealousy, and not in confidence; it is jealousy and not confidence which prescribes limited constitutions, to bind down those whom we are obliged to trust with power: that our Constitution has accordingly fixed the limits to which, and no further, our confidence may go. \* \* \* In questions of power, then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

What were the chains which the framers fashioned, to bind man down from mischief, in defense of liberty? Principally, they were two simple and workable devices, which together form the main components of our well-known checks-and-balances system.

First, the newly established Central Government was to be kept small and limited. It was a government of enumerated powers only, all powers not delegated to it by the Constitution (nor prohibited to the States) being reserved to the States or to the people. In other words, the Central Government would exercise power over only a limited number of fields of general concern to all the States. Among these would be foreign affairs, military defense, commerce of a genuinely interstate nature, and so on; while the great bulk of domestic matters would continue to be under the jurisdiction of the

several States. The States were by no means supposed to be mere provinces or administrative subdivisions of the General Government, but were separate and distinct sovereignties, coexistent with the General Government. Thus was a balance set up between the new Central Government on the one hand and the States on the other.

Second, within the framework of the new General Government itself, the founders provided for a distinct separation of powers. That is, in order to prevent all the powers of the new Government from being exercised by one man or a single small group of men, it was provided that the legislative, the executive, and the judicial powers should be in the hands of separate branches. By a series of devices, these branches were to be kept independent of one another, insofar as possible.

It was by these 2 governmental principles, these 2 constitutional devices, that our forefathers sought to prevent that concentration of centralized power which they knew would be the death knell of individual liberty in America. Liberty would be safe so long, and only so long, as these two principles remained intact and were scrupulously upheld.

We may express the framers' thinking graphically in this way: The structure of our liberty rests upon these two supports, the twin pillars of States rights and separation of powers. So long as both these pillars stand, unimpaired, our liberties stand also. But if either one of these pillars be destroyed, or slowly eroded away, then, surely and inevitably, the temple of liberty will come crashing down.

Gentlemen, we are nearer to that eventuality than is generally realized. We are very near, dangerously near, to it. By processes which at first were gradual, but which in recent years have assumed a progressively increasing rate, the structure of States rights has been almost completely eroded away, until what was once a sturdy and massive support of American freedom has been whittled down to a very tenuous column indeed.

Actually, the process of infringing on the rights of the States is not new. It began early in our history. Thomas Jefferson saw the beginning of this process of usurpation by the Federal judiciary; he feared its ultimate result, and he expressed his fears as follows:

"There is no danger I apprehend so much as the consolidation of our Government by the noiseless, and therefore unalarming, instrumentality of the Supreme Court."

With prophetic vision, the great Virginian warned further that the germ of dissolution of our Federal system lies in the Federal judiciary, " \* \* \* working like gravity by night and by day, gaining a little today and a little tomorrow, and advancing its noiseless step like a thief, over the field of jurisdiction, until all shall be usurped from the States, and the Government of all be consolidated into one."

Jefferson's description of the process and methods of judicial usurpation is truly remarkable. It could well have been written today. These are his words:

"The Judiciary of the United States is the subtle corps of sappers and miners constantly working underground to undermine the foundations of our confederated Republic. They are construing our Constitution from a coordination of a general and special government to a general and supreme one alone. This will lay all things at their feet. \* \* \* They skulk from responsibility to public opinion. \* \* \* An opinion is huddled up in conclave, perhaps by a majority of one, delivered as if unanimous, and with the silent acquiescence of lazy or timid associates, by a crafty chief judge who sophisticates the law to his mind, by the turn of his own reasoning."

This process which Jefferson depicted was beginning even in his own day. Nevertheless, despite this early beginning of judicial usurpation; despite the War Between the States and the force-imposed postwar amendments, which radically altered the original concept of the Union; despite the nationalizing influence of the commercial expansion of the postwar period—despite all of these things, the basic principle of States rights remained fundamentally intact. The North, the Nation as a whole, might have rejected the Southern contention that States rights included the right to secede and dissolve the Union; but within the framework of Union, the country was still dedicated to the principle of local self-government.

In 1863 Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase echoed the prevailing view when he characterized the United States as "an indestructible Union composed of indestructible States."

Thus, until the 1930's, our governmental system was still fundamentally based on States rights, both in principle and in practice. Not to the extent that some of us had desired, to be sure; not to the extent that the framers had recommended; but still to the extent that the great majority of those vital economic, political, and social activities most closely affecting the people were the subjects of State control only and were outside the province of the Federal Government. And the country and the people seemed aware of the vital importance of keeping them that way. In an address delivered in 1930, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, then governor of New York, emphasized the necessity of preserving States rights, when he declared:

"To bring about government by oligarchy masquerading as democracy, it is fundamentally essential that practically all authority and control be centralized in our National Government. The individual sovereignty of our States must first be destroyed, except in mere minor matters of legislation. We are safe from the danger of any such departure from the principles on which this country was founded just so long as the individual home rule of the States is scrupulously preserved and fought for whenever it seems in danger."

As a distinguished commentator has pointed out, the significance of this address by Governor Roosevelt lies in the fact that it was not merely a statement of the views he himself then held, but rather was a rephrasing, a restatement, of "the long-established American principles which had been well understood and firmly accepted by generation after generation of the American people, and voiced in varying forms innumerable times throughout the country for almost a century and a half."

In the last quarter century, however, we have seen assaults on States rights at every point. We have seen the National Government in Washington expanded to its present swollen size, accompanied by a steady diminution of the reserved powers of the States. It is not my purpose to attempt to fix the blame for this development. Suffice it to say that all three branches of the Federal Government participated in it, and that an acquiescent and desperate people permitted it. The Supreme Court resisted the trend until 1937, but, in that year, as the Honorable Hamilton A. Long, of the New York Bar, explains in his brilliant study, *Usurpers: Foes of Free Man*, the Court underwent a major policy-revolution. From that time forward, the Supreme Court's role has been one of willing, and then eager, collaboration in the process of aggrandizing the Central Government at the expense of the States. In 1954, with the school segregation decision, the Supreme Court really moved into high gear against the States and the Constitution. It sustained the assault with the sub-

sequent *Steve Nelson* and *Girard College* cases. In 1957 the Congress and the executive branch joined in the attack. The passage—in an atmosphere of bogus sanctity and mock legality—of the misnamed civil rights bill was followed shortly by the subjection of a once-sovereign State to bayonet rule, which still continues.

Before leaving the subject of States rights and going into this second aspect of usurpation, within the Federal Government itself, I should like to pause for a moment to reflect upon a circumstance which frankly puzzles me.

I can easily understand why those who are at heart enemies of America and enemies of liberty would seek to destroy States rights. I can easily see why our secret enemies, those who would weaken our civilization and bring our Nation to its knees, would seek to destroy local self-government.

What I cannot understand is, how it is that many loyal and sincere Americans, conscientious and zealous advocates of civil liberty, have in recent years been in the very forefront of the effort to break down the integrity of the States.

These men honestly picture themselves as champions of individual freedom; yet they are its worst enemies. They see some real or imagined violation of civil liberty on the State level—generally a situation in which a member of some racial minority group is allegedly deprived of an alleged right—and, egged on by shrewd and conscienceless politicians bent on corraling the vital minority-group vote, these liberals become inflamed with righteous wrath and filled with deep and honest concern over the fact that an individual's rights are being violated.

So what is their remedy? Do they seek corrective action on the State level? No. They do all in their power to break down the rights of the States and to build up a supergovernment which is supposed to be for the protection of the individual, a supergovernment strong enough to rule the recalcitrant States with an iron hand and thus to prevent them from continuing their alleged denials of the rights of individuals of certain classes.

But does it never occur to these self-styled liberals that this supergovernment they are building up, this "big brother" to police the States, someday may, inevitably will, become itself the greatest possible threat to the rights of the individual? That, by tearing down the rights of the States and centralizing power in Washington, they are building up a power apparatus before which the States first, and later the individual, will be completely powerless? Can they not admit the inexorable truth of Calhoun's solemn warning that the powers which it is necessary for government to possess, in order to repress violence and preserve order, cannot execute themselves? They must be administered by men in whom like others, the individual is stronger than the social feelings. And hence the powers vested in them to prevent injustice and oppression on the part of others, will, if left unguarded, be by them converted into instruments to oppress the rest of the community."

Surely they know that the reins of government will fall into the hands of such men, "in whom the individual is stronger than the social feelings." Or do they naively trust that completely good and altruistic men—themselves, perhaps?—will always be in control? Is not this the very delusion against which the founders warned, the same mad folly so eloquently referred to by Patrick Henry and by Jefferson in their insistence upon a system of checks and balances?

Blinded by shortsightedness and by a failure to read history, these zealous liberals, these self-styled champions of the individual's civil rights, are busily engaged in

breaking down the principle of States rights and thus destroying what is, in the long view, the greatest single bulwark of our individual freedom.

Perhaps they rely on the idea that it is safe to destroy the rights of the States and create a centralized government so long as, within this centralized government, the principle of separation of powers is strictly enforced; that the latter principle is all that is really necessary to guarantee individual liberty.

Nothing could be more wrong. The two pillars, States rights and separation of powers, are complementary to each other. Destroy or remove one, and the other will soon collapse. Jefferson warned that " \* \* \* when all government, domestic and foreign, in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it will render powerless the checks provided of one government on another, and will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated."

And even the arch-Federalist Alexander Hamilton saw clearly that the fate of individual liberty was inextricably tied up with the fate of the States. Said Hamilton:

"The States can never lose their powers till the whole people of America are robbed of their liberties. They must go together; they must support each other, or meet one common fate."

Let us now examine the other face of the coin; let us turn to the second pillar of our checks-and-balances system, the principle of separation of powers, and see how it has fared over the years.

Generally speaking, separation of powers has not been subjected to anything like the degree of attack that has so largely eroded away States rights. This constitutional support is still in a comparatively healthy condition. But in the past 4 years, especially, the Supreme Court has stepped up the assault in this direction, too.

You are probably generally familiar with a series of decisions handed down by the Warren court, in cases involving various aspects of internal security—commonly referred to as the subversion cases. Some of the decisions in these cases constituted further restrictions on the rights of the States, denying them the right to prosecute for or even to investigate sedition and treason or to exclude suspected Communists from the practice of law. Others restricted the executive branch of the Federal Government in its antisubversion efforts and limited the power of Congressional investigating committees in questioning witnesses.

The net effect of these decisions, of course, was to hamper seriously the activities of our Government in the antisubversion field.

But what principally concerns us here is not so much the serious impairment of our Government's antisubversion efforts, deplorable as that is. Nor is it simply the fact that the decisions placed certain restrictions on the Executive and on the Congress.

The more fundamental cause for concern is that, in some of these cases, the Supreme Court has usurped powers rightfully belonging only to the legislative branch of the Government. In other words, the Court has been guilty of judicial legislation. In the *Steve Nelson* case, for example, the Court violated the intent of Congress by construing the Smith Act as giving the Federal Government complete preemption of the antisubversion field, to the exclusion of the States. When the Court thus violates, or goes beyond, the intent of Congress, it is, in effect, making new laws, or legislating—a function which the Constitution bestows exclusively upon Congress.

That the Court has in fact exercised legislative powers is clear to lawyers, and they have reacted with considerable concern. Only a few weeks ago Judge Learned Hand, one of the most eminent jurists in this country, and considered of liberal views,

observed that the Court was apparently becoming a third house of the legislature.

Laymen, however, may have some difficulty in grasping the significant difference between interpretation and judicial legislation and I should therefore like to take a few moments to discuss this point. The Honorable Hamilton A. Long, of New York, of whom we have already spoken, dealt with this vital subject in an editorial which appeared last year in the Saturday Evening Post. Mr. Long wrote:

"Few subjects are surrounded by more confusion than the function of the United States Supreme Court in interpreting the Constitution. There can be no doubt, however, that the Court has no right to change this basic law or to violate the intent of those who initially adopted it or of those who later amended it. Only the people can change the Constitution, by amendment.

"For the Supreme Court to try to bypass this process, by interpreting the Constitution contrary to that original intent, is to usurp power never given it."

In other words, the Supreme Court, in interpreting a provision of the Constitution, must stay strictly within the limits set by the intent of the framers and adopters. Likewise, in the case of construing a statute, the Court cannot violate the intent of Congress.

Once the Court has initially defined this intent, its decision on the matter becomes binding—on the Court itself, as on all others—becomes, in effect, an integral part of the Constitution, or of the statute. This legislative intent, as initially determined by the Court in the first pertinent case to come before it, is absolutely binding thereafter and is not subject to change, except, of course, by new legislation or by constitutional amendment. For the Supreme Court to assume the power to revise, at will, this initial determination of intent completely destroys the stability of the law; and for the Court, in subsequent decisions, to violate this intent (as initially determined) or to go beyond it, is to usurp power never given it.

Where an act of Congress is involved, such action by the Court amounts to judicial legislation. In handing down a decision contrary to the intent of the lawmakers, the Court is itself making new law, and is thus usurping a function which the Constitution vests exclusively in the legislative branch.

And where the Court is interpreting a constitutional provision (or amendment), violation by the Court of the framers' and adopters' intent constitutes an illegal amending of the Constitution. In such a case the Court would be usurping a power rightfully belonging to the people alone; for only the people, through their States, have the right to change the Constitution, and they can do so only by amendment. The decision in the school segregation case of May 17, 1954, is a flagrant example of this type of usurpation.

What are we to do to remedy this critical situation? What steps can we take to save these beleaguered constitutional principles, so vital to our liberty as free men?

In the case of separation of powers, we, the people, by exercising vigilance and firm determination, can nip the process of usurpation in the bud, comparatively speaking. We must remember Mr. Justice Brandeis' words:

"The doctrine of the separation of powers was adopted by the Constitution of 1787, not to promote efficiency but to preclude the exercise of arbitrary power. The purpose was, not to avoid friction, but, by means of the inevitable friction incident to the distribution of the governmental powers among the three departments, to save the people from autocracy."

The Congress can protect itself against further judicial usurpation by exercising its constitutional right to limit the appellate

jurisdiction of the Court. I disagree with those who feel that this is too drastic a remedy. It is an effective way to curb the excesses of the Court and to discipline that body, and it is a curb which the Congress could as easily remove later as it would now impose.

Let me cite just two examples of this kind of remedial legislation.

One such bill was introduced by me last year. It would limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in two fields—the activities of local school boards in regulating school attendance, and the efforts of State governments to combat subversive activities through legislation.

Another bill of this sort, one that has been given widespread attention in recent weeks, is Senator JENNER's bill to remove the Supreme Court's appellate jurisdiction in certain cases involving subversion. I have been actively supporting the Jenner bill, because I feel that the Supreme Court has overstepped its bounds and encroached on the prerogatives of Congress, the executive branch of the Government, and several agencies of local government in the cases to which the Jenner bill is applicable.

If Congress will enact laws restricting the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, I believe that the Court will see the handwriting on the wall and curb its impulses. Unless the Court is restricted by legislation to judicial matters, we can expect to see new and more far-reaching forms of judicial legislation in the future.

The problem of States rights is more difficult, because here the process of usurpation has been going on so much longer. It has proceeded so far that it will be difficult to stop. That is the great danger in permitting "just a little bit" of usurpation, of acquiescing in just a little deprivation of one's rights: Before one realizes it, the point of no return has been reached.

The States, however, have not quite been destroyed. If they will stand firm from here on out, they can preserve a good measure of their independence and can keep the pillar of States rights standing as a sturdy support of our individual freedom.

Congress, too, can play a part in preserving the power of the States. In the first place, it should examine each piece of legislation that comes before it to determine whether it will expand Federal power at the expense of the States. Some bills with admirable aims must be rejected because of the means they would employ to reach their ends.

An example of such a law is the legislation now pending to limit the erection of billboards along the new Interstate Highway System. The purpose of the bill is laudable; it would help keep these highways beautiful. However, the method is deplorable; it would take away the right of the States to control and limit the erection of billboards on land purely under jurisdiction of the States. If States rights is to have a practical meaning, the principle must apply to good proposals as well as to bad ones.

Congress can also take an active role in upholding the rights of the States by enacting legislation that will help in restoring power to the States.

In this connection, I can mention several pieces of legislation now pending in Congress.

There is S. 337, a bill which I am cosponsoring. It provides that no act of Congress shall be construed to nullify State laws in the same field, unless the act expressly states that this is the intention. The Supreme Court could not have ruled as it did in the *Steve Nelson* case if this bill had been enacted.

On March 3, the cause of States rights was substantially strengthened by the passage in the Senate of S. 1538, another bill I have cosponsored. It would return to the individual States a large measure of legislative jurisdiction over lands in the several States,

owned by the Federal Government or used for Federal purposes. This bill is now in committee in the House and has a most favorable chance for final enactment this year.

In January, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 145 to set up a commission on Federal and State jurisdiction. The purpose is to study the usurpation of State powers by the Federal Government, and the usurpation of powers by each branch of Government from the others. The commission would report to Congress, recommending legislation that would redraw the boundary lines in places where they have become completely obliterated or obscured.

I am cosponsoring another important piece of States rights legislation, S. 1723. This bill would eliminate the no-man's land now existing between State and Federal jurisdiction in the field of labor relations. This gap was caused by the Supreme Court's decision last year in the *Guss* case. S. 1723 would empower the States to act for the protection of both labor and management rights where the National Labor Relations Board declines to assert its jurisdiction.

I will mention just one more example. This is my bill, S. 6, which was recently passed by the Senate. It would prevent private contractors executing Federal contracts from escaping State sales taxes on their purchases under the guise of Federal immunity. This would reverse a 1954 Supreme Court decision which closed another State revenue source.

These are merely examples; they will do for starters. There are many ways in which Congress can assist the States to regain the powers they should be exercising and which powers are reserved to them under the Constitution.

Among the many fields of activity which are still under State control, however, there are two which are preeminent—law enforcement and public education—and it is these two which have been singled out for attack by the enemies of States rights and of American freedom.

One of the greatest obstacles in the way of any grab for power, by Communists or any other group, is the existence in this country of 48 separate and independent police systems. As was demonstrated in the cases of several eastern European countries, which fell to communism after World War II, a useful, perhaps essential, factor in seizing power in any country is a centralized police organization, which can be infiltrated, then controlled, then used at the crucial hour to suppress the opposition.

So long as we avoid this centralized control of our police systems, then, no matter what internal crises and tensions the years may bring, there is little likelihood of even an attempt at a Communist-style coup d'état in this country. Such would not be the case were the weapon of centralized police control available to those who would seize power.

But a Federal Government bent on usurpation and complete centralization of power, finds it annoying to be confronted with law-enforcement officers who are loyal to State and local governments instead of to the Federal bureaucracy, and who are beyond reach of the threat of federalization. We can therefore expect increasing pressure to destroy the independence of the State police agencies. It has already been seriously suggested by one liberal that a special Federal police force, similar to the Canadian Northwest Mounted Police, be set up to enforce the integration of southern schools.

This brings us to the other outstanding function of State government—public education. There is a grave risk that this function of State government will be destroyed, to be replaced by a centrally controlled school system operated by the Federal Government.

It is true that the proponents of Federal aid to education assert repeatedly that they are not interested in Federal control. Be that as it may, it can be stated as an absolute fact that Federal control of education will follow Federal aid, as surely as the night follows the day.

The pattern is crystal clear. Once the States have geared their whole educational and revenue systems to Federal aid, the Federal Government will impose certain conditions. They will appear harmless, even helpful, at first. Certain minimum standards in school equipment, teacher training and level of teaching will be set up as prerequisites for the receipt of Federal aid. Some substandard schools will be improved.

But is anyone naive enough to think that we can have just a little Federal control? Not a chance. Within a very few years, a bureau in Washington would be drawing up the curriculum and a list of approved textbooks. The history books, the texts on government, and the courses in sociology would be lined out to follow whatever school of thought was, at the moment, most popular in Washington.

From this point, the movement to mass brainwashing and despotism would be ready

to begin in earnest, needing only a strong and arrogant President to set it in motion.

We must, then, fight with all our strength to maintain control over our educational systems and our law-enforcement agencies. In addition, we must resist, at all points along the line, any further attempts on the part of the Federal Government to encroach on any right still held by the States.

It is not enough to put obstructions in the path of Federal encroachment on the rights of the States. Obstruction must be joined with construction, by which I mean constructive efforts on the part of State government to provide the essential services the people demand.

One of the arguments most strongly relied on by advocates of Federal aid to education is that the States have failed to meet the educational challenge of a world of science and technology. Figures and statistics designed to support this argument are brandished. To counter this argument, we must be able to point to effective measures taken by the States to meet the problem. Such effective steps will not be forthcoming, unless you, as individual citizens, take an active stand in support of independent State action.

In keeping up a constant struggle to preserve the principles of States rights and

separation of powers, we are not fighting for any mere slogans. We are not interested in States rights and separation of powers in and of themselves, but our interest in them lies in the fact that these two principles are essential supports of liberty. And liberty, as Lord Acton said, "is not a means to a higher political end. It is itself the highest political end."

The archenemy of liberty is usurpation of power. It is, therefore, our duty to resist this usurpation, from whatever source it comes. We would all do well to bear in mind the words of our first President, George Washington, who, in his Farewell Address, warned the people of this country to allow no change to be made in their Constitution except by the constitutionally prescribed amending process. These are his words:

"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; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 28, 1958

The Senate met at 9:30 o'clock a. m.

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

Our Father, God, author of liberty: Out of heroic yesterdays we are conscious of a cloud of witnesses whose peering eyes are upon us. As a grateful nation prepares to hallow its yesterdays and to remember the cost of its liberties—freedoms that are threatened now as never before, by sinister forces who deal in tyranny and chains—help us to realize that our glorious heritage is not as an ancient heirloom from the past that can be handed down to generations following, but that it is a spiritual thing which must be reinterpreted, relived, and rewon with every new test that the changing years bring.

As these days beneath the great white dome which in its illumined majesty is a symbol to the Nation of the American dream there rests, in honor, on the journey to the Tomb of the Unknown, representatives of those who gave up the years that were to be theirs so that their mortal bodies might be shields to defend our freedom, may the rotunda, mecca for millions, be a vast whispering gallery where, for multitudes of pilgrims, a voice may be heard—"It was for visions we fell." Stir our hearts with the beauty of that vision which by faith is brought near—when—

"Nation with nation, land with land,  
Unarmed shall live as comrades free;  
In every heart and brain shall throb  
The pulse of one fraternity."

In the name of that Holy One whose truth shall make all men free. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading

of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 27, 1958, was dispensed with.

### ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on May 27, 1958, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 2498. An act for the relief of Matthew M. Epstein; and

S. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the International Civil Aviation Organization to hold the 12th session of its assembly in the United States in 1959.

### LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

### IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Regular Air Force.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the

nominations in the Regular Air Force be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Regular Air Force are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. 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.

### AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, RELATING TO PLEDGE OF FAITH CLAUSE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1105 (b) of title XI (Federal Ship Mortgage Insurance) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to implement the pledge of faith clause, which with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF RHODE ISLAND LEGISLATURE

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and myself, I submit, for appropriate reference, a certified copy of resolution H. 1427 passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations.

This resolution is entitled "Concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island memorializing