Mr. FINE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2004. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. David H. Perkins; without amendment (Rept. No. 1610). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2005. An act for the relief of Harriet F. Bradshaw; without amendment (Rept. No. 1611). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FINE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2418. An act for the relief of Britt-Marie Eriksson and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 1612). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2628. A bill for the relief of the George H. Soffel Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1613). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4037. A bill for the relief of M. Neil Andrews; without amendment (Rept. No. 1614). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4492. A bill for the relief of Norma J. Roberts; with amendment (Rept. No. 1615). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 7151. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 7152. A bill to provide for voluntary coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system for lawyers engaged in the practice of their profession; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 7153. A bill to abolish free transmission of official Government mail matter and certain other mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. R. 7154. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp honoring the centennial of the Indiana State Fair; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 7155. A bill to relieve from liability to refund to the United States any compensation received for any period prior to July 1, 1935, in contravention of dual compensation laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7156. A bill to provide that certain unclaimed deposits in national banks shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 7157. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 7158. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to provide support for the price of defatted milk at 1½ cents per pound; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 7159. A bill to recognize nonprofit nonpolitical veterans' organizations for purposes of bestowing upon them certain benefits, rights, privileges, and prerogatives; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 7160. A bill to provide for the training of candidates for appointment as nurses in the military services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 7161. A bill for the safety of life and property by making certain commercial fishing vessels subject to the rules and regulations of the United States Coast Guard marine inspection; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RAYBURN:

H. R. 7162. A bill to authorize the Chief of Engineers to enter into contracts for the use of dams and reservoirs under the control of the Department of the Army for the storage and release of water for domestic and industrial uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. Res. 583. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives, so as to make in order provisions in and amendments to general appropriation bills which reduce, or impose limitations upon the expenditure of, appropriations previously made; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. Res. 584. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the activities of the Tribal Council for the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. J. Res. 406. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a statue of Leif Ericsson in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 7163. A bill for the relief of Peter M. Mihalovici; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 7164. A bill for the relief of Peter Rousetos, also known as Panagiotis Roussetos, also known as Panagiotis Roussetos Metritikas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENNY:

H. R. 7165. A bill for the relief of Lydia L. A. Samraney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 7166. A bill for the relief of Chien So Chen and Chien So Chuing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7167. A bill for the relief of Osamu Yamaguchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7168. A bill for the relief of Nalani Jean Damon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 7169. A bill for the relief of Aroussian Agopian and Tacor Agopian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 7170. A bill for the relief of Johanna Zeline Zolliker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 7171. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Toumanoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 7172. A bill for the relief of Cosmo Spinosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 7173. A bill for the relief of Linda Darlene Kunz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7174. A bill for the relief of Charles Edmund Dumaresq Clavell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 7175. A bill for the relief of Robert Keith Slotvig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

642. Mr. HART presented a petition of the Hudson County Press Club, Union City, N. J., which unanimously passed a resolution protesting House Speaker's ban on broadcasting and telecasting in House committees, which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 21, 1952

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-blessed God, as we continue in the business of this new day, may we be conscious of the creative and cooperative presence and power of the spiritual factors and forces.

Make us see that we cannot solve any of our human problems without Thy help and that all our efforts will end in futility and failure unless we have divine guidance.

Lift our timid and trembling spirits out of the doubts and fears which make us cowards, into the glorious faith that enables us to go forth as conquerors, courageous and invincible.

Grant that our lives may be strong in the integrity which remains steadfast in times of trial and temptation.

May we be patient and hopeful in the hours of darkness when all earthly lights are eclipsed and extinguished by adversity.

In Christ's name we bring our petition. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION, 1953

Mr. NORRELL (on behalf of Mr. KIRWAN), from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 7176) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1628), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JENSEN reserved all points of order on the bill.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, no quorum is present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 32]

Abbitt	Belcher	Brownson
Auchincloss	Bolling	Buchanan
Bailey	Bolton	Burdick
Baring	Bosone	Burnside
Battle	Boykin	Butler

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Byrnes	Heffernan	Patman
Carrigg	Herter	Potter
Celler	Hinshaw	Powell
Clevenger	Hull	Prouty
Combs	Jackson, Calif.	Rabaut
Corbett	James	Ribicoff
Dawson	Kee	Rivers
Dingell	Kersten, Wis.	Roberts
Dollinger	King, Pa.	Rogers, Tex.
Dondero	Larcade	Sheppard
Doyle	McConnell	Short
Fernandez	McKinnon	Staggers
Flood	Mack, Ill.	Stockman
Fogarty	Martin, Iowa	Velde
Fugate	Miller, Calif.	Weichel
Gore	Morgan	Welch
Granger	Morrison	Wheeler
Grant	Morton	Wickersham
Halleck	Murdock	Widnall
Harrison, Va.	Murphy	Wigglesworth
Hart	Murray, Wis.	Wolcott
Hays, Ohio	O'Hara	Wood, Ga.
Hedrick	Passman	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 349 members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour today, following the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7072, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read down to and including line 12 on page 25. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Committee, including one Director at not to exceed $17,500 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent, and including contracts for the making of special investigations and reports and for engineering, drafting, and computing services; equipment; not to exceed $213,400 for expenses of travel; maintenance and operation of aircraft; purchase of four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed $100 for newspapers and periodicals; and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5. U. S. C. 55a); $46,522,200.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to say a few words about this program and how important it is to our national defense and to the development of an Air Force, in which I think every Member of the House is interested. You may recall that the NACA operated for many years without contract authority, except from the appropriations authority, many facilities which are now necessary to carry out the basic and fundamental research that is necessary now. We did not have a supersonic wind tunnel in this country until after World War II. That was a great mistake because we have seen the slow development of the jet engine and the metallurgical problems that have slowed down the jet program, in my opinion, more than any other one thing. We will bring before this body on Monday an authorization for a metallurgical laboratory. I want to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if there are any funds carried in this appropriation, which we are considering today, which can be used to begin a metallurgical laboratory.

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to our distinguished friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, that there are funds in this bill authorizing the construction of four separate and distinct brand-new projects. We have been given to understand by the NACA that the gentleman's subcommittee was in the act of approving this, and, as the gentleman will recall, I discussed the matter with him and, on the assumption that he was going to approve them and bring them to the House for the approval of the House, we are supplying some funds for this work.

Mr. DURHAM. I thank the gentleman very much. I think it is very wise to put the necessary funds into the present appropriation to start this metallurgical laboratory.

There are reasons why that is necessary that cannot be gone into on this floor. Speeds are developing problems in our metals and alloys that are beyond comprehension. I feel that if we can have the necessary scientific tools we can solve some of these problems and speed up the program.

The wind-tunnel program, which is being carried out today, is one of the most scientific and highly technical problems facing scientists, because it goes into the highest problems of science.

I understand we are cutting out today 800 positions in the personnel of NACA. Is this correct?

Mr. THOMAS. Let me give the gentleman the exact figure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute, that the gentleman may answer.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me go back to the beginning. I do not know of any agency in this Government that has had any better treatment than this agency. I agree with my distinguished friend from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM]. He certainly has done wheel-horse work on this agency. But this crowd had less than six or seven hundred people right after World War I. In 1941 they had only 844 employees. We have let them go up now to 7,800. Just think of it.

Mr. DURHAM. Does not the gentleman think it was justified in the development of the Air Force?

Mr. THOMAS. Of course they are justified, to some extent; but, frankly, I think we have let them go too fast. They ought to consolidate; they ought to stop and take a look and pull in their horns and see if they cannot do a better job with the people they have without expanding at the rate of seven or eight hundred or a thousand employees every year.

Mr. DURHAM. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS. I wonder if I may propound a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not out of my time, I hope.

Mr. THOMAS. No.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph dealing with NACA, and all amendments thereto, close in 6 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to vote for any and all amendments which will cut down appropriations, perhaps for a reason that others may not have. The Library told me this morning that we had spent for the Marshall plan $597,000,000. Then, for ECA through 1948 to 1952, $22,539,913,000 under Paul Hoffman—he says no relation—from April 3, 1948, to October 1, 1950, actual expenditures, exclusive of administrative costs, $8,463,000,000; total appropriations during that period, $10,146,000,000.

A total of $23,136,913,000 spent.

I noticed in the press recently that Paul Hoffman, who was the Administrator of ECA—it is now known as Mutual Security—and who so efficiently—no, I do not want to say that—so quickly and with so little to show for his spending, spent so many billions abroad, is coming back home and I understand—and this is not a political speech in any way—that he is to be the campaign manager of a candidate—I will not name names—of a candidate for the Presidency. Paul and his candidate are presumably of one mind as to our foreign policy: It is the policy of the internationalists and financial interests of this country. I am also told by my colleagues from the Northeast—I have been told several times in the last few days—that the gentleman whose campaign Paul will manage, will be elected. If that is so, as long as Paul and those associated with him—you can get most of their names from the press; they as a rule are politicians and statesmen intending to carry out the policies of

the present administration, the foreign policies—I think that we ought to save a few dollars, for certainly Paul and most of the others are advocates of billion-dollar spending. I want to cut this bill. I will not say what I will do later on as other bills come up. But I want to cut this bill so that there will still be some money left so that if afterwards I do change my mind and want to appropriate a few billions to help this Republican candidate who they say is the people's choice and who they say Paul Hoffman is going to manage—there may be a few dollars available. So there will be some opportunity for someone on this side of the aisle who believes in that policy to find at least a little money somewhere to support that campaign for a foreign policy which so far has brought us nothing but grief.

Now, I am serious about this. If we are to continue this present foreign policy of Acheson, of the Senator from Massachusetts, the Senator from Pennsylvania, and all those others, Paul Hoffman and our good friends here from the Northeast, the big industrialists, the steel makers and the New York financial interests who feel we must save the world, all of those who so enthusiastically and so successfully backed Willkie and then Dewey twice in the nominating conventions—if we want to have something for those people, or, more accurately, their program, then we will have to save money out of this bill, because may I say that when I go home all I hear is: Must we go along? Have we no choice? No chance to vote on the real issue, which is: Is our first duty to the world or is it to the United States of America? Our folks are tired of rising taxes, the conscription of men and later possibly of women, to fight either in Asia or in Europe. I would be more willing to appropriate dollars to hire Chinese to do the fighting if they want to fight, and that seems to be their avocation, or occupation in life, and I would much rather have them do it than have our men sent all over the world to fight—to maintain the prestige of Britain or France.

Then my good friend here from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and my good friend from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] after we have made a new crop of veterans, come along, and justly so, ask for benefit payments to veterans. My thought is that if some of these people, and I do not include the gentleman from Mississippi, would just avoid getting into so many wars we would not have so many veterans. I fear very very greatly that if we are to continue on with an ever-increasing number and an ever new crop of veterans that the sad part of it will be that the veterans do realize that in the end when some of us older fellows will no longer be taxpayers the veterans themselves will have to pay the check. The check not only for what they have received—to which they are entitled, but the check for billions for others—for billions which have been—will be wasted.

That is why I am a little worried, a little disturbed over this idea of Paul Hoffman coming back after election—and he undoubtedly will be back here if his candidate is successful—asking for, should I say millions, billions, or go one step further and jump to trillions for aid abroad? Yes, and for an unlimited number of men, American men, year after year, to police the world, fight the wars of U. N. or some other world organization. Oh, my good friends—and I see some of you here from the northeast—yes, you can nominate, as three times before you have dictated the nomination—and I am so, so sorry that you did not succeed before in electing your nominee, I am afraid you will have a terribly hard time in convincing the Mid-Westerners and those who furnish the cannon fodder for war that they should continue spending billions of dollars sending millions of boys abroad to fight—in wars which are not necessary for the advancement of our people, for the security of our Republic.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to turn to page 27, the section having to do with locomotive inspection. I have an amendment I would like to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. Page 27?

Mr. WITHROW. Page 27, line 7.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to object, and I hope the gentleman will forgive me for doing so. That has already been passed.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U. S. C. 1861–1875), including award of graduate fellowships; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $95,000 for expenses of travel; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; $3,500,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRIEST: Page 30, line 6, after the semicolon, strike out "$3,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,500,000."

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment, and I hope very much the Committee will see fit to accept it. I feel very strongly about the importance of it at this time.

The National Science Foundation last year operated on a budget of $3,000,000 and requested this year $15,000,000. The Committee on Appropriations allowed them $3,500,000.

Recently I had a conference with Dr. Waterman, the Director, and some of the other members of the Board and others interested in this subject and I asked Dr. Waterman at that time how well the Foundation was progressing on the policy of assuming chief responsibility for the Federal Government's research program. He told me that he would send me some information. Of course, they have not had time yet to do very much on evaluating all of the Federal research that is being done. It amounts, Mr. Chairman, to approximately $2,000,000,000 all told in all of the agencies.

Mr. Chairman, I want to read from a letter that Dr. Waterman sent me a few days ago in which he stated:

> The President has stated his objective of having the National Science Foundation "ultimately assume major responsibility for the Federal Government's support of basic research through grant or contract." (President's letter to the Congress, Hearings, pt. I, p. 179.)
>
> The President's budget for 1953 reflects this policy. It reduces the basic research budgets of defense agencies by approximately $7,300,000.

The reduction is in the Department of Defense, $5,000,000—this is for basic research—Atomic Energy Commission and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and other agencies, $2,300,000.

Mr. Chairman, I simply take that $7,000,000 by which the basic research appropriation for some of the other agencies has been reduced, and add it to the $3,500,000 appropriated here by the committee for the National Science Foundation bringing the total to $10,500,000, which I believe, is the minimum, if this organization is really to do the job that Congress directed it to do when it passed an authorization sometime ago. The Foundation already has awarded, as you know, 50 grants for basic scientific research. These grants were awarded to 30 different institutions in 19 States. I think if you members of the Committee will read that list you will be greatly pleased in the awards of these first 50 grants by the Board of the Science Foundation. I note, for example, that there was no concentration in the larger institutions as some had feared. I notice that in Indiana, four small colleges that you do not hear of very often, but that have a very high scholastic standing, received awards for research in the biological sciences. Practically all of the first 50 grants were in research in medicine and in biology.

Mr. Chairman, I have been amazed at the number of the Members of the House of Representatives who have been unable to answer roll calls recently because of illness due to virus infection. What do we know about virus? Some research scientist out in Indiana or Iowa or somewhere else may find out some day about that thing that exists now in that never-never land between an inert, dead organic chemical, and a living organism. We call it virus but we do not know much about it. All of these first 50 grants were in the field of medicine and biology.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and place in the RECORD some information about some of the discoveries in these fields recently, not by some widely known institution but by some little scientist out here in the laboratory, a one-man laboratory, who has been able to operate because he had a little assistance in that operation.

I want to call your attention to the program and some future plans of the National Science Foundation.

Recently, I had an opportunity to review with Dr. Barnard, Chairman of the

National Science Board, and Dr. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation, the progress that this young agency has been making. I wish to assure you that the program of the foundation is in fine shape. The morale of the staff is high; they are imbued with a mission—that of making America scientifically strong. The quality of the research projects so far supported by the foundation has earned for the agency the respect of outstanding scientists throughout the country.

During the first week in April the foundation expects to announce the award of some 500 graduate fellowships in various fields of the natural sciences. These fellows are now being selected out of more than 3,000 applications which have come from every State in the Union, from the District of Columbia, from Hawaii, Puerto Rico and Alaska, and from Americans living abroad. The selection process is based on merit; it is carried out with great care. Applicants for these fellowships represent the cream of the crop in the sciences—the finest and most promising young scientific minds that we have. As the Members of this House know, American intelligence is our most priceless asset. The National Science Foundation, through this graduate fellowship program, is making it possible for this asset to become of maximum use. Through the fellowship program the best in young scientific talent is being trained.

I am happy to be able to report that the initial projects supported by the National Science Foundation are in the field of basic research in biology and medicine. You and I know that the cost of disease in this country is appalling. In a time of national emergency when we need every available hand at work in the shop, at the plow, or back of a gun, we cannot afford the terrible loss of man-hours through sickness or the premature crippling diseases which remove useful persons from the labor supply.

I have previously referred to the virus. Under certain conditions it appears to thrive and multiply and to destroy living cells. Attacks on the human body by viruses and other virulent agents are as great a danger to the country as attacks by any other type of enemy. And we must fight them with equal vigor. How this inert substance can suddenly become alive and dangerous is a subject of much interest to our biochemists and physiologists.

This and other distressing problems have long been the subject of direct clinical research. They have not been solved. There is now general belief that the answer lies in more complete knowledge and understanding of these matters; mere search for a cure will not suffice. Now this is in the realm of basic research. It is this kind of research, basic research, which is stressed in the program of the National Science Foundation. An investment in this type of research is an investment in the future strength and health of our country.

A most encouraging research story, which illustrates the point I have just made about basic research, has made headlines recently. I refer to the report of a sensational treatment for acute cases of that dread disease tuberculosis. It appears to be a fact that this treatment, although only in the experimental stage, offers promise of positively stopping acute phases of the disease. Thus cases ordinarily fatal may now recover.

The patient rallies and shows remarkable gain in weight and vitality. This is indeed welcome news and again evidence of the importance of research to every citizen. The fact that this treatment does not cure the chronic sufferers, as thus far found, and that further careful investigation is necessary to discover possible harmful reactions, should not detract from the fact that a capital discovery has indeed been made. This kind of progress in medicine grows out of scientific research at the frontiers of biological knowledge.

As Members of the House you have already come to know how basic research has helped to strengthen our military competence. We all know, surely, the many new devices, weapons, and techniques which are now in use by our Armed Forces as results of the application of basic scientific findings. There is hardly a modern weapon now being used for our defense which did not have its beginnings in the research laboratories. Tomorrow's weapons are in today's laboratories. We must keep the basic information for scientific developments pouring from our American research centers. The National Science Foundation is dedicated to the stimulation and encouragement of such activity—toward the increase of basic knowledge upon which our military and our whole economy may draw.

It is sometimes thought and said that all that is done by research is to bring about more costly devices and processes. This is far from true. First, let me say that in critical matters of military equipment we dare not delay the development of a revolutionary or clearly superior weapon or piece of equipment. Such are the means by which our defense is made impregnable.

While this highly critical type of project does result from research we would be foolish indeed to do other than prosecute such developments with the utmost dispatch, cost what they may. However, basic research does far more than point the way to revolutionary advances. It is only by full attention to basic research and the soundness of its coverage that we can hope to eliminate unnecessary developmental work. This type of research is cheap; it is in the development of the application where large funds are expended.

It goes without saying that the time when economies must begin is before these large developments are undertaken. It is in the basic and background research which precedes the start of an expensive developmental project where the real savings may be made.

Thus basic research can point out lines of procedure which are not promising, and others whose initiation should await further research before being attempted. Of what profit is it to develop the most powerful jet engine if it can be proved in advance that the life of the engine is only a few hours, and if it can be proved that the country's supply of critical materials will not permit the manufacture of the engine in usable quantities? Of what use is it to develop a jet plane costing over a million dollars if at its supersonic speed no pilot has quick enough reaction time to fly the plane? Of what use is it to develop a guided missile which cannot find its target?

From the examples which I have already cited in the medical and biological sciences it can be seen that this type of research is providing countless savings in man-hours, increased production, and improved living conditions. In the same way basic research has been able to provide the military with economical techniques for making best use of its men and machines.

I do not mean to imply by these examples that the mission of the National Science Foundation is to provide information for the military solely, or to create better health conditions solely. As has abundantly been shown in the past, these will be byproducts of that program. The mission of the foundation is designed to increase the scientific competence of the Nation as a whole, in all fields of science. It does this through its support of basic research, through its stimulation of increased scientific activity in the basic sciences via the foundation's grant program.

Universities and laboratories throughout the breadth of the United States and its Territories are encouraged to make studies leading to new knowledge and new principles. Such findings are the bases for all future developments, for the improvement of our standard of living, and for the strengthening of our defenses. And such findings yield the direction by which such improvements can best be made. In the long run such findings are keys to the economic use of man, machine, and money in research.

This is one of the primary responsibilities of the foundation, the stimulation of basic research and the support of such activities. It was recognized as such by the sponsors of this agency, and I am proud to call myself one of those sponsors. This young agency, now only beginning its second year of operation, was designed to be the main independent agency on the policy level of government which would look toward progress in American science. It was to such a purpose that the President addressed his last message on the National Science Foundation.

I quote from that message:

> The foundation is much more than a new executive agency added to those already in existence with a research mission. It was conceived as a much-needed keystone in the structure of the national research program. Its principal task is to appraise the rapid growth of research activity, both public and private, and to recommend the broad goals toward which this massive effort should be channeled. In addition the foundation will support those areas of basic research and scientific training where the needs are most acute and will ultimately assume major responsibility for the Federal Government's support of basic research through grant or contract.

As long as the Federal Government continues to be the largest factor in the national research effort, it must frankly face the responsibility to insure that this effort is conceived and executed soundly and effectively. The results to be obtained from the operation of the foundation far outweigh its cost. The foundation's annual budget represents no more than a small fraction of the annual Federal outlays for research and development.

The funds involved represent a long-term investment in the national security no less than the funds presently being invested in the expansion of productive capacity to carry us through a long period of partial mobilization.

Through this agency, we have put our faith in the knowledge that American intelligence and American science can produce countless benefits for our way of life. By backing the Foundation we are insuring that there will be a strong base for future research and development. By backing the Foundation we are in fact giving support to the training of our future scientific talent and thereby we are increasing our scientific potential.

You all know the critical shortage which now exists in scientific manpower. Trends now indicate that this shortage will be even more critical in future years. The number of trained graduate scientists and engineers coming from our universities and technical institutes is dwindling. As legislators for the Nation we must do something positive to alleviate this situation. By supporting the Foundation we are taking positive action. It is one of the missions of the National Science Foundation to train new scientists.

Through the Foundation's fellowship program such an effort is now under way, even though it is only on a modest scale. The 500 fellowships being awarded this year by the Foundation marks an earnest beginning in this direction. The limited budget which the Foundation received last year allowed for only the skimming of the very top of the cream of young American talent. The total number of applicants worthy of support, in the judgment of some of our leading scientists, far exceeded the limited budget which could be allotted for that purpose in the past year.

It is to be hoped that this program can be increased to some 2,000 fellowships annually for coming years. Such an investment in our human resources is a small thing to pay for the future of the United States. First-rate scientists now being trained under such a program will bring back benefits a thousandfold to American progress.

There remain to be said only a few words about the nature of the National Science Foundation program in relation to the research programs of other agencies. I must reemphasize that the National Science Foundation is destined to be the key agency in basic research whose purpose is the progress of science itself. This fundamental mission of the Foundation has been recognized by the President and by agencies within and without the Government.

During the last year this concept was given careful consideration in planning the future activities of Government organizations. It shows realistically in their estimates. The plan has thus been to reduce their basic research budgets and to increase by a comparable amount the budget of the National Science Foundation. The result, from the taxpayers' point of view, is that this year's basic research budget has not been increased by the existence of the program of the National Science Foundation. Here again we find a real effort to establish a valid approach to research planning and supervision of research expenditures.

In these brief minutes I have tried to give you some idea of the nature of the Foundation's work. I have tried to tell you what real benefits can accrue from such work. At the end of its first year the Foundation has already won the hearts of American scientists and the cooperation of other scientific groups, both Government and private. Its modest beginning through the grant and fellowship programs have won wide approval and mark the first step toward the development of a strong government policy toward the development of American science. I close by repeating my statement of belief in the Foundation which I made last year: The Science Foundation Act is the legislative expression of the truth that to live well and safely tomorrow, we must prepare today.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments to the paragraph close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. WITHROW. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments to the entire paragraph on National Science Foundation close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I propounded a unanimous-consent request some few minutes ago because I was unavoidably absent from the Chamber when the item that I was particularly interested in was taken up. There was objection.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in economy. I think we all believe in economy, but I believe that we should be cautious in practicing so-called economy in certain fields of Interstate Commerce Commission activities. I have particularly in mind that field which pertains to the inspection of locomotives.

Let me bring to your attention the fact that the budget estimate on the item of locomotive inspection, that is, the actual inspection of the engines that operate on the railroads, was $761,000 for 1953. The actual appropriation for 1952 was $706,600. The committee has recommended $664,000 for this activity of the Government, which is very important, or a cut under the amount they received in 1952 of $42,600.

That cut is being made on the premise that there is a duplication of services in the States. That premise is false. That was the argument made by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] in the general discussion upon this bill that a great many of the items that are carried in the Interstate Commerce Commission budget are duplications of activities of the States. I concede that in part he was right, but in this particular item, namely, the inspection of locomotives, there is no State duplication whatsoever in any State I know of.

This item is essential to the safety of the people who travel on the trains and of the men who work on the trains. It is not a large item but it is essential. I have had a great deal of experience in the railroad field, and I know that this money is badly needed and these inspectors are needed. We should have more of them, because this inspection contributes materially to the safety of the men who work on the passenger and freight trains and also to the safety of the general public who travel.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true they have many more locomotives than they have inspectors; therefore, there are many locomotives not inspected today because we do not have the inspectors to do the job?

Mr. WITHROW. That is true. Very, very few times during the year do these inspectors get to a terminal. Very seldom do they get there more than twice a year. This inspection is badly needed. I hope that when this measure goes to the other body and goes to conference the question of restoring this very, very small amount of $42,600 will be sincerely considered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I wish to support the Priest amendment in relation to the National Science Foundation. I think more attention should be given to the work of this organization, which is for the first time trying to coordinate the scientific research that is engaged in by the Federal Government.

The present budget takes from the Armed Forces and the Atomic Energy Commission certain research funds which they received last year and turns them over to the National Science Foundation. If this cut which has been made by the committee prevails, that research will not be done. It is something that has been taken out of the budget of these other agencies.

I am especially interested in the work of the National Science Foundation because of the fine start that has been made during the first year of the operation of this organization. At the time the Foundation was authorized, great fear was expressed that it would merely centralize further work in the so-called Ivy League institutions. The big institutions of learning which do most of this work through large endowments have

already been centralized as to research. But the work of the National Science Foundation, if we are to judge the future by what has happened in the past, will be to emphasize this work in all the institutions of learning throughout the country. I think it is highly important that this effort to decentralize to that degree, and to help in an intelligent approach to these scientific investigations, and help in every aspect of scientific educational work in the country should be encouraged by at least an appropriation that is not several hundred percent less than it was for this type of research activity last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I take the time of the House to point out something in connection with this particular amendment, in which I support our distinguished friend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], that has not yet been discussed; and I think it is extremely important. It is awfully easy to believe that the only struggle we are in with the Soviet Union is the military struggle, the economic struggle and the ideological struggle of the propaganda war—what we like to call the education and information front. But the Soviets do not think so, because in the Soviet Union among the classes at the top who are much honored and who receive great emoluments are the scientists. They realize something which perhaps we do not adequately realize: that an important part of this struggle whether men's minds and souls shall be dominated by these master craftsmen of brutality and totalitarianism in the Kremlin, or by the idea of freedom, will rest in the scientific field.

This particular increase of about $7,000,000, which our colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] gives us an opportunity to vote upon, is for the general staff that is directing the scientific effort of the United States. I do not think you need to do much more in substantiation of what I just stated than to read the list of the members of the National Science Board. These are by all odds among the most distinguished scientific minds in our country, and they are serving on a small per diem fee. This is not a group of bureaucratic employees; these are indeed scientists trying to marshall the scientific effort of the United States. Indeed, one of the most eloquent witnesses before the Appropriation Subcommittee was Dr. Chester I. Barnard, president of the Rockefeller Foundation, and one of the most distinguished men in America. You do not have a group here that is trying to build up its power. You have a group that deeply and sincerely feel that at least the amount of money they have asked for is needed for a general staff or directing brains for the fundamental coordination of basic research in the United States, a general field in which, in the Federal Government establishment alone, we are spending $2,000,000,000 a year. If this is going to be a push button conflict, hot or cold, we have got to have some pretty intelligent minds at the push buttons, and also some pretty intelligent minds to determine how many push buttons are needed.

This foundation does not do any research itself. What it does is to plot out the fields for research, ascertain gaps in research, and point out where there is duplication of research. They have already been instrumental in saving the small amount of money the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is trying to add by his amendment. They can save a very large amount of money, but what is even more important they can make more certain our victory in the fundamental struggle in science between freedom and communism. I think the National Science Foundation is entitled to this modicum of support. We are asked to support the top scientists of the country, who are some of the most outstanding and patriotic men we have.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, one of the major consequences of our growing burden of taxation is its serious effect upon our colleges, our universities, and the expansion of our scientific research.

Today as never before in world history, we should be doing everything in our power to maintain and strengthen our colleges, but our tremendous taxes have made it impossible to establish new endowment funds. The fixed income derived from many of the established funds is no longer sufficient to provide the facilities that modern colleges require.

All of this creates a two-way squeeze. Because of the tax set-up, hundreds of small colleges which once took pride in their scientific departments are unable to maintain them adequately. At the same time, the Federal Government points to this shrinkage and says that it must establish and support Government-sponsored scientific research. This vicious circle causes us to lose out on every count. The colleges and universities suffer, and the Federal Government then comes to Congress demanding more and more money for what could have been done in the first place at the institutions of higher learning. It is time that we understood that big taxation has social and educational results that strike deeply at our entire pattern of American life.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, the reason that the research program was not given more money in this particular budget is because it is not yet ready for it. The record will show, on page 203, that the Federal expenditures for all sorts of research now come to over $2,000,000,000, and that this agency was created, admirably, and with no resistance from the subcommittee or from Members of Congress, to coordinate the research work already being done and to be developed. I think it is a matter of time, and I suggest we are not yet ready for the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

However, I would like to raise a mild voice of inquiry as to how all the people in the past got their research work done without financial help from some government. I wonder how Darwin, Newton, Marconi, Henry Ford, Pasteur, the people who discovered penicillin, and insulin, and some of these other benefits to mankind, managed to get anything discovered without $10,000,000 of Government money. Of course, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] would quickly point out that Newton was following strictly the bureaucratic pattern, because he lay down under a tree in a position of complete inactivity and let an apple fall on him. I think we can wait just a little and find support in some later budget for the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I am glad to be given credit for that quip and I thank the gentleman from California. Now, is it not a fact that when this agency came in with their budget request for this fiscal year, that those parts of their budget for new research constituted the major portion, and a very minor portion was for coordinating and preventing duplication in other governmental agencies engaged in research?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct. And the other agencies have their own research money. What we want is coordination, and eventually economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman realize that the budget estimate for the Defense Department called for $1,700,000,000 for research, and that they have their own special outfit coordinating that research?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PRIEST. If the gentleman will yield for one comment on the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from New York——

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. I believe, however, that practically all of the research engaged in now by the Defense Establishment, or at least a major portion of it, is applied rather than basic. We do not have time now to separate the two; but I think that is the fact, and the RECORD should so show, that it is applied research rather than basic research.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I exceedingly regret that I find myself in opposition to the amendment offered by my genial friend. I doubt if there is a man who is more beloved and better thought of by the entire membership than our able friend the gentleman from Tennessee. I regret it, too, because this little subcommittee, of which I have the honor of being a member, is very scien-

tifically minded. But as the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and my distinguished friends, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] and the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], have brought out, what we are spending this year for research—and I hope the membership will get the hearings and turn to page 682 where the Bureau of the Budget sets out what we are spending by agencies for scientific investigation and research this year—reaches the tidy little sum of $1,987,000,000.

There is nothing wrong with this new agency; this is the third year we have appropriated for it. We are for it, make no mistake about that, and I hope my distinguished friend in his efforts to raise this appropriation by $7,000,000 will get his very able committee together and give them some authority to do what it was intended to do when it was created; namely, give them that authority to coordinate the research of the various agencies and tell Agency A or B to cut out this duplication of research, and to Agency C: "You stay in this field." When you do that you are going to save this Government millions of dollars.

We gave these people 78 employees, the same number they had this year. They want to spend $15,000,000, of which $13,393,000 is for grants to 2,200 students, and for research support. They are going to send them to school at a cost of from $2,000 to $4,400 a year as a stipend, 2,200 of them to be sent to school to learn to be scientists; and, of course, they are excluded from the draft by virtue of the law, and that is as it should be. Of the $15,000,000, they want to spend $8,800,000 at 40, 50, or 60 universities for research support. We think that is fine, but let us postpone this work until we get rid of this war. We have one agency in this bill to which we have already given nearly $24,000,000 this year for biology and medicine, and that is the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $500 for the purchase of newspapers; not to exceed $90,000 for expenses of travel; and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); $5,245,080.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time in order to see if we cannot clarify the situation a little upon the tremendous number of letters each Member of Congress has been receiving in regard to the proposed fees to be put into effect on investment dealers and brokers by the Securities and Exchange Commission; and if I may have the attention of my genial and distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee on Appropriations, for a minute I would like to ask him when they inserted title V of Public Law 137 into the Appropriation Act of 1952, how many agencies they thought would come under this title.

Mr. THOMAS. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that there are at least 40 or 50. My memory may not serve me in this regard, however.

Mr. BUSBEY. I wonder if the gentleman from Texas would be kind enough to try to give us a list of those agencies at this point?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; we will comply with the gentleman's request with pleasure.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, we have been receiving many letters. If I were not so modest, I would say I think I was somewhat responsible for the Securities and Exchange Commission starting hearings on this matter, plus the fact that a bill I introduced in the House on February 28, 1952, has been referred to the Subcommittee on the SEC of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to our distinguished friend that his modesty is more than well founded. He actually did the work.

Mr. BUSBEY. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution and thank him. I would like to ask the chairman another question: In view of what he has learned since the Securities and Exchange Commission has proposed these fees, does he think that the SEC is still justified in going through with its proposal?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to quibble or to be evasive, but, frankly, I have not studied this matter. As a general proposition, as brought out in the hearings by our distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and by our distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY], it certainly is not reasonable to request a man to pay a fee for being investigated. I believe that is as far as I can go. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HELLER] has a subcommittee that is dealing with an investigation of the Securities and Exchange Commission and all of its operations. He told the subcommittee the other day he was going to begin hearings on this item and go into detail. I am sure what that distinguished subcommittee does will meet with the complete satisfaction of the Members of the House.

Mr. BUSBEY. I hope the gentleman's observations are correct.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I should like to point out to the gentleman, inasmuch as my name has been mentioned, that during the subcommittee hearings my questioning was not directed only to the Securities and Exchange Commission. I went into the matter of fees by all of the agencies that appeared before our subcommittee. Each of the agencies was interrogated with respect to the possibility of charging those being regulated by the agencies for a portion of the costs that are incurred as a result of regulations. For example, it was believed by our subcommittee that a company which is given a valuable franchise by the Federal Communications Commission to operate a broadcasting studio or to operate a television studio should bear at least a portion of the costs incurred in the hearings.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman is taking up my time.

Mr. YATES. With respect to the Securities and Exchange Commission, let me invite the gentleman's attention to a Senate study made on the subject. I would call the gentleman's attention to a report that has been issued by the other body on July 20, 1950, by Senator McCLELLAN's committee entitled "Fees for Special Services." I direct the gentleman's attention to page 14 of that report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, in view of my generosity in trying to clarify this matter and in yielding so much of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the committee's attention to one particular paragraph in the proposed rules to be adopted by the Securities and Exchange Commission in their release of January 31, 1952, in which it is stated:

> If the registration fee of any company is not paid on or before the date specified in paragraph (b), the Commission may order the registration of such company suspended or terminated for that reason.

Mr. Chairman, there has never been an agency that I know of in the history of this country that has usurped the powers of Congress to that extent. Everybody is entitled to his day in court, and even under the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 the SEC has to serve notice on any investment dealer or broker and then prefer charges and have a hearing. But here they propose that if a dealer does not get his annual fee in by June 1, he is out of business; the same as revoking his license. Furthermore, the SEC does not give a license to any dealer. There is not a soul in the United States who cannot be registered if he just fills out a simple form that is put in the files, unless he has a criminal record. That is something to which we should give very serious consideration.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I only want to take this opportunity to commend my distinguished colleague for the strong line he is taking upon this subject. As one Member of this House it seems to me quite clear that the Securities and Exchange Commission is stretching very far the language of this act and is certainly interpreting it in no sense as Congress intended that it should be interpreted. I commend the gentleman for

the amending legislation that he is offering, and for my part I am inclined to believe that this entire section 5 should be repealed because under it, if other agencies are permitted to extend their power contrary to the obvious intention of the Congress as this one is, then it will definitely create a secondary tax structure and consititute a very great burden on business.

Mr. BUSBEY. I will say to the gentleman from New York in regard to my amendment that I did not offer it at this time to the appropriation bill because I knew a point of order would be made that it would be legislation on an appropriation bill. Therefore I did not want to take up the time of the committee.

But I would like to ask the distinguished chairman, if I may, in regard to the paragraph I just read from their proposed regulations, if he thinks there is any justification for the SEC terminating a dealer-broker's license just because he does not pay his fee by June 1 of each year.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to get on my feet so much and take too much of my friend's time. In answer to that, may I read to you one section of the law? Section 5 lays down a yardstick and it suggests to them; that is all it does. It lays down a suggested yardstick to be used in arriving at a fee. Here it is: One of the things to be considered by the agency shall be direct and indirect costs to the Government, and value to the recipient.

Mr. BUSBEY. I am glad my friend mentioned that.

Mr. THOMAS. So that answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. BUSBEY. Let me read it as it is in the law: "to be fair and equitable, taking into consideration direct and indirect costs to the Government, value to the recipient, public policy or interests served, and other pertinent facts."

I contend, and, if I am wrong, I hope the chairman will correct me, that when the Securities and Exchange Commission proposed these fees and made out their schedule they did not take into consideration any cost whatever in accordance with the law. There is no cost against which the fees may be charged, because they render no service whatever to the investment dealers and brokers of the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have studied the provision carried in last year's appropriation bill and I think the substance of the provision is very sound. For years I have advocated that services should be charged for wherever possible by any agency of the Government. To the extent that revenue is brought in by reason of services being properly charged for, it inures to the benefit of all taxpayers.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Not just now.

Mr. BUSBEY. I just wanted to agree with the gentleman on one point.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad my friend agrees.

Mr. BUSBEY. As far as he has gone.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, but he disagrees in one particular respect.

I am not taking issue with my friend on the bill he has introduced. I am not taking issue on the particular question to which he addressed himself in his remarks today and in the House the other evening. My mind is open on that. However, I do not think the Securities and Exchange Commission should be the subject of criticism because the members of that Commission do what they think Congress directed them to do. That is the issue now.

My purpose in rising is to at least let members of commissions of the executive branch of the Government know that when they are doing something they think is carrying out the law as intended by Congress and are exercising their best judgment in relation to that, even if some of us think they are mistaken, they should not be subject to criticism.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. I asked the gentleman to yield to correct what I think is an erroneous impression the gentleman from Massachusetts has. This law was put on the books a year ago, and the Securities and Exchange Commission must have known they did not come under the jurisdiction of this law, because they did not do one single thing about fees for investment dealers and brokers until after the hearings this year.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] has stated that the first time such a provision appeared was last year. I believe the Commission has been studying this matter for some time. The attention of the SEC was directed to this matter in a report issued by the other body on July 24, 1950, Report No. 2120, entitled "Fees for Special Services." This is what the report says so far as the Securities and Exchange Commission is concerned. This is on page 14:

> It is understood that the regulation of investment companies by the Securities and Exchange Commission results in the reservation to them of a segment of securities dealings not available to others engaged in similar transactions. This may well be found to be similar to the granting of a franchise and, thus, an equitable subject for appropriate fees. Similarly, the registration and supervision of brokers and dealers can readily be visualized as representing a tangible asset to those covered thereby. There is no charge now for either of these two services.

I make this point for the purpose of showing that the Securities and Exchange Commission is only examining the propriety of its charges and is holding hearings to determine the nature of the charges that should be made.

It has invited representatives of the industry. It has asked for its suggestions, it is giving them an opportunity to make constructive suggestions and state their objections. I think this is a fair way of looking into the matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I just want to make clear the fact that no charges have been imposed by the SEC, but they are merely sending out a list, and they are discussing it and the decision will be made pretty soon.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, I think instead of impugning their motives, we ought to commend them. If we do not agree with them, let us legislate. Apparently this legislation on the part of the Congress started the chain of events operating, which has brought about the present situation in this matter. I do not want to get into any argument on the merits of it because my mind is open. But, I am not going to sit here and listen to the Commission being attacked for doing something that they think was imposed upon them by law, which law came into existence as a result of the action of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. I might say that there is no directive or mandate to the SEC to put into effect these proposed fees. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the very first sentence of title 5 of the public law involved here.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know you are going to say it is "the sense of the Congress." But when you are talking about "the sense of the Congress," you are putting a construction upon it which is consistent with your views. Now I have no objection to your doing that, but if you were a member of the Commission connected with another branch of the Government, you would have to consider that a little bit differently than you would as a Member of the Congress. If I were a member of the Commission, to me that would be a rather strong direction, and it means that I should take affirmative action, or at least affirmative consideration should be given. It is not mandatory, but it would be somewhat obligatory upon me. At least that is my opinion.

Mr. BUSBEY. I want to agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts to the extent that——

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman will pardon the interruption, if you and I can agree—if you and I can agree, then my purpose is accomplished because the only purpose I had is not to attack the SEC for doing what it is doing. If they are wrong, let us change it by a law, if they, as a result of these hearings, decide to continue to impose these fees.

Mr. BUSBEY. I will say to the gentleman, I have made no attack on the SEC. I have contended all along that this whole controversy, the time and expense and everything else could have been eliminated.

Mr. McCORMACK. When you say that they do not have the authority to do something, and are asserting authority they do not possess, I consider that to be an attack.

Mr. BUSBEY. At no time could anything I have said be construed as an attack on the SEC.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I want to take this opportunity to make clear to the House first that this title 5, which is the present subject of controversy is not limited in its application to the SEC, but applies to all Government agencies.

Mr. McCORMACK. A very wise provision in substance.

Mr. COUDERT. Therefore, it is not a question of the SEC at all here except as an example. Second, I would like to ask the gentleman a question—the act in effect directs the establishment of a fee system and purports to establish standards by which the agency shall determine how much to charge. Is there anywhere in the Government a right of review of the schedule of fees that this or any other agency can charge? In other words, have we not legislated perhaps unfortunately in directing that fees be established under a vague set of standards, and then not providing that there be some place for a review of those fees?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a fair statement—a very fair statement. But, it comes back to what we have said before, that Congress is to blame for that, and not the Commission.

Mr. COUDERT. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, so that we will not get too serious about this, I desire to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that if they want to know what the Securities Act, the Stock Exchange Act, and the Utility Holding Company Act mean, and what authority is granted under those acts—all three of which laws the Securities and Exchange Commission administers—if they would read three reports which were filed when those bills were presented to the House, and three speeches which were made at that time, they would understand the powers and the functions of this Commission. Of course, Mr. Chairman, modesty forbids my saying who filed those reports and who made those speeches.

The Clerk read as follows:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by title I of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 604), as amended, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); not to exceed $250 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals; not to exceed $69,500 for expenses of travel, National Administration, Planning, Training, and Records Management; not to exceed $363,500 for expenses of travel, State Administration, Planning, Training, and Records Servicing; $92,500 for the National Selective Service Appeal Board, of which not to exceed $3,500 shall be available for expenses of travel; and $215,200 for the National Advisory Committee on the Selection of Doctors, Dentists, and Allied Specialists, of which not to exceed $40,000 shall be available for expenses of travel; $36,597,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year the President may exempt this appropriation from the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: On page 31, line 18, strike out "$36,597,000" and insert "$33,000,000."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate upon this subheading and all amendments thereto close in 6 minutes after the gentleman from Mississippi has finished—4 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to add my expressions of appreciation for the splendid work done by the subcommittee which has reported this bill. They have done a splendid job, in my opinion, in reducing unnecessary and wasteful Government expenditures in this bill, and I think they are entitled to the commendation and cooperation of every Member of this House. They have done such a splendid job that I want to help them do an even better job, and that is the reason I have offered this amendment.

Last year Selective Service was given $30,154,000 for the 1952 appropriation. Later they found it necessary, because of the increase in the number of persons to be inducted under the system, to come back to the House and ask for another $2,955,000, not only to cover the additional workload but also to cover the costs of the Pay Act increases that we granted last year. The total for 1952, therefore, may be considered as $33,109,000.

It is noted that the 1952 budget was based on inducting 300,000 men. Later, they found it necessary, before the year was over, to induct 600,000, thus doubling what you might consider to be their workload. Yet they only found it necessary to come back to the House and ask for an additional 10 percent in appropriations to take care of this doubled workload.

The amendment which I have offered would hold them to virtually the same amount they had last year. The prospect in 1953 is that they will induct 650,000 men, which is only 50,000 more than last year.

I realize that General Hershey probably has the most difficult job in Government. He has an almost impossible task. One of the main reasons why General Hershey has such a tremendously hard job may be found in the haphazard, absurd recruiting systems that we continue to allow the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force to operate. If you will turn to the hearings—I believe they start on page 309—and read General Hershey's testimony, you will find that he is having to operate under almost impossible conditions, not primarily because of laws set out by Congress, but because of the absurd recruiting systems, as well as the varying standards for induction laid down by the Army, the Navy, the Air Forces, and the Marines. You will find that it is primarily the rejections that are causing the most expense in this program—that are causing his workload to be so heavy.

You will find that General Hershey estimates approximately 50 percent of the men he sent the services for induction last year were returned to him as disqualified. You will find further that 50 percent of those rejected were turned down because of mental reasons, failure to pass the mental standards laid down by Mrs. Rosenberg. You will find that General Hershey, in his testimony before the committee, deals at great length with that subject.

I feel that Selective Service can do the job this year for the same amount of money they had last year.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I want to compliment the gentleman on his amendment. I think if we reduce this amount, it will perhaps put some sense in the recruiting programs that we have in the Armed Forces. We have four different groups competing against each other, and practically all the men who are taken in by recruitment are the byproducts of the people who are processed by Hershey's selective-service group. As soon as a man gets notice of induction or thinks his time for induction is coming up he starts looking for a chance to enlist. Today I had a session with a man who was worked on by two different military agencies who came to him offering to enlist him—the Army and the Marine Corps.

I think that if we cut this appropriation, it will perhaps help get the recruiting program on a sensible basis.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman for his splendid contribution.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Can the gentleman advise me how much work of selective service is done by civilians and how much by personnel of the Armed Forces transferred to the various selective-service units throughout the country?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That question, of course, I cannot answer; I do not know.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I think that is the key to the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the committee is in sympathy with the purpose of the statement and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi to cut this amount; but facts are facts, and they cannot be disputed Let us set the record straight. If you can cut a dime more out of this item than your committee, we are going to be with you all the way down the line.

Let us not charge Selective Service with the weaknesses of the armed services, because they are two separate and distinct things, and Selective Service has no right and no power to tell the armed services what to do. Had the Selective Service System had the authority, they would have stopped a long time ago that very wasteful and expensive and duplicating recruiting system that now goes on in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps all in competition with the Selective Service System. The Selective Service System has their hands tied.

Let us see what we have done here. The armed services, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told the Selective Service System that for the fiscal year 1952 they should induct 300,000 men, and we gave them enough to do that. But before the year was out the armed services raised the number to 400,000 men and, of course, Selective Service had to come to the committee for more funds, which we gave them in a supplemental appropriation bill a few weeks ago. To be accurate the Joint Chiefs of Staff said they did not want 400,000 inductees next year, but they wanted 650,000. Think of it. An increase from 400,000 to 650,000.

The program of the Selective Service System is broken down into three parts: The local draft boards in your town and mine and in every county in the United States, and there are, roughly, 3,850. Then there is the national headquarters and the State headquarters, and every State has an office. Twenty-eight million four hundred thousand dollars of the entire appropriation goes to the local draft boards. We did not cut off a nickel. Why? The people in your community, your local draft board—do you know how much compensation they get a year? They do not get a penny. There are 40,000 of them; they work for nothing as a patriotic duty, and they are to be commended for the job they are doing. In each draft board there is one paid employee, that is a local person in your home town or home county, and they are the poorest paid of any Federal employees. Look at your own town; there will be a man or woman doing the same or similar type of work and be classified as grade 6 or 7 under the Classification Act. This employee of the draft board, of course, does not come under the Classification Act, and there is only one in each draft board, but there are 10 or 15 other people working there, local citizens, and they work for nothing. Do you get that? Now, we have taken the national headquarters here in the District of Columbia, and what did we do to them? We cut them between 20 and 25 percent. We took your various State headquarters, located at your home State capitals, and what did we do to them? We cut them between 20 and 25 percent and we put a limitation on their travel, too. We reduced that by 33 percent.

Mr. Chairman, those are the facts. You are fooling with dynamite and I do not want to see the House make a mistake, because 90 percent of the appropriation goes back to your local draft boards where 40,000 of your local citizens work for nothing. The amendment should be voted down. This is dangerous.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think I know as much about the selective service boards as our very brilliant chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations because I was for several years chairman of a selective service appeal board in California. I do not want to hurt those people who are working for nothing as members of local boards or those who are working as clerks for very nominal wages. However, I am trying in some way to get a little common sense into the armed services and their competitive recruiting systems. They are today wasting millions of dollars each year. I cannot offer an amendment covering this particular feature because it would be stricken out on a point of order, but if we reduce the amount here by approximately $3,000,000, in my opinion, there might be some indirect effect felt over at the Pentagon and they will straighten this duplicating of recruiting matters out.

The Members will recall that when we had a bill up here sometime ago in reference to this very matter I offered an amendment to consolidate the recruiting services of all four of the armed services. Unfortunately this amendment was defeated; however, I do not think it was defeated on merit, but because the Members present did not thoroughly understand it.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the gentleman from Mississippi, and I hope that reducing the amount that is made available to the Selective Service System will perhaps result in a little common sense being used by people who are running these costly and ineffective recruiting services.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Can the gentleman advise me, or can the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations advise me, how much of the work in connection with selective service in the local offices to which the gentleman refers is performed by men in uniform or officers in uniform drawing down Army pay? How much of the actual work is being done by civilian employees today?

Mr. THOMAS. There are military personnel working in your local draft boards. I hope the members of the Armed Services Committee will correct the defect the gentleman points out. These people cannot do it. We have no authority to do it. The gentleman's committee has the authority. He is an able and valuable man and I hope he will do the job.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi) there were—ayes 49, noes 53.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. THOMAS and Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 83, noes 114.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Salaries and expenses, Smithsonian Institution: For all necessary expenses for the preservation, exhibition, and increase of collections from the surveying and exploring expeditions of the Government and from other sources; for the system of international exchanges between the United States and foreign countries; for anthropological researches among the American Indians and the natives of lands under the jurisdiction or protection of the United States, independently or in cooperation with State, educational, and scientific organizations in the United States, and the excavation and preservatilon of archeological remains; for maintenance of the Astrophysical Observatory and making necessary observations in high altitudes; for the administration of the National Collection of Fine Arts; for the administration and for the construction and maintenance, of laboratory and other facilities on Barro Colorado Island, C. Z., under the provisions of the act of July 2, 1940, as amended by the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946; for the maintenance and administration of a national air museum as authorized by the act of August 12, 1946 (20 U. S. C. 77); including not to exceed $35,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); not to exceed $9,100 for expenses of travel; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and elevator conductors; repairs and alterations of buildings and approaches; and preparation of manuscripts, drawings, and illustrations for publication; $2,274,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the repair, alteration, improvement, preservation, and equipment of leased premises, and the construction of auxiliary and appurtenant temporary structures, ramps, roadways, and approaches thereto, at the Chicago International Airport, O'Hare Field, Park Ridge, Ill., to house the National Air Museum storage collections.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: On page 33, line 3, strike out "$2,274,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "including $100,000 to enable the Smithsonian Institution, through construction and utilization of a pilot plant and otherwise, to extend its studies on solar radiation to include determination of the practicability of utilizing solar energy for the production of electricity, $2,374,000."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph dealing with the Smithsonian Institution and all amendments thereto close in 13 minutes, 10 minutes for the gentleman from Mississippi and 3 minutes for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GENERATING ELECTRICITY WITH SUN HEAT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I called the attention of the House several days ago to the fact that Dr. C. G. Abbot, down in the Smithsonian Institution, as a result of more than 20 years of hard struggle, has developed a process for generating electricity with sun heat. What I am asking for here is a small appropriation to enable the Smithsonian Institution to establish a pilot plant to test out his program.

I am looking down the centuries, on a proposition that will mean more to future generations of America than probably anything else that has been proposed in your day and mine. I know that Dr. Abbot has been criticized just as Thomas A. Edison was criticized when 70 years ago that greatest contributor to the welfare of humanity was struggling day and night to develop the incandescent lamp.

One of the great scientists of the world denounced it as ignis fatuus. Another one said it was airy ignorance. Another said it was an American hoax. But the greatest of all of them said that even if he did develop this process he could not divide the electricity. It would all be in bulk. In other words, you could not have one light here and another one over yonder.

With all that criticism of Edison, that great man developed the incandescent lamp. With it he gave us the spark that fires the gas that makes the motor machine possible. He did more for humanity than any other man who has ever lived in all the tides of time.

Here we have the scientists of America urging us to move forward with this development which means more, especially to the arid areas of the Southwest, than anything else that has been proposed.

I wrote the other day to Dr. Gano Dunn, a leading scientist, in New York and received this letter from him in which he says:

> My opinion goes along with that recently expressed by President J. M. Conant of Harvard University that within the next 50 years a large part of the power used in this country will come from solar energy.

That does not come from some man who is accused of being old and senile, it comes from one of the great scientists of America. He said:

> Dr. Abbot's experiments already give incontrovertible proof of the immense amounts of power that solar energy [would] develop including large allowances for nighttime and obscuration by clouds.

I have the records here. Here is one from Massachusetts, where they have been using this solar energy to warm buildings at night. They are using it in Florida even to cook with at night.

But here when we come asking for this small amount, merely to test out this theory, which would mean the transformation of the great arid areas of America, and which would mean the use of the greatest source of power the world has ever known, or ever will know, we are denied funds for that purpose.

When we burn coal, we are merely releasing the heat which was deposited there by the sun untold centuries ago. When we burn wood, we are merely releasing the heat that was put there by the sun while the timber was growing. When we burn oil or gas, we are merely releasing heat that was placed there by the sun. Yet, here when we come and find a process of developing this energy, we cannot even get a hearing. For that reason, I have come before the Congress of the United States advocating that this program, and asking for this reasonable amount of money be allowed in order that this process may be tested out in full at the earliest possible date.

Let me show you what is happening. Take the arid areas of the Southwest. They tell me that they can generate a trillion horsepower in the arid areas of New Mexico, Arizona, California, Nevada. Do any of you know how much power that amounts to? It probably means a million times as much electricity as we are now using. If that process were in operation, they would have power to pump all water they want, to pump all the sea water, and to distill it and separate the salt from it, and use it to irrigate the land.

President Peron of Argentina has announced that his scientists who have flooded in there from war-torn Europe, have developed a process of "generating electricity from atomic energy derived from sun heat."

His scientists are merely taking this program of Dr. Abbot's and are now trying to take credit for it. Last summer, President Peron said that in 2 years from that time, they would have the entire Republic of Argentina electrified in that way.

Russia is trying it out in Asia, and now we find that Great Britain is preparing to test it out in Australia. Are we going to sit here and let them take the process that has been developed by our own scientists, at our expense, and not even give ourselves a chance to try it out here in the United States?

Let me show you what it would mean. You could not only pump all the water you need in the arid area, but as I said, you could also distill sea water and separate the salt from it, and use it to irrigate that vast area. That is what they are trying to do in Australia. This man said that they could generate a million horsepower almost over a square mile of ground, in Arizona and New Mexico. I said, "I live in the same latitude. We do not have as much sun heat, but we do have about 75 perecent or 90 percent as much. What could you do there?" He said, "We could generate from 500,000 to three-fourths of a million horsepower on a square mile of ground, which is now covered with pine bushes or clay gullies. This program may not work; but I think it will. The great scientists that I have listened to, and I will read to you the letters from some others I have received, if you care to hear them, are of the same opinion pointing out that this will probably be one of the greatest developments the world has ever known.

I ask you to give us this $100,000 in order that we may test it and see. Here is a letter from W. F. Durand, who was formerly connected with Stanford University. He is one of the great scientists of America. He says:

> Replying to your letter of recent date regarding Dr. Abbot's studies in connection with the power from the sun, I would say that I have known of this work of Dr. Abbot now for many years, especially in 1936, at the time of the World Power Conference. I witnessed a laboratory set up for this purpose which looked most promising.
>
> There is no question but that the earth receives from the sun daily enormous amounts of power in the form of heat, and it only remains to devise ways and means of transforming the heat into mechanical power.
>
> I would recommend most warmly, and without reservation, the granting of this appropriation to Dr. Abbot in order that he may carry on his work on the pilot plant level. Power from the sun is bound to come sometime. Let us push the effort to solve the problem.

Another from a leading scientist in Wisconsin, Dr. Farrington Daniels. He says:

> Solar energy is our great hope for the future and fundamental research and pilot plants should be rushed vigorously, not only for the present but for the long-range future.

I am calling your attention to these letters in order that you may understand just exactly what it means.

I also have a statement from Dr. Conant of Harvard University, another great scientist who also supports this program.

I see my time is up.

I trust this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment before the House seeks to increase the amount of this appropriation by $100,000.

It is not an easy matter for me to rise in opposition to an amendment offered by our distinguished friend from Mississippi, JOHN RANKIN. If I may humbly say so, you have just heard one of the most brilliant minds of this House. He is a monument, and the possessor of one of those scientific minds that is forward looking. Certainly for the last 25 years I doubt if there is a man in this House who has left a deeper imprint on it than has the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

I hope he will forgive me for rising in opposition. But, Mr. Chairman, there is in this budget now in the neighborhood of $110,000 or $115,000 for this same purpose. Do you know how long it has been going on? We call them astrophysical laboratories. That is a rather large word for me, but this same item has been in these budgets for 60 consecutive years.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Not for this purpose. We are only asking for a small amount, compared with the importance of the question involved, asking that they may test out this pilot plant, to see whether or not this project will work. If it works, it will revolutionize the world.

Mr. THOMAS. My sense of humility is not going to permit me to argue with

my distinguished friend, but let me repeat, this same item, with slight variations, has been in this bill for 60 consecutive years, and $115,000 or $118,000 is in it now.

I think myself, with the gentleman and that very fine mind of his, the possibilities are bound to be unlimited, but one group has been handling this for 60 years. Well, let us not start now giving it more consideration and do it in a big way. I am not going to quibble with my friend from Mississippi, but I hope the amendment is voted down at this time, and let us take another look at it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 13, noes 70.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to propound a question to the gentleman from Texas:

Will the gentleman give us a hearing? These scientists want to come here and testify before a House committee to present this problem. Will the gentleman give us a hearing before his committee?

Mr. THOMAS. We cannot deny our friend from Mississippi any request he makes.

Mr. RANKIN. All right; we will present the question.

The Clerk read as follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16 U. S. C., ch. 12A), including purchase (not to exceed two) and hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; the purchase (not to exceed 110 for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $185,270,000, to remain available until expended, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against prior appropriations: *Provided*, That no funds appropriated for the Tennessee Valley Authority by this paragraph shall be used for the maintenance or operation of any aircraft for passenger service that is not specifically confined to the active operation of the official business of the Tennessee Valley Authority by officers or employees of such Authority, and not to exceed $1,375,000 of funds available to the Tennessee Valley Authority shall be used for expenses of travel.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAKER: Page 35, before the period at the end of line 24, insert the following: "*: provided further*, That no funds appropriated for the Tennessee Valley Authority by this paragraph shall be used for the purchase of coal unless the purchase is made under a contract with a contractor who has furnished a bond for the proper performance of the contract."

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment should be obvious; there has been widespread publicity in the newspapers throughout the country concerning the methods employed by TVA in purchasing coal for future delivery for its coal-consuming steam plants. By 1956 it is expected that TVA will be buying 10,000,000 tons of coal annually to supply five coal-consuming electric-generating plants. It would serve no useful purpose for me to review these newspaper stories; they have been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and have been read by most of the Members.

On Tuesday of this week I extended my own remarks in the RECORD and requested the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee to investigate fully in public hearings TVA's method of awarding these contracts. I believe that will be done; it should be done.

The public is entitled to know whether these methods are the best and in the interest of the taxpaying public. The answer to this whole question is very simple. Here is the situation: One of the greatest coal fields in America is located in east Tennessee and southeastern Kentucky. There are dozens of fine, established, operating coal companies employing thousands and thousands of experienced coal miners. These mines at the moment are operating about 2 days a week. TVA—and I am not saying whether rightly or wrongly—in their recent awards of millions of tons of coal did not award any contract of any consequence to one of those established coal operating concerns; on the contrary, they were awarded to companies in many instances recently formed with small capital, in some instances to individuals who are not producers of coal. Now, let us say for the moment that that is not necessarily wrong.

According to the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the investigation conducted so far shows that there is no proof that TVA or the Government has lost any money. That may be true as to now, but let us see where it would lead to.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. May I say that the minority members of the subcommittee, particularly the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and myself, want to associate ourselves with the suggestion of an investigation. We think it is quite necessary.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman is discussing a very important and vital subject. I assume, of course, that he has gone into it and that he knows his amendment will solve the problem. Is there any doubt in the gentleman's mind about that?

Mr. BAKER. I shall discuss that point very shortly.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is talking about what will happen many years hence. I have called attention to the fact that within the last 3 months the greatest gas well ever produced east of the Mississippi was brought in in Monroe County, Miss., in the district I represent and, of course, within the TVA area. It produces 35,000,000 cubic feet of gas and oil each day.

It will only be a short time until we will be able to supply gas at a very reasonable rate to operate all of these steam plants, and it will not be necessary to have this row with the coal dealers.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. In answer to the gentleman from Mississippi, may I say that the TVA did undertake to purchase gas on an interruptible basis for the Johnsonville steam plant or for a certain number of units at that plant. The record discloses they could dispense with these contracts at any time they desired. In other words, they could let them have gas today and deny them gas tomorrow. In the interest of national defense, which should be paramount in our thinking, it does not make sense to contribute further to the underutilization of the coal industry and its available manpower while at the same time aggravating the existing and prospective shortages of steel and of gas.

The decision of the Federal Power Commission was sound because any other decision would have detracted from the dependability of TVA's fuel supplies. Any other decision would have discouraged the development of highly desirable underground storage of gas to meet peak demands, and it would have deprived other users of steel and gas of their essential requirements at a time when shortages of them already exist and such shortages are impending.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. In that decision the Federal Power Commission stated that TVA should use coal and not gas. This decision was wholly sound.

May I say further that I am not opposing the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee. I have tried to keep up with the investigation that has been going on the best I could, and personally I do not believe that there is anything wrong with the TVA's purchases of coal. I think they are all aboveboard. However, I may be mistaken in this belief and I intend to make further inquiries, but I now believe the TVA in every instance has awarded the contracts to the lowest bidder.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss how this amendment, in my judgment, will solve the problem. I certainly want TVA to acquire its coal at the lowest possible price. There is only one way under competitive bidding to be assured that that will be done.

The market now is in a depressed condition. The market now is about $3.50 to $4 a ton f. o. b. the mines.

During World War II coal, generally speaking, in Tennessee and Kentucky

was from $5 to $6 a ton f. o. b. the mines. I remember distinctly that in the latter part of World War I coal in our fields went from $10 to $12 a ton.

What does this mean? It means that if you let bids to people who cannot produce or to people who do not have a bond and do not have sufficient assets, if they are not under a performance bond, the temptation is too great when prices go up to channel coal off into the black market or otherwise, if there should be a ceiling price, and then say to TVA: We are sorry, we cannot deliver.

This is not a new thing. Title 40 of the United States Code, section 270 (a) provides that all contractors for public buildings and public works in the United States receiving contracts in excess of $2,000 shall furnish performance bonds. In titles 41 and 42 of the United States Code there are various references to performance bonds. The cost will be very small. If a person cannot furnish a performance bond, especially for these contracts that run for years in the future, then the United States of America has no business dealing with him. If the market price goes up substantially, as it is most likely to do, the temptation will be too great for irresponsible fly-by-night operators to divert their coal into the open market.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that TVA should welcome this amendment. It will result, in my honest judgment, in a saving of millions and millions of dollars to TVA and to the taxpaying public of the United States in the next 5 years. And an even almost equally important thing is this. If world war III should come, this electricity is of the utmost importance to the atomic-energy plants and to the Alcoa aluminum plants. What would happen if TVA could not get this coal and the atomic-energy plants were to shut down or Alcoa would shut down? I believe the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] will join me in this request. I repeat, I hope that the subcommittee will fully investigate the methods, but let us now put this performance-bond provision in there and be sure that TVA gets its coal at $3.70 so that it will not have to shut down those plants.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments to the paragraph dealing with TVA close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. COUDERT. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments to this section dealing with the subject matter of TVA close in 40 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee for 2 minutes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I intend to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER]. I know he has in mind doing a public service in this regard. I do think his amendment is a bit restrictive. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee states, "furnished a bond for the proper performance of the contract." We know that bonds cost money. In a moment I shall offer an amendment, which I believe the gentleman from Tennessee can accept, to insert the word "performance" before "bond", and, immediately after "bond", to insert "or other satisfactory security."

As the gentleman and I know, many of these concerns can furnish a financial statement upon which they can bid, and I think that would be satisfactory warranty. However, if they are forced to put up a performance bond, which costs money, then that would necessarily be added to the price of coal. I hope the gentleman will accept my amendment to his amendment. If so, then I can go along with his amendment.

Mr. BAKER. I accept the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GORE to the amendment offered by Mr. BAKER: In front of the word "bond", insert the word "performance", and, after the word "bond", insert "or other satisfactory warranty."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COUDERT: On page 35, line 14, strike out "$185,270,000" and insert "$171,270,000."

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted to Mr. TABER and Mr. JENKINS was given to Mr. COUDERT.)

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted to Mr. PRIEST, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. PERKINS was given to Mr. GORE.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] is recognized.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, here we have again before us the platinum-coated, sacred cow of the Government herd of sacred cows. In fact, this is the No. 1 bull of the herd, and that is why I stand here again in the well of the House to try to represent the small, still voice of the partially disfranchised populations of the great metropolitan areas who have so long supported in luxury and comfort the population served by the cheap electricity of the TVA area, and perhaps some other similar areas. If there be any doubt as to the sacred character of this bull, just take a look at the bill that is before you. Just take a look at the enlightening comparison of the treatment accorded this agency, this sacred bull, with the treatment given to all of the twenty-odd other large agencies in this bill—some of them possibly almost as important as providing flood-lighted golf courses for people in the TVA area.

The over-all reduction effected in this bill—the over-all average for all agencies is some 33 percent from requests. Perhaps the most important or the most touted agency from the standpoint of defense is atomic energy, and what did the majority of the members of this subcommittee do to atomic energy? Did they leave that alone? Oh, no, Mr. Chairman, they knocked 12 percent off the requested funds for atomic energy. Then what did they do with housing? Housing, the only city, metropolitan counterpart of the give-away hand-out which the TVA represents, they knocked that off 20 or 25 percent. What did they take out of the plantinum-plated hide of the TVA bull? They took exactly just 5 percent—just 5 percent—of the total $250,000,000 which was intended for use, planned for use, in this next year's budget, the budget we are working on now for the construction, acquisition, and development of new projects.

What is the background against which we have to examine this? As of today, the TVA produces about 3,600,000 kilowatts. There is in the works, under construction, some $750,000,000 worth of plants and equipment for the production of power so that when presently authorized projects, plus what is asked for in this bill, are completed, the TVA power will have increased from 3,500,000 to 8,000,000 kilowatts for the benefit of those very fortunate people in the TVA area. How nice it would be to live there. How nice it would be for my New York City constituents who pay so much of the bill. The amendment itself would simply eliminate an additional two units of steam generating capacity. The original request was for eight additional units.

The subcommittee, in its wisdom, reduced it by two. My amendment would postpone two more. So that would only cut down the request for additional steam-generating units from eight to four. We would cut it down by half.

In the area where the steam plant might best be cut out, the two Shawnee units, there is available ample electric power generated by private industry that can be brought into the area without difficulty.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this presents a pretty far-reaching and important issue that affects every one of us. Yesterday a majority of the members of the Committee of the Whole passed through tellers on this floor; and, for all practical purposes, cut out public housing. Why did they cut it out? Why, they said, "This is socialism." They said, "we in the State of Tennessee, the State of Alabama, the State of Virginia, and all the other great anti-Socialist States could not tolerate the thought of Socialist housing in New York." But for them the TVA is an entirely different story, because their States are receiving the benefit of it. The Members who voted against housing ought to vote for this amendment, because if public housing is bad socialism, certainly TVA is no less so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted

to me be allotted to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately following the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, my distinguished and able friend and colleague from New York [Mr. COUDERT], for whom I have a deep affection, would like very much, I believe, to fight the battle of TVA all over again, which battle was fought before either he or I were privileged to be Members of this body. The TVA is an established, going utility.

I would like to inquire of the gentleman which two steam units he would cut out.

Mr. COUDERT. The two remaining Shawnees, the committee having taken two of them, we reduce two more.

Mr. GORE. I believe the gentleman has just revealed himself defenseless, because the Shawnee plant is for one purpose only, and that is for supplying electricity to the atomic energy plant being built at Paducah, Ky.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. Does the gentleman recall that the subcommittee itself, with the gentleman's assent, reduced that Shawnee plant by two in committee?

Mr. GORE. Indeed so.

Mr. COUDERT. So evidently Shawnee cannot be of such vital importance.

Mr. GORE. I will be delighted to respond to the gentleman.

The subcommittee studied this matter and studied it carefully. We reduced as much as we thought we safely could reduce. We are not trying to kid ourselves or you. The two units which the subcommittee eliminated were eliminated, not because they will not be needed, and soon, but because we found, rightly or wrongly, that because of delays in the atomic-energy construction program, those two units which we eliminated could safely come later. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] has made no such finding as to the other two units which he has suggested be eliminated.

What is the situation with respect to Shawnee? It narrows down not to a question of whether TVA is an advisable concern since the gentleman specifies that the units to be eliminated are those to supply power to the Atomic Energy Commission; it is a rather narrow issue; TVA is not an issue, because the Atomic Energy Commission is responsible for the Shawnee plant, not the TVA. TVA did not come to the Congress, upon its own, asking for an appropriation to build the Shawnee steam plant. Who came? The Atomic Energy Commission. The AEC was unable to secure power for that enormous new atomic energy plant from private utilities; they had been able to secure a warranty from a combination of power companies that they would supply one-half the load of that plant. They were turning in desperation for another source from which to obtain electric power. They came to your committee requesting an appropriation, requesting that TVA furnish half of the power for that enormous undertaking, and in so doing they said to us that they were more certain of their ability to build the gaseous diffusion plant on time than they were of their ability to secure the power with which to operate it. What you have here, therefore, is really a question of whether you want to build a gaseous diffusion plant at Paducah, Ky., and not have the power to operate it. I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I am very much interested in the gentleman's observation. The gentleman takes the position that the elimination of these two plants would seriously impair the Atomic Energy Commission's power to build the proposed plant. Can the gentleman advise the committee as to the precise percentage of the TVA electric power that the Atomic Energy Commission uses?

Mr. GORE. I am not sure that I can give the precise percentage; I can state, however, that when these plants are completed they will be using more electricity than the city of New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I am afraid that is a little irrelevant; and, besides, the city of New York is not getting any of this power, I regret to say.

Mr. GORE. I was using it only as a manner of indicating size of load. Actually, I think I can give the gentleman the percentage. When the plants are in operation they will be using something better than 40 percent of the entire TVA output.

Mr. COUDERT. Approximately better than 40 percent. What percentage of the total production of TVA would be represented by these two additional units that I suggest be taken out of the bill?

Mr. GORE. That is not relevant to the Paducah question.

Mr. COUDERT. What could be more relevant?

Mr. GORE. Paducah, Ky., is almost as far from Chicago as it is from the Norris Dam. It is uneconomic to furnish hydroelectric energy at Paducah, Ky., from a hydroelectric plant over in North Carolina. Transportation of power, like transportation of anything else, is a very expensive proposition; you lose a lot; it costs a lot to build transmission lines. The only feasable way to supply a huge electric demand is to have a generating capacity in the vicinity of the demand. That is not an arguable point, so what the gentleman has raised here is whether or not we shall have a gaseous diffusion plant at Paducah, Ky., upon which the security of this country may depend, without the power to operate it.

Mr. COUDERT. If the gentleman will yield further, I do think the gentleman is obscuring the issue. He has just stated that at the most only 40 percent of the total production of TVA power would be utilized by Atomic Energy. Now, is there any reason in the world, under these circumstances, why these two additional little plants, costing a measly $50,000,000, cannot be deferred another year?

Mr. GORE. Indeed so, there is a very good reason, and if the gentleman had studied the proposition as I have studied it, I am sure he would be aware of the reason, which is very plain. In order to supply the expansion at Oak Ridge, additional hydroelectric, additional steam plants, are now under construction to meet the demand of those plants which are going to demand more, more, and more power.

Mr. COUDERT. The gaseous diffusion plant to which the gentleman refers, is that under construction and, if so, when will it be completed and performing?

Mr. GORE. The plant is under construction and we measured very carefully in the subcommittee the construction schedule of the atomic-energy facility with the construction schedule of the power units, units 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. Now the committee thought we could take a chance in eliminating the starting of the last two, but we do not say to the Congress that they should forever be deferred. We know they are going to have to be built; however, we could not go so far as to eliminate units 3 and 4 because I think that part of the atomic energy construction schedule will be so far ahead they will have to have this power. Does the gentleman desire further information?

Mr. COUDERT. As far as I can see, the gentleman is merely saying what I said in introducing the amendment, that TVA has to have everything it asks for regardless of anybody else and regardless of the total over-all national picture, and that so long as TVA is satisfied nothing else matters.

Mr. GORE. I hope the gentleman will not seriously entertain that point of view because the committee has acted I think responsibly in this. I cannot acknowledge the charge that I am unwilling to make any reduction in TVA or to accept any change. As a matter of fact, the distinguished gentleman from the Second District of Tennessee and I have just worked out an amendment which I support. I am supporting the cut in TVA that is contained in this bill, but I am not willing to go so far as to eliminate the power for the atomic-energy facility.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be yielded to the gentleman from Tennessee, a member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be yielded to the gentleman from Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GWINN. In the beginning of the gentleman's remarks, stating that TVA was an established business, and that we ought not to be reviewing again, possibly——

Mr. GORE. Will the gentleman permit me to say that I did not say it should not be reviewed?

Mr. GWINN. I mean as a project.

Mr. GORE. It is an established, going concern. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York does not go to that question at all, because the Shawnee plant is not for the purpose of supplying power to the people of Tennessee. It is not for the purpose of supplying power to the municipalities of the Tennessee Valley. It has only one function and is created for only one function, it was not requested originally by TVA, but by the Atomic Energy Commission, and that is to supply power to the new gaseous diffusion plant now under construction at Paducah, Ky.

Mr. GWINN. I had reference, if the gentleman please, to a fundamental concept. If we, as the House, decide that we have gone into socialized housing and into socialized power by mistake, ought we not to review the problem that Government monopoly creates when private enterprise is destroyed in the area?

Mr. GORE. Well, I do not think if an atomic attack should come to this country, that we are going to have too much time debating theories of government. I want the maximum amount of atomic readiness and I am not going to share the responsibility of eliminating power necessary to operate an atomic energy facility.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. If it had not been for the Tennessee Valley Authority, we would not have had the atomic bomb in the last war, would we?

Mr. GORE. I think that is a fair statement. The gentleman has offered this amendment in haste. I am sure he is doing something or attempting to do something which upon more mature consideration he would not desire to do. I ask the committee to vote down this amendment.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly to see the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] offer this amendment. To my recollection every year that I have been a Member of the House, he has seen fit to offer amendments objecting to certain expenditures proposed to be made by the Tennessee Valley Authority, regardless of the adverse effect such amendments would have on their corporate endeavors.

Over 90 percent of the funds made available under this section of the bill will be used for new construction and acquiring new generating facilities. We must keep in mind that TVA is the only supplier of the area. It must not only supply the immediate needs of the area but construction must be made to take care of the expanding needs and requirements of 1952, 1953, and 1954. Like all utilities, TVA must make plans now for new electrical capacities to meet the eventual demands of our growing economy. This is the constant dilemma of power supply planning.

Let us for a moment look at the overall power needs in the entire United States for the next 3 years. A very realistic report was most recently made by the Electric Power Advisory Committee of the Defense Power Administration. Mr. Edward W. Morehouse, vice president of General Public Utilities Corp., is chairman of this advisory committee and is a resident of New York City. Let us see what this authority, who comes from the same city as the author of this amendment, has to say.

Mr. Morehouse and his committee in their report pointed out that 30,000,000 kilowatts of new capacity now planned and on order by the electric utilities of the country for construction in the next 3 years is not in the aggregate excessive—if anything, it may be too small. The committee concluded that the load estimates for the 1953 peak made by utilities should be increased by as much as 2,000,000 kilowatts, and that the 1954 estimate should be from 4,000,000 to 5,000,000 kilowatts larger than had been estimated. According to the committee report, there would be more than sufficient power to serve the load in certain areas, while in others there would be deficits. Consequently, it was recommended by the committee that these situations be corrected by installing generating capacity now on order in locations different from those for which it had been originally intended.

The electric power advisory committee then proceeds to analyze the energy requirements sectionallywise. The committee mentioned particularly the section between the Great Lakes and the Gulf into which large defense loads would have a tendency to gravitate. The prospect in this situation the committee reported, is one of tight power supply. I would like to emphasize that the Tennessee Valley Authority is in this area.

This finding alone should be convincing to every Member that the proposed generating capacities for TVA will be needed not only for domestic use but for the enormous defense-plant activities. These findings by the Morehouse committee were very carefully prepared and the load estimates were made by the utilities after careful examinations. They were made as a result of a series of 22 meetings held in various parts of the country during October and November 1951.

Unless presently indicated trends toward sectional deficits are altered, some curtailment of the loads in various areas will be unavoidable during the coming 3 years. Such curtailments must fall largely on essential industry. The reason for this is that it is physically possible to ration power for large industries simply because deliveries are made in large enough blocks to be policed. Theoretically, it is possible to ration power to the small user—rural, residential, and so on—but these uses cannot be rationed effectively by any means which have thus far been devised.

Close examination of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York clearly shows that its adoption would reduce the power potential requirements in the TVA areas, and more particularly affect the atomic-energy plants now under construction in the State of Kentucky.

I sincerely hope that the Committee will reject the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

(Mr. PHILLIPS asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted him to Mr. KENNEDY.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I think that the House is familiar with what is happening up in New England. We are in danger of losing two basic industries, textiles and shoes, to the South. There are three reasons for this: First, lower wages; second, lack of unionization; and, third, cheap power. For instance, in Boston the industrial rate of 1,000 kilowatts of demand and 400,000 kilowatt usage per month is $5,785. For the same amount of power in Chattanooga, Tenn., it is $2,390. Now, we do not blame the South for trying to build their industrial position. I think we, in New England, have been backward not to develop water power in our own area. But, if the South attempts to extract our industries, they cannot expect us to contribute to our own demise as we are doing. For example, if the rate of unemployment was carried throughout the country as is now taking place in Lawrence, Mass., there would be more unemployment than there was during the height of the depression.

When the Government attempted to assist us by permitting certain defense contracts to be given to distress areas, even if they may not be the lowest bidder, the gentleman from Tennessee who seeks this money for TVA had this to say on page 675 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> Should this be consummated, as is now almost the case, then instead of following the practice long established in the United States of procuring through the lowest responsible bidder, we will be back on the costly, extravagant, wasteful trail of negotiated cost-plus contracts. That would be a deplorable day—condoning unnecessary spending and rewarding inefficiency.

Now, when the gentleman has attempted to prevent assistance for unemployment in New England, he cannot in return expect us to contribute our taxes to increase unemployment in our State.

The gentleman from Tennessee talked about what the power demands would be for national defense. According to the representative of the TVA in Washington by 1955 there are expected to be 7,100,000 kilowatts. Of the 7,100,000 kilowatts, a total of 1,740,000 kilowatts, including 1,200,000 kilowatts for the Atomic Energy Commission, are expected to be channeled to Federal agencies, for

industrial loads 1,485,000, and for municipalities and cooperatives 3,875,000 which means that less than one-third of this project is going to be for Federal agencies, including the Atomic Energy Commission. Most of it is going to be for cooperatives or the industrial load in this area, more than two-thirds. Therefore, it would seem to me that some cut could be made in this appropriation. The fact is that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is of such high repute in this House that year after year he has been able to push through large appropriations for TVA, and I do not blame him, but, after all, we in Massachusetts are in a very difficult predicament. Five or six of our cities have enormously high unemployment levels. If this flight of industry continues, and the American Woolen Co. is talking about going into the South, what is going to happen to our people? It is our fault in great measure for not doing what the South has done.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Why do you not do something about it? You have a great river up there.

Mr. KENNEDY. There is now a survey being carried out, but unfortunately it will not be until 1956 before the survey will be completed and its recommendation carried into effect. However, in the meantime we cannot be expected to contribute our taxes to the support of this attempt to ruin us industrially.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman is in favor of the development of the power of the Niagara and the St. Lawrence?

Mr. KENNEDY. Certainly, I am in favor of the development of power in our area of the country. I am in favor of the development of power in the South. On the other hand, I do not expect that we should contribute tax money in large quantities to the South which will result in the loss of our industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, the same old platinum-plated bull is being given us today. Yes, the same old bull, the same old suggestion from the same gentleman from New York. He says he regrets that his constituents cannot use this cheap power. The door is always open in Tennessee. We welcome you and your plants.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. Not at this point.

Mr. COUDERT. That is what we object to in New York and Massachusetts.

Mr. SUTTON. Now, may I say to my good friend from Massachusetts that we in Tennessee wholeheartedly support his developments in Massachusetts. I do not blame the manufacturer in Massachusetts for coming down South. It is the fault of the people in Massachusetts that have not demanded cheaper power. It is the private monopolies that have caused you to have excess rates. We in Tennessee will join you in reducing your rates.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The Members are addressing the gentleman who is speaking not once or twice but continuously without recognizing the Chair, and I think the Chair should be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will certainly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I wholeheartedly subscribe to what my friend from Tennessee is saying. The reason we have not developed the public power that is available in the Northeast is that the private utilities have blocked it at every turn of the road, and they are the most powerful lobby in this Congress.

Mr. SUTTON. I agree with my friend 100 percent. We in Tennessee will join with our friends from New York and Massachusetts, in developing their power projects.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I certainly agree with what the gentleman from New York said. It is our own fault we have not done it. Now we are faced with a difficult situation in unemployment.

Mr. SUTTON. We in Tennessee hope you will help us, because it is your fault you have not done something about your excessive rates.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The South ought not to be charged with the moving of the industries that are being run out of Massachusetts and other States in that part of the country by the FEPC.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, being just a simple bystander, innocent, it might be added, I do not want to get into the debate between the South and the people of Massachusetts. But I do think the people of Massachusetts should not be criticized so severely because they have not been looking around all the time for a hand-out—hanging around the Federal Government for a hand-out. If they have mistakenly thought they could go along in the good old way of their forefathers, working, thrifty, and developing, making improvements, increasing production, bringing up the output of their factories, I can understand their position. Just because the South wants to pay common labor so much less and have them, as the gentleman from Florida told us yesterday, live in those shacks and freeze, as he said, down in Miami—and that is the first time I ever heard about that—I do not think it is right—is no reason why southern Representatives should criticize our Massachusetts citizens when they lose factories but still insist on paying a living wage and supporting themselves.

I do not think it is fair to criticize the gentleman from Massachusetts or his people. Moreover, there is this to be thought about. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], and we all have respect for his ability as a parliamentarian, asked our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], how many hearings of the subcommittee he had attended and suggested that he was not present at many of the meetings, and more especially when the bill was marked up. Since the gentleman made that suggestion, I learned, might I say, possibly through Drew Pearson, that when this bill was being marked up, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], came in and told them what to do, what to put in this item. And if you want to know and insist on my telling you, I can give you my version of the reason why the bill came to us as it did and in whose interest it was written. Maybe it has something to do with the coming election in Tennessee. I just do not like that slinging of dirt from over here. May I say that the gentleman from New York did not know I was going to say what has just been said. My statement is my own and I make it because I resent the insinuation that our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] was not on the job and does not know what he is talking about.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FRAZIER].

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Chairman, the TVA has become the most important agency in the Tennessee Valley. Whether you know it or not, it is the only agency that furnishes power in the Tennessee Valley. We do not have any other electric power company in existence in east Tennessee or in the Tennessee Valley. We are dependent solely upon this agency. It furnishes all of our electric power.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. GWINN. The fact that the private power companies do not exist in your area is because they are forced by the Federal Government not to come into the area; is that not true?

Mr. FRAZIER. No; the private power companies sold out to the Government a great many years ago for tremendous prices.

Mr. GWINN. And now the TVA is an absolute monopoly and refuses to let any other private industry compete with them; is that not true?

Mr. FRAZIER. No; it is not.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. And is it not a matter of fact that the gentleman from New York was here in the Congress when the Congress itself made us have this complete monopoly by selling out private power to public power?

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The gentleman from Tennessee must remember that this side of the House was not in control when that legislation passed.

Mr. FRAZIER. That may possibly be true, but I just want to call your attention to the fact that there are a great many manufacturing plants that exist in east Tennessee and throughout the Tennessee Valley which get their power from this source. In the war effort, the TVA furnishes power not only for the atomic-energy plant at Oak Ridge, but for the great aluminum plant at Alcoa, the Kingsport munitions plant at Kingsport, the Arnold Engineering Base at Tullahoma, and it is now being called upon to supply power for the new atomic-energy plant at Paducah, and to supply the power for the guided-missile plant at Bristol.

At Chattanooga the Wheland Co. is now engaged in the manufacture of guns. All these plants require tremendous amounts of electric power.

I urge you to vote against this amendment which will not only retard the growth of that area, but will materially interfere with the war effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much the prejudice which has been indicated in the debate on the floor of the House on this bill. Every year, year after year, since I have been here, the gentleman from New York has always gotten out his ax against TVA. He seems to have a deep seated and great prejudice, and a sectional prejudice against the TVA. He is a very articulate man. He is a very handsome man. He is a very smooth man, but he is certainly imbued with a deep prejudice, a very deep prejudice which I regret to see—and which I deplore. I regret also the partisanship that has been shown here. If the gentleman would visit the Tennessee Valley, and see the great progress that has been made there, and the great prosperity that has been brought to the farms and to the agricultural section of the country some of his prejudices against a great Government agency might be removed or minimized. He should be proud that a great section of America is making great progress.

He speaks of the advancement in power production. Does he resent the fact that America is producing electric power that is so greatly needed today? Does he regret it? It seems to me that the gentleman from New York and all the Members of this body should be very proud that America is building power, which is so greatly needed today in our national defense program and for other purposes. The Tennessee Valley Authority is making a great contribution to our national defense, and to the prosperity and well-being of all our people. I also point out that the Tennessee Valley Authority belongs to all the people, and it pays into the Treasury of the United States approximately $30,000,000 annually.

Mr. Chairman, will the time never come when the private power lobbyists, the paid snipers and underminers of TVA, will cease their despicable work of attempting to cripple the TVA and do injury to our country? I urge that the pending amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be reserved until after the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] offers his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time will be reserved.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COUDERT), there were—ayes 96, noes 87.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. COUDERT and Mr. GORE.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 122, noes 98.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: On page 35, line 24, strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "and not to exceed $99,131,125 of the funds available to the Tennessee Valley Authority shall be used for personal services."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment but will reserve it to permit the gentleman from New York to make his statement.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the intent of the amendment is to bring this appropriation in line with the policy adopted by the Committee with regard to all other agencies. It would, in fact, save about $4,000,000.

The purpose of the amendment is to require this agency to absorb pay raises as has been required of all other agencies and as has been done in all other cases. One reason, perhaps, why the subcommittee did not take the same action here as with regard to the other agencies is because in the case of TVA, corporate income is available for obligation, as well as the amounts appropriated in this bill. The savings effected by this amendment mean that much more will be paid back into the Federal Treasury. Thus from appropriations and income, there will be a total of about $365,000,000 which may be spent by TVA in fiscal 1953. It is indicated that TVA intends to spend about $347,000,000, turning back $18,000,000. If this amendment is adopted, they will turn back $22,000,000.

I see no reason why the same formula should not be adopted here with regard to personnel as was adopted in the case of the other agencies, namely, to require that they absorb the pay raise by a reduction of personnel. On the contrary, in this case they propose a thousand more employees in this agency for next year than they have this year. That is contrary to the trend which we have been seeking to establish here day after day and it seems to me it is a trend that is not a healthy one.

It illustrates, of course, why it is dangerous and unsound for any agency of Government to be permitted to spend from its receipts. The receipts should go into the Federal Treasury and all expenses paid from appropriated funds. I do not know how else Congress can possibly maintain control over the Federal purse strings, as the hard-pressed taxpayers are expecting us to do.

When the TVA Act was originally approved, I wonder how many at that time realized that in the year 1953 we would have a colossus of 22,000 employees in this little empire? Think of it. More than an army division. The purpose of this amendment is to reverse that trend. I hope it will be supported by all those who are as worried as I over the financial picture in the Federal Government.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the committee is in sympathy with what our distinguished friend from New York has said and what he is trying to accomplish. He has given the facts quite succinctly and quite accurately. Of course, you have two types of funds—corporate funds and appropriated funds—but in truth and in fact and in the final analysis all the funds are taxpayers' funds because the corporate funds stem from those.

The committee has served notice in no uncertain terms upon TVA that in the future they must justify every 5 cents of their expenditures in a very detailed breakdown, not only of appropriated funds but also of corporate funds and the expenditures in personnel and in supplies and materials under those categories.

I renew the point of order that the amendment covers funds not included in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] on the point of order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the language of the amendment follows exactly the wording of the limitation at the bottom of page 35 in regard to travel. It says that not to exceed one million-odd dollars of funds available to the TVA shall be used for expenses of travel. In this same item are personal services. The additional limitation is here offered that not to exceed ninty-nine million-odd of the funds available shall be used for personal services. It seems to me that it is exactly in line, that it is clearly a limitation, and that the point of order is not well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to ask the gentleman from New York if his amendment does not apply to funds for the TVA other than those contained in the bill before the committee?

Mr. KEATING. No, Mr. Chairman. It applies only to the item of $185,000,000 as now reduced by the Coudert amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair has before him the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York on page 35, line 24, to which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] makes a point of order. The amendment says not to exceed so many dollars of

funds available to the Tennessee Valley Authority shall be used for personal services. As the Chair reads the amendment it is not limited to funds contained in the bill now before the Committee. The fact that the amendment may be patterned after language in the bill would still not make the amendment in order if it goes to funds beyond those contained in the bill before the Committee, thus adding legislation.

The Chair is not called upon to rule on the question of legislative provisions allowed to remain in the bill, in view of the rule adopted waiving points of order. The Chair is of the opinion that this amendment applies a new restriction on funds not contained in the bill thus adding legislation and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: Page 35, line 24, strike out the period and insert a comma and add the following: "and not to exceed $99,131,125 of funds available under this section shall be used for personal services."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. THOMAS. I made the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. It says "funds available." There are two types of funds available to the TVA—appropriated funds and its own revenues.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to request, if there is no objection, that the amendment be again reported.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me it meets expressely the ruling which the Chair has just made.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment refers only to funds contained within this section of this bill and is merely a negative limitation, which is in order. Therefore, the Chair overrules the point of order.

Permit the Chair to say that under the limitation of time adopted some bit ago the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] had not consumed his time.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to my chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman may yield his time to the gentleman from Texas, if he desires the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I say in all courtesy and fairness to my good personal friend from New York that the committee has not the slightest idea of what his amendment does. We have not had the opportunity to see it, and I do not condemn him for that. Perhaps he has not had an opportunity to present it to us. However, I gather that he is seeking to cut down some salary costs. Is that it?

Mr. KEATING. No, Mr. Chairman. I may say to the gentleman from Texas that the amendment reduces the figure which is in the bill for personal services by $4,000,000. It is just limited to personal services. It does in dollars what your committee did with regard to all other agencies of Government, requiring that additional pay be absorbed by elimination of personnel.

Mr. THOMAS. How does the gentleman expect to reduce the personnel cost by $4,000,000 by his language? That is what I do not quite understand.

Mr. KEATING. The amount in the bill as it stands if this amendment were not adopted is $4,000,000 more than $99,000,000 for personal services.

Mr. THOMAS. There is not a dime set out in here for personal services.

Mr. KEATING. That is true, but it appears from the record very clearly, and I am sure the gentleman would agree with me, that of the $185,000,000, $103,000,000 is for personal services. This reduces that item to $99,000,000.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I am sure the gentleman means to do what he says he intends to do, but I cannot see how the amendment he has offered can possibly do what he says it will do. Indeed, it may have a contrary effect.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, when this Coudert amendment comes up on a roll call, when we get back into the House, it should be voted down by all means. It is one of the most dangerous blows at our national defense program that could be made at this time, since it would tend to paralyze our atomic-bomb plant at Paducah, Ky.

If we should be plunged into another European war, it would be an atomic war that would probably destroy every city along the Atlantic seaboard. Our hope for survival, and for the survival of our civilization, would depend upon the strength of our Air Force and our supply of atomic bombs.

This Coudert amendment is supported by the same element that has fought the Tennessee Valley Authority, and has fought the development of the Columbia River, for the last 20 years.

If they had succeeded in their attempts to prevent the development of the Tennessee and the Columbia Rivers, we could not have produced the atomic bomb, and many other facilities, that enabled us to win World War II. Now, when we are faced with a dangerous international situation, as well as enemy infiltration at home, they bring up this amendment to prevent the construction of this steam plant at Paducah, Ky., where our new atomic-bomb plant is situated, knowing that this plant is to be constructed, not for the power consumers throughout the TVA area, but for this atomic-bomb plant at Paducah that is producing the materials necessary to defend this country, and to save the lives of our American boys, if we should be plunged into another world conflict.

It has certainly been surprising to me to hear these attacks made on the Tennessee Valley Authority by certain Members from the Northeastern States on the ground that their industries are leaving them and moving into the South.

The TVA is not responsible for that situation. Those industries are moving into Texas, Louisiana, and other Southern and Western States that are outside of the TVA area.

One thing that is driving those industries out of some of the Northeastern States is the communistic FEPC that has been fastened on to some of those States, including New York and Massachusetts.

No one would go to a State that has this FEPC written into its laws to establish a new industry, and many of the industries that have been operating there for years and years are now seeking locations beyond what might be called the FEPC iron curtain.

Another thing that is causing them to move is the fact that in those States where most of this criticism is coming from they have no coal, no gas, no oil, very little wood, if any, and no raw materials, and they will not develop and distribute what water power they have at rates the people can afford to pay.

Let me remind you that those industries are also moving to the West and the Middle West, as well as to the South.

For almost 100 years the South and West have borne the burden of economic discriminations never before imposed by any other country on the people of any section of their own domain. A great economist at Harvard University said a few years ago that no country that ever lost a war had paid the indemnities the South had paid in indirect taxes, high protective tariffs, discriminatory freight rates, and other discriminations. The same situation applied to practically every State west of the Mississippi River. This great economist might have revised his remarks and said that no country that ever won a war, or helped to win a war, had ever paid the indemnities the people of the Western States have paid in the discriminations borne by their people since the War Between the States.

That day is now over. If there is any prosperity in this world for the next century, the South and West are going to enjoy their portion of it. They have everything to make it. They have coal, gas, oil, wood, water power, raw materials, soil, climate, rainfall, and a people who are willing to work, and who are interested in building up their own country and promoting their own prosperity.

You would think to hear some of these attacks that the TVA, and the Columbia River development, and all the other water power developments in the South and West, were being paid for out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the other sections of the country. That is not true. The TVA and the Columbia River development, and all of those other water power developments, will pay for themselves in the years to come. And, I might add, that they have added more to the wealth of the Nation, as well as

more to its national defense, than anything else that has occurred during our generation.

It is absolutely silly to refer to these developments as being socialistic. The power business is a public business. It has become a necessity of our modern life. Nobody can live and enjoy the benefits of our modern civilization without the use of electric energy. It must be handled by a monopoly. It would be ridiculous to have a half dozen, or a dozen, concerns supplying electricity to the people of any one city, town, or community. The overhead costs would be so great they could not bear them.

Besides, the water power of this Nation already belongs to the Federal Government. That was decided by the Supreme Court of the United States many years ago in both the Ashwander case and the Appalachian Power case.

Then, how can any man contend that it is socialism to have the Government improve the navigation, controls the floods, generate the electricity in these navigable streams, and supply the transmission lines to carry it to the various cities, towns, and rural areas where it is used and paid for?

As I have said before, the TVA has wrought the greatest development of ancient or modern times. It has greatly aided the people in every section of this country by showing them what electricity is worth and how it can be used to stimulate business of every kind, brighten the homes, lift the burdens of drudgery and make our country a brighter and a better place in which to live.

In addition to that, it enabled us to produce the weapons of war that helped us to win the victory in World War II, and probably saved the lives of a million American boys.

If the House should adopt this vicious amendment, I hope the Senate knocks it out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services: For necessary expenses of the Veterans' Administration, including maintenance and operation of medical, hospital, and domiciliary services, in carrying out the functions pursuant to all laws for which the Administration is charged with administering, including purchase of 38 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); maintenance and operation of farms; recreational articles and facilities at institutions maintained by the Veterans' Administration; expenses incidental to securing employment for war veterans; funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental thereto for beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration except burial awards authorized by Veterans' Administration Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended; aid to State or Territorial homes in conformity with the act approved August 27, 1888, as amended (24 U. S. C. 134), for the support of veterans eligible for admission to Veterans' Administration facilities for hospital or domiciliary care; not to exceed $6,000 for newspapers and periodicals; not to exceed $3,138,400 for expenses of travel of employees; not to exceed $45,300 for the preparation, shipment, installation, and display of exhibits, photographic displays, moving pictures, and other visual educational information and descriptive material, including the purchase or rental of equipment; $803,586,430, together with not to exceed $12,500,000 of the unobligated balance of funds appropriated for this purpose in the "Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952," from which allotments and transfers may be made to the Federal Security Agency (Public Health Service), the Army, Navy, and Interior Departments, for disbursements by them under the various headings of their applicable appropriations, of such amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of 70 persons engaged in public relations work: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home, or for the purchase of any hospital or home; and this appropriation may be used to repair, alter, improve, or provide facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration, not otherwise provided for, either by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and the purchase of materials.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGRATH: On page 37, lines 8 and 9, strike out "$803,586,430" and insert "$809,382,260."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all sections and paragraphs under the heading "Veterans' Administration" be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how liberal, may I ask the chairman of the subcommittee, is he going to be with the time later on? Is he going to cut us down to 2 minutes?

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] that we are going to try to finish the bill in a reasonable length of time and give everybody who wants to be heard an opportunity to be heard. Everybody is familiar with what is involved here. You know and we all know that we can talk here for a week, if we wanted to, on this subject. So let us get down to business and finish this in a reasonable length of time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object: Might I suggest to my friend that he could accept this amendment and that would obviate the necessity of taking up a great deal of time.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have not used any time at all on this bill, and I have an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York and I would like to have 5 minutes at least.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I just want to say to the gentleman from Texas that, as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, we want some time on all these amendments, and so will the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], as well as other members of the committee. I do not think you ought to just take a sweeping stroke and cut out debate on the entire section because there are going to be some very important amendments.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the committee has convinced us that we should proceed for a while at least. So, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH].

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply restores the contact officers in the Veterans' Administration. Unlike the previous discussion that has been had today, there is nothing sectional about it. It is for the American veteran. I am very hopeful that the suggestion of the majority leader will be accepted by my friend, the chairman of the subcommittee. The Committee on Appropriations struck out $5,795,000 which eliminated 80 percent of the contact office workers in the Veterans' Administration. These contact men are the very people to whom the returning veterans go with their many, many problems, whether they be questions of rights of education under the GI bill of rights, or whether they be questions of rehabilitation or of hospitalization. These men do a remarkable job. In the main, they are the first contact with the returning veteran. We have passed a great deal of beneficial legislation for the veterans. These men return home. Many of them come to a new section where they did not live before. They do not know where to turn except to the contact officers of the VA. They must go to someone who will advise them as to their rights.

In the general debate it was suggested by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that they could go to the veterans' organizations. It is true the veterans' organizations are doing a good service, as far as they are able, but we must remember there are 19,000,000 veterans in the United States today. We have passed legislation that inures to the benefit of the families of veterans and that number is 80,000,000 individuals. In addition to that, I call your attention to the fact that there have been 670,000 veterans who have been added since the Korean situation. While it is true the men in the various posts of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars have attempted to do what they can, they cannot meet this great burden which would be placed upon them.

Again, these men who are contact officers have been trained. Those of us who try cases in court know that the presentation of a case is a very important thing, and if you deny a veteran the right, because he has not been in a position to logically and in succinct fashion present his case, you deny to that veteran the very thing that you voted for in this House.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Does your amendment restore the full amount for contact officers, or does it just come up to the budget recommendation?

Mr. McGRATH. It is just up to the budget recommendation, which was $7,231,329. At no time have I attempted to go over the budget estimate.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. The budget estimate recommends approximately a two-thirds cut in the veterans' contact officers; is that not right?

Mr. McGRATH. That is right.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. As I understand, that two-thirds cut would practically eliminate this contact service to veterans out in rural areas. There would only be service available in the larger metropolitan areas; is that true?

Mr. McGRATH. The advantage of this amendment is this: that it gives to the men in the rural sections an opportunity to continue these contact officers. In the big cities, we would not be hurt as much as in the rural areas. While I come from New York, I can say that the Legislature of New York has passed legislation which gives us contact officers, but my amendment will be for the benefit of those in the rural sections.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. In the State of New York alone, with 262 contact employees, there were over 200,000 single operations handled in the last fiscal year.

Mr. McGRATH. That is correct. In addition to that, there have been a great many handled by the veterans' organizations.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Will the gentleman's amendment keep in contact those contact officers in the remote, rural areas, a long way from the regional offices?

Mr. McGRATH. It will.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that if we accept your amendment, we still lose 200 contact offices?

Mr. McGRATH. That is true. The reason for that is we have kept within the budget estimate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DENNY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENNY. Mr. Chairman, I have voted consistently for reductions in the cost of Government. Many businessmen, friends of mine and members of veterans' organizations have protested to me against exorbitant cuts involving veterans. I want to hear all that I can regarding the reason for these cuts. I will not vote for reductions that will cripple the work with veterans, particularly the work with disabled veterans. Therefore, I want a complete explanation of all these proposed cuts.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. MARTIN of Iowa be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the House Appropriations Committee, in my opinion, has committed a most grievous mistake in recommending the elimination of the Veterans' Administration Contact Service.

This is the service that operates at the grassroots level of our Nation to provide information and help to veterans and their dependents who need Veterans' Administration benefits, as enacted by the Congress.

The Veterans' Administration now has 343 contact offices throughout the country—most of them many miles distant from the big VA regional offices where applications for benefits are adjudicated. In addition VA maintains contact services in the big regional offices for the thousands of veterans who stream into those offices every day for help.

In the month of January, 1952, alone, this contact set-up handled approximately 500,000 visitors—veterans and their dependents who needed help.

On February 29, 1952, VA had 2,212 persons in the Contact Service. The VA budget, as submitted to the Congress, cut this number to 1,526 employees. This alone would have required the closing of 200 of the 343 contact offices. It further would have required VA to abandon the formula agreed upon by the Bureau of the Budget and VA for the closing of contact offices. This formula was made known to Members of Congress on March 20, 1951. It provides that if the number of visits to any contact office east of the Mississippi River falls below 450 a month for 4 consecutive months the office would be closed. For contact offices west of the Mississippi River, the number was set at 350 visits per month, except in metropolitan areas where the 450 figure would prevail.

Now the House Appropriations Committee comes along with a recommendation for only 305 contact personnel. That recommendation, if adopted, would force VA to close all of its 343 contact offices and to reduce by 75 percent its contact staff in its 70 big regional offices.

Yet our veteran population continues to grow larger. In addition to the 18,500,000 veterans of World War II and prior wars, we now have 655,000 veterans with military service since the Korean conflict started. By the time the men and women now in service are discharged as veterans, the since-Korea veteran population will equal if not exceed the number of persons who served in the Armed Forces during World War I.

The present Congress already has enacted Public Law 28 that gives since-Korea veterans virtually all World War II benefits except those in the GI bill. The present Congress also has enacted Public Law 23 that sets up an entirely different type of postservice Government life insurance system for our since-Korea veterans. The present Congress further is considering at this moment the extension of GI bill benefits to our since-Korea veterans.

In other words, we are increasing the number of benefits that VA administers; but, in the House Appropriations Committee recommendation, we are asked to consider cutting off the good right arm of VA in administering these additional benefits efficiently and expeditiously.

All of your major veterans organizations already have or are now protesting this recommended cut. They do not have the personnel or the money to replace this invaluable VA service.

Further, the Secretary of Defense has notified VA within the last 10 days that the counseling structure of the Defense Department "is built around the availability of contact service provided by the VA through its network of field offices" and "any marked curtailment in this contact service would have a direct effect upon the Armed Forces separation counseling program."

In view of all this I think the committee's recommendation is penny-wise and pound-foolish. My earnest advice is that you provide the Veterans' Administration with approximately the $8,500,000 it needs to maintain the present contact service.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not absolutely true that the State contact officers do not have rights in the Veterans' Administration that the Federal contact officers have?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They go in under sufferance, and they can shut them out many times, and they have been shut out many times.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I have supported every single amendment designed to save dollars for the taxpayers that has been offered during the reading of this bill, but to me the action of the subcommittee in cutting the item which concerns contact officers is false economy. Therefore in the few minutes at my disposal I shall try to paint a word picture of what the situation is, in hope that the majority will agree that we need the contact officers we have today, and for that reason will support the McGrath amendment.

Let me begin by pointing out that we have in this country today approximately 19,000,000 veterans of all wars, campaigns, and expeditions. In addition we are making 20,000 new veterans a month as a result of the Korean war. As the gentleman from New York has mentioned, since the beginning of the

Korean war we have added to the veteran ranks of this country 617,000 new veterans. To speak of veterans alone is not sufficient, because the Congress provides benefits to both the veteran and his dependent. Therefore, in this country today we have 61,000,000 people who are entitled to benefits administered by the Veterans' Administration in accordance with existing laws.

To do this job, the Veterans' Administration has 152 Veterans' Administration hospitals scattered throughout the United States and Territorial possessions. In addition they have 70 regional offices and 343 other VA offices. The other VA offices may be a district office, a suboffice, located in some public-health hospital, a State institution, or an Army or Navy hospital. These contact officers must be available to any of the 61,000,000 people who are entitled to benefits and who need information, necessary forms, as well as assistance in executing such forms.

The contact program of the Veterans' Administration is engaged in assisting veterans, their dependents and beneficiaries, and representatives in the preparation and presentation of claims as has been authorized with the beginning of World War Veterans' Act in the early twenties and has been reiterated in other veterans' legislation over the years, including the so-called GI bill. The contact service is the focal point in regional offices where visitors come for assistance and answers to questions relative to laws passed by the Congress for the benefit of veterans and their dependents. This is advantageous not alone to the veteran, but to the taxpayer, as through this method claims are properly prepared, permitting prompt action by the Veterans' Administration to effect determination as to benefits and subsequent payment when indicated with the least practicable delay and without the expense of continued correspondence.

The various ex-service organizations have individuals who are trained in a comparable manner to contact representatives, but they are limited in number and, in my opinion, the funds of these organizations would not permit the employment of a sufficient number of trained personnel to replace the services rendered by contact personnel. In any event, you cannot deny the right of veterans and their dependents to come to the Veterans' Administration seeking aid. There is undoubtedly a mistaken idea that competent advice and assistance can be rendered to veterans and their dependents in every community where there may be a post of any service organization. I say this because the service officers of such posts are generally veterans who have full-time employment in private vocations and perform this extracurricular work as a means of helping their fellow veterans, but could not possibly be coversant with all rules, regulations, and laws that apply as is the case with the employees of contact service or full-time, paid representatives of service organizations who are rarely available except in locations where regional offices are situated and hence in metropolitan areas. I have the greatest sympathy for these post service officers. They do the best they can, but I assure you that they cannot render service as one employed full time. In fact, it is well known that VA contact representatives, in order to keep on a current basis, are continually studying on their own time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I have not taken much time on this bill and for that reason I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five additional minutes

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think a strong powerful point is that the contact representative is the outpost of the Veterans' Administration in helping the veteran get his rights under the law.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Absolutely. I was in my home town last night where we have a Veterans' Administration hospital. The veterans of Altoona and vicinity depend upon a contact officer, and unless the McGrath amendment is adopted they will lose his valuable services.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Is not the contact officer rather a diagnostician for the veteran? In other words, if he were to go to a regional office and there was no contact officer, the veteran would not know where to go and that in turn would waste a good deal of the time of the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes. If a veteran walks into a facility and there is no service officer there he goes to the contact officer. This contact officer is briefed in law, briefed in policy, he knows a little bit about medicine, he gets to know the veteran and aids him by gathering information and preparing his claim for presentation to a board who decides whether or not the veteran is entitled to benefits. The VA contact officer is a valuable man, he is a liaison between the veteran population of this country and the Veterans' Administration. Frankly, when you abolish the contact officer position you are toying with the misery of millions of veterans who seek relief from the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This case came to me and I think the gentleman can straighten it out for me. A veteran of World War II had an insurance policy which was about to expire. He placed the money in the hands of one of these contact men before the time of expiration occurred. The money was later sent to the Veterans' Administration. The Veterans' Administration denies this by saying it did not receive the money in time. Are these contact men permitted to accept such deposits? In other words, what happens in a case of that kind and who is responsible?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Of course, the law is very specific when it comes to dealing with this particular question of insurance and the interpretation undoubtedly made by the Veterans' Administration was that this veteran, even though he had the assistance of a contact officer, did not meet the provisions of existing law. I have had similar cases and I had to agree because it was the interpretation of the legal division of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Even if this amendment is adopted, still 60 percent of the present offices will be closed?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Regardless of whether or not the amendment is adopted, we stand to lose 200 contact officers.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Which is 60 percent.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman think that is a rather substantial cut?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes. Instead of cutting we should provide more contact officers because of the increasing veteran population in this country. Let us not forget these veterans did not declare war on anybody. The Government of the United States declared war and many of them were drafted, many volunteered, and today as veterans they are entitled to the benefits granted to them by the Congress of the United States in the name of the American people and administered by the Veterans' Administration.

The contact officers we are trying to restore are simply representatives of the United States Government, the Veterans' Administration and the American people who are there to assist the veteran population to this country to receive the benefits that they are entitled to.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] for the clear, forceful, and logical statement he has made today in support of the pending amendment. It is characteristic of the part he has taken on all occasions where the interests of the veterans are concerned.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to increase the amount provided in this bill for the maintenance of contact offices. I consider that the welfare of the veteran is at stake in this matter. I have

continuously voted to reduce the expenditures of Government but cannot with good conscience do so in an instance of this kind.

I am in full accord with all that has been said in support of the amendment. There is no justification for cutting this necessary service for veterans. In my opinion we should consider increasing these facilities instead of cutting them. As the name implies, these contact facilities provide a means of enabling veterans to contact a representative of the Veterans' Administration to ascertain the answer he needs to his problems of one character or another and incident to his rights as a veteran. Otherwise, it would be necessary for him to travel long distances to regional offices or carry on extensive and involved correspondence. This is difficult for the average veteran and very unsatisfactory.

To provide contact offices for veterans where they may obtain desired information as to their rights or attention for physical needs is one of the finest and most necessary services provided for veterans. At the present time there are 1,526 of such offices provided for veterans. Unless the pending amendment is adopted, this number would be reduced to approximately 300. Such a cut would result in great distress to our veterans. I cannot believe the Congress will consent to any such drastic cut, especially in view of the fact that each month several thousand more veterans from the Korean war are being added to the 19,000,000 veterans already existing as a result of our previous wars. And, in addition to these veterans there are also the members of the families of deceased veterans who have rights and benefits under our veteran legislation who need the services of these contact offices.

I have personal knowledge of the necessity as well as the advantages of these contact offices. There has been one located in Camden, N. J., for many years. A short time ago the Veterans' Administration sought to close it or greatly curtail its facilities. Veterans' organizations from all over south Jersey opposed this action by the Veterans' Administration. After a united and persistent effort we were able to keep it open, and, today, it is still rendering splendid and efficient service to the veterans of south Jersey. If this amendment is not adopted it will mean that this facility would be closed and veterans from south Jersey, as far south as Cape May, would have to travel to Trenton or Newark to get the attention they need. This is unthinkable.

Within the next few weeks we will be called upon by the Administration to appropriate billions of dollars for aid to foreign countries. If we have money for such a purpose, to benefit countries all over the world, then, we should be willing to do what is necessary for our veterans. To cut down their benefits and the service they are entitled to, while spending billions of dollars in foreign countries, is without justification. Our first duty is to those who have served our country in its hour of emergency. I will support the pending amendment so that the services through contact offices will continue to be available to our veterans. I trust that my colleagues in the Congress will do likewise.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I also desire to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his continual support of the veteran and to state that I intend to support the amendment restoring the contact officers.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I thank the gentleman. Let me say this in conclusion. There are 1526 contact officers scattered throughout the United States and our Territorial possessions. Unless the McGrath amendment is adopted it will mean we will reduce the contact officers from 1526 to a mere 300. If these veterans cannot go to these contact officers they will go to Members of the Congress of the United States, and, believe me when I tell you, your offices will be swamped with requests for assistance.

The Department of Defense has at this time stated that they have built their counseling service around the availability of the contact service provided by the Veterans' Administration through its network of field offices conveniently located throughout the country, which is indeed an important factor in view of those being discharged for disability and other reasons from the Armed Forces, incident to its present operations, particularly from Korea and, as is well known, the number is continually increasing.

The proposed 80 percent reduction in funds for the contact program for the Veterans' Administration will eliminate all 343 VA contact offices, eliminate all service to veterans in private and State institutions, reduce the availability of service in the regional offices to a number that would not permit contact service to be rendered as necessary. In fact, 45 percent of the 70 regional offices would be reduced to one contact representative and one clerk. The number of visitors to regional offices and VA offices to the contact service during January 1952, for example—which excludes services rendered in VA hospitals—was approximately 500,000, which represents in the neighborhood of 6,000,000 visitors to these offices a year, and I ask who is going to help these people.

Irrespective of the amount cut from the budget request, I am informed it will be necessary to close 200 of these offices immediately even though the funds requested are granted, which will have an adverse effect on service to veterans and their families. To maintain the contact service as it presently exists will require approximately $809,382,260 instead of the $803,586,430 recommended by the appropriations committee. So it is evident that the committee action would result in the virtual elimination of the contact service, which has been of such great benefit to those who have served their country and to their dependents.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to understand the thinking of the persons who would recommend, so shortly after the Second World War and at a time when so many of our young men are on active military duty that services to our veterans be drastically curtailed. The proposed 90-percent cut in contact services to our deserving veterans cannot be justified at this time.

Last year over 16,000,000 contacts were handled by the Veterans' Administration contact representatives. It would be folly to assume that the demand for such service would diminish to such an extent that the needs of veterans throughout the country would be satisfied by the few existing regional offices.

Should this curtailment in funds for VA contact offices be effected, all veterans in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania would have only the Philadelphia or Pittsburgh offices to assist them in matters pertaining to the privileges and benefits to which they are entitled under existing legislation. It would be impossible for these two offices to take on the additional burden of furnishing information on claims, hospitalization, education, GI loans, and so forth, and continue to efficiently perform their other functions. Not only are our veterans entitled to have this service as readily available to them as possible, but it would be most unfair and result in severe hardships and unpleasant consequences in many cases to suffer the delays which would be unavoidable in prolonged correspondence with the distant regional offices. To attempt to serve our veterans via long distance would result in a gross negligence of the Nation's obligation to those who served our country in its hour of need.

In addition to the hundreds of thousands of veterans of World Wars I and II who still from time to time find it necessary to obtain assistance in negotiations with the VA regional office and central office, the return of large numbers of Korean veterans increases the demand for contact representatives in the remote communities throughout each State. There is also the factor to be considered that the majority of these positions have been filled by disabled veterans who have been adequately trained to assist other veterans in their problems with efficiency and dispatch.

I strongly urge that the reduction of $5,795,830 proposed by the Committee on Appropriations be restored and that the House of Representatives approve the complete budget estimate of $7,231,329 for operation of Veterans' Administration contact offices throughout the country.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia to the amendment offered by Mr. McGRATH: Strike out "$809,582,260" and insert in lieu thereof "$806,484,345."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on

the McGrath amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour and 5 minutes, 5 minutes to be reserved to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], and 6 minutes for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, do I understand, in the event the McGrath amendment or any of the substitutes therefor or amendments thereto are not agreed to, that the time limitation would not apply to other amendments to the section?

The CHAIRMAN. The time limitation requested by the gentleman from Texas only applies to the McGrath amendment and all amendments thereto.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD following those of the previous speaker, and further that my time be allotted to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the budget request for this item called for $7,231,329. The committee bill has cut that by $5,795,830, which amounts approximately to a cut of 80 percent, or four-fifths of the amount the budget request carried. My amendment would restore half of that reduction to the bill.

In the fiscal year 1951 there were 3,034 of these contact officers, departmental and in the field. In the fiscal year 1952 that number had been reduced to 2,234. The amount carried in the budget for the fiscal year 1953 called for 1,526, which likewise was a reduction from the number in 1952. Seven hundred and eight of these contact officers were cut off by the budget request figures from the number in the 1952 fiscal year.

The committee bill would cut the 1,526 which the budget request calls for by four-fifths, to approximately 300. I believe that is much more drastic than any reduction which has been made in any bill which has come before us up to this time. Some items have been reduced 20 percent, possibly some 25 percent, but I know of none that has been reduced as much as 80 percent, or four-fifths.

I realize, of course, that the distinguished gentleman from Texas is a careful man. I know he works hard and diligently on the items in the independent offices appropriation bill. For that reason, having read the hearings which begin at page 1270 and finding very little information in there on which to base an opinion as to whether or not this is a reasonable cut, I talked to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], who is the able chairman of this subcommittee, and asked him what there is to justify this drastic cut. He told me that the Veterans' Administration could very well cut out all these contact officers without doing any harm to the veterans' program.

Having the respect for the gentleman's opinion that I have, I was so concerned that I took it upon myself yesterday morning to go down to the Veterans' Administration office here in Washington for the purpose of seeing just what work is being carried on by these contact officers there. I have been in the reception room in the Veterans' Administration office in Atlanta, which is in my district and I have seen there on a number of occasions anywhere from 25 to 50 veterans sitting in the reception room at one time waiting for one of the contact officers to take up their problems.

I went down yesterday morning to the office here in Washington. There were some 20 or 30 veterans sitting there in the reception room in the office when I went in. So I went around to a number of them, and asked them what they were there for. I wanted to know myself whether a real and necessary service is rendered by these contact officers. I questioned 4 of these veterans at some length about what they were there for. The first one I questioned was there to see about cashing in his life insurance, which is a legitimate thing for a veteran to go there to see about. And certainly the Veterans' Administration is obligated to give him information on that when he goes there. The second one was a student who was taking a course under the GI bill of rights, and he was there on a legitimate errand in connection with that. The third one was there because he had some trouble with his insurance premium payments, and the monthly payments that he had been making. I know all of you have had trouble laid in your lap by your veteran constituents on that very thing. He was there—not taking it up with his Congressman, but directly with the Veterans' Administration, and that was a legitimate errand. The next one I went to was in to see about having some dental work done, which he contended was necessary because of service connection, and also to see what his civil-service rights were as a veteran. All of them I talked to were there on legitimate errands, and certainly were entitled to have some competent, capable person dealing with them when they went there. So I am convinced that these contact officers, if they work constantly and diligently at their job really render a service to the veterans.

I asked the head of the Department also to give me some information about how much work they do. I have here a summary of the contact activities for the month of January 1952, which when we go back into the House, I am going to ask permission to insert at this point in my remarks:

Contact and administrative services—Contact activities, January 1952

Location	Personal contacts		Counter contacts	Telephone contacts	Correspondence prepared	Forms prepared	Applications prepared
	At office	Away					
Grand total	622,486	22,300	140,138	512,804	175,776	331,841	156,453
Central office	4,623	0	202	9,774	2,109	2,633	1,499
Total hospitals and domiciliaries	134,321	137	20,545	42,799	24,970	59,024	24,927
Total regional offices	476,706	21,937	117,949	444,516	146,881	265,962	128,125
Alabama: Montgomery	7,131	167	1,024	4,591	2,446	3,069	949
Alaska: Juneau	1,727	61	276	1,137	1,107	779	614
Arizona: Phoenix	4,917	287	353	2,492	1,071	2,609	847
Arkansas: Little Rock	6,581	548	1,568	4,203	2,273	3,427	1,589
California:							
Los Angeles	20,651	263	3,057	31,736	11,077	11,564	6,307
San Diego	4,106	68	368	4,252	720	2,001	849
San Francisco	9,960	815	2,334	11,786	2,342	4,885	2,408
Connecticut: Hartford	7,175	973	1,281	5,167	2,418	4,475	2,560
Delaware: Wilmington	630	16	2	1,049	153	446	230
District of Columbia: Washington	7,403	177	1,671	11,623	2,720	2,845	872
Florida:							
Miami	7,837	364	1,191	7,451	1,923	3,690	1,067
Pass-A-Grille	8,976	224	1,379	5,606	2,323	4,826	1,814
Georgia: Atlanta	12,466	420	3,132	8,355	3,601	7,247	2,995
Hawaii: Honolulu	2,716	656	370	1,706	861	1,786	742
Idaho: Boise	2,791	66	588	1,457	905	1,467	761
Illinois: Chicago	18,852	459	4,429	22,115	4,815	9,878	6,134
Indiana: Indianapolis	10,559	236	1,631	9,606	2,329	6,945	3,612
Iowa: Des Moines	4,993	18	1,826	4,649	1,252	3,430	1,764
Kansas: Wichita	2,216	36	375	2,093	674	1,342	773
Kentucky: Louisville	6,345	87	1,980	3,456	2,010	3,567	1,506
Louisiana:							
New Orleans	7,000	118	1,905	4,522	1,929	3,454	1,090
Shreveport	1,928	8	472	2,039	665	1,060	401

Contact and administrative services—Contact activities, January 1952—Continued

Location	Personal contacts		Counter contacts	Telephone contacts	Correspondence prepared	Forms prepared	Applications prepared
	At office	Away					
Maine: Togus	2,265	493	500	2,284	1,243	1,681	760
Maryland: Baltimore	6,348	304	2,089	5,563	1,464	3,273	1,160
Massachusetts: Boston	23,363	1,594	11,679	22,343	8,915	11,394	6,647
Michigan: Detroit	8,191	1,639	3,880	11,154	2,955	4,620	3,031
Mississippi: Jackson	3,813	21	520	1,483	748	1,271	500
Missouri:							
Kansas City	5,750	45	1,646	8,758	2,197	4,606	2,598
St. Louis	5,081	329	446	3,086	880	2,109	962
Montana: Fort Harrison	1,932	47	976	1,292	879	709	411
Nebraska: Lincoln	2,813	48	678	2,995	767	1,827	1,102
Nevada: Reno	878	21	52	665	259	463	238
New Hampshire: Manchester	3,347	135	804	1,960	969	1,925	1,010
New Jersey: Newark	12,054	623	1,491	14,554	5,113	7,551	3,147
New Mexico: Albuquerque	3,418	354	944	1,937	1,423	1,464	574
New York:							
Albany	5,044	479	1,109	4,090	1,652	3,133	1,655
Brooklyn	12,623	44	3,829	14,746	2,496	6,690	3,362
Buffalo	7,473	621	1,094	6,771	1,704	3,666	1,363
New York	32,280	1,727	9,958	42,381	10,406	17,847	10,192
Syracuse	5,059	367	743	4,424	1,957	2,627	1,485
North Carolina: Winston-Salem	5,579	46	1,969	4,485	1,877	3,116	923
North Dakota: Fargo	1,252	37	184	958	784	712	361
Ohio:							
Cincinnati	9,847	231	2,647	10,687	4,059	6,540	4,242
Cleveland	12,562	168	3,040	11,126	3,249	7,063	4,772
Oklahoma:							
Muskogee	4,997	128	723	2,777	1,587	3,185	1,778
Oklahoma City	6,177	1,012	1,261	4,693	1,820	3,519	1,843
Oregon: Portland	5,023	189	2,274	3,869	2,026	2,490	1,168
Pennsylvania:							
Philadelphia	10,958	482	5,047	11,405	2,934	7,909	3,466
Pittsburgh	11,665	128	2,406	9,509	2,407	6,729	3,434
Wilkes-Barre	11,895	425	2,888	7,440	2,676	7,936	4,056
Puerto Rico: San Juan	7,293	635	1,931	867	2,118	3,644	1,349
Rhode Island: Providence	5,890	631	813	3,435	1,731	2,829	1,498
South Carolina: Columbia	5,424	157	1,558	3,796	1,910	2,748	1,374
South Dakota: Sioux Falls	847	106	359	1,056	268	364	176
Tennessee: Nashville	6,220	23	541	5,025	1,215	2,321	804
Texas:							
Dallas	5,489	108	789	5,054	1,714	2,444	792
Houston	6,459	264	2,089	6,031	2,252	3,338	1,542
Lubbock	5,254	132	781	3,381	1,363	2,368	955
San Antonio	6,315	502	641	4,599	1,671	3,168	1,278
Waco	4,854	35	610	3,153	1,237	2,496	1,188
Utah: Salt Lake City	1,708	17	1,543	3,323	1,251	1,579	900
Vermont: White River Junction	935	243	284	812	382	623	439
Virginia: Roanoke	4,750	118	715	4,838	1,312	2,343	1,381
Washington: Seattle	9,340	406	2,277	8,317	2,494	5,124	2,949
West Virginia: Huntington	17,628	251	4,231	13,670	3,053	13,909	2,619
Wisconsin: Milwaukee	8,620	381	2,326	7,649	3,218	5,031	2,430
Wyoming: Cheyenne	1,033	124	372	1,024	692	786	327
Total Do-Ro centers	6,836	226	1,442	15,715	1,816	4,222	1,902
Colorado: Denver	4,790	126	1,094	5,092	1,225	2,329	816
Minnesota: St. Paul	2,046	100	348	10,623	591	1,893	1,086

It shows, and I will give some specific instances here, that at the office I visited yesterday morning, that during the month of January 1952 there were 7,403 veterans who came in with a problem which called for having their files brought down from the file cabinets and taken up across the desk with the veterans. They do not list here in that column those who merely come in to ask questions, and who get information directly without having to have their files brought down. They have those listed in another column called the counter-contacts. That shows 1,671 contacts in addition to the 7,403. Now to do that work, and carry that load, they had here in Washington 46 of these contact officers. If this bill goes through as it now stands, the 46 will be reduced down to 9. There is grave doubt in my mind whether nine contact men working as hard as they could all the time would be able to handle anything like the load that rests on this office here.

I want to give you some other illustrations of reductions which would result from the reduction carried in the committee bill. These facts were furnished to me by the Veterans' Administration:

New York now staffed with 149 contact VA officers, reduced to 26.

Los Angeles now staffed with 83 contact VA officers, reduced to 12.

Chicago now staffed with 77 contact VA officers, reduced to 11.

St. Louis now staffed with 31 contact VA officers, reduced to 4.

Jackson, Miss., now staffed with 18 contact VA officers, reduced to 2.

Dallas, Tex., now staffed with 33 contact VA officers, reduced to 3.

Nashville, Tenn., now staffed with 26 contact VA officers, reduced to 3.

Atlanta, Ga., now staffed with 53 contact VA officers, reduced to 6.

Boston, Mass., now staffed with 100 contact VA officers, reduced to 11.

Washington, D. C., now staffed with 46 contact VA officers, reduced to 9.

Maine now staffed with 12 contact VA officers, reduced to 2.

Vermont now staffed with 6 contact VA officers, reduced to 2.

Rhode Island now staffed with 19 contact VA officers, reduced to 3.

Memphis office will be cut out altogether.

This tabulation shows how drastically the personnel will be reduced if the bill goes through as it now stands.

My amendment will add one-half the amount cut off by the committee. If the House believes that 1,526 contact officers are too many to perform this work, then let us try to get along by cutting only half the number provided in the committee bill. We can try that for a year, and if that is too many, the number can be reduced again next year. I think these contact officers are performing a needed and valuable service to the veteran, and I do not believe that this necessary work can be carried on by one-fifth the number now engaged in that work.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I agree thoroughly with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] who has served on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs a great many years, and who knows the problems of the veterans.

I realize that I am pro veteran. I get more letters than almost any other Member of the Congress. They come from every State in the Union, almost every day, and they are letters on veterans' affairs and concerning veterans, as a rule. I know there is no service rendered by the Veterans' Administration or by any other administration that is more valuable to the servicemen than this contact service in every State in the Union. For that reason, I sincerely trust that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be voted down because the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGRATH] certainly goes far enough.

Is it not strange that we will take up a proposition of this kind to abolish these contact officers, deprive these veterans of this service, and at the same time pour literally billions of dollars into foreign countries, giving it to people who sometimes laugh at us with contempt? Is it not strange that we would treat our veterans that way?

These contact officers not only serve the veterans, but they serve the widows and orphans, the fathers and mothers of these boys who have been killed in the various wars through which we have passed.

Every veterans' organization that I know anything about is opposed to cutting down this appropriation. I know the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the AMVETS have all supported this appropriation, as I understand it, and have opposed this reduction.

There are many people on the Federal payroll that you can get rid of and save a great deal more money without injuring anybody than by putting in an amendment to cut down this appropriation below the danger point, as far as the veterans' service is concerned.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee said we will save $5,000,000 here and make it available to veterans' pensions. The gentleman knows and you know there is a schedule of pensions provided by law, and if we do not spend this $5,000,000 on contact officers, it will not be spent on pensions.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; and the gentleman knows and I know that a majority of the veterans do not belong to any veteran organizations. They feel a hesitancy in calling on veterans' organizations that they do not belong to, but they feel as if the contact office is open to them, and that is the reason they go there and talk about their cases, about their insurance, and about various other things, such as bringing home the bodies of their deceased boys, on down to the minutest problems that affect veterans.

I sincerely trust that this amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] will be voted down, because, in my opinion, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH] goes far enough.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would like to read to the Members just the effect this will have on the offices across the country:

Los Angeles has 83, and it will be cut down to 12, if the committee bill goes through.

Chicago has 77, and it will be cut to 11.

St. Louis has 31, and it will be cut to 4.

Jackson, Miss., has 18, and it will be cut to 2.

Dallas, Tex., has 33, and it will be cut to 3.

Nashville, Tenn., has 26, and it will be cut to 3.

Atlanta, Ga., has 53 and it will be cut to 6.

Boston, Mass., has 100 and it will be cut to 11.

Washington, D. C., has 46, and it will be cut to 9.

The State of Maine has 12, and it will be cut to 2.

Vermont has 6, and it will be cut to 2.

Rhode Island has 19, and it will be cut to 3.

And the Memphis office is to be cut out altogether.

Mr. RANKIN. That bears out my argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi has consumed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, back in the Eightieth Congress, when there were even more contact men in the Los Angeles office than at the present time, a member of our Committee on Veterans' Affairs, my colleague from Missouri [Mr. BAKEWELL], chairman of a subcommittee, was inspecting the San Francisco office of the VA with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Sarbacher, and he found a veteran on the floor on a stretcher. There were not enough contact men there to come out to see him they said. The contact was crowded with veterans. I spent 2 weeks myself in San Francisco inspecting veterans' facilities at that time. This member of the committee found that that man was hemorrhaging.

That would occur much more frequently if you cut out the contact men in the office in San Francisco and over the country generally.

I do not know how many Members realize that if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia is passed there would not be a single contact representative in the military and naval hospitals.

Mr. PHILLIPS. On what basis does the gentlewoman make that statement?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I received that information from one of the men in the Contact Division of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Does the gentlewoman mean to say that with 190 hospitals and one-thousand-four-hundred-and-odd people under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia that they could not put a contact man in each hospital?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I do not mean in veterans' hospitals; I am talking about military hospitals. I think a lot of you who go to Walter Reed Hospital and the naval hospital realize that they have but one VA contact man, but perhaps you do not. When I go out there I find so many boys who do not know what their rights are and cannot get any information. Some of the boys even come out of the hospitals without knowing their rights.

I have a letter that the people in the Pentagon building sent to the Veterans' Administration saying that they would welcome very much the help of the Veterans' Administration in a counseling course; but they cannot have that counseling course without a contact man in the hospital and they say in this letter to General Gray that they assume that there will be one there. It is of vital interest to these boys, and there are six hundred and some odd thousands of them more than there were at the time the members of the committee were analyzing when they marked up this bill. They are certainly entitled to care. The following is the letter from the National Defense:

MARCH 11, 1952.

Mr. CARL R. GRAY, Jr.,
Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GRAY: It has come to the attention of this office through the Interdepartmental Committee established as a result of your letters of December 19, 1951, that, because of anticipated budgetary limitations, the Veterans' Administration plans to reduce the number of field offices and contact representatives now in existence throughout the country.

The Chairman, Armed Forces Medical Policy Council, by letter to you dated November 5, 1951, has indicated the desirability of reactivating the benefits counseling program in effect during and subsequent to World War II at service hospitals. This means that it would be highly desirable if the Veterans' Administration could furnish contact representatives at each major service hospital to assist the military authorities in giving technical advice and assistance to those personnel who are being separated or retired from the service because of physical disability and, particularly, assisting those personnel who are being transferred to Veterans' Administration facilities.

As far as the counseling program for servicemen being separated for reasons other than physicial disability is concerned, this program appears to be proceeding satisfactorily now. The services are giving separatees basic benefit information by means of lectures, personal interviews, group discussions, pamphlets, etc. Thus, the individual is given basic information as to veterans benefits available at this time; then he is referred to the agency administering a particular benefit for further details, if desired. As far as Veterans' Administration benefits are concerned, this program assumes that the present Veterans' Administration field offices will remain in existence. The present counseling structure is built around the availability of the contact service provided by the Veterans' Administration through its network of field offices conveniently located throughout the country. Any marked curtailment in this contact service would have a direct effect upon the Armed Forces separation counseling program.

Under present plans, the volume of separations from the Armed Forces will reach a peak the latter part of this summer, remain at a high level until the summer of 1953, and then gradually taper off. Thus, the counseling program will assume more importance as separations increase. Also, as you know, the Congress is presently considering legislation which will provide benefits for veterans of Korea.

I do not believe that the counseling program on veterans benefits, in which both the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Defense have a vital interest, should be curtailed in any matter at this time.

Sincerely yours,

ANNA M. ROSENBERG.

BOSTON, MASS., *March 19, 1952.*

Hon. EDITH N. ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the Amputee Veterans Association of America, Department of Massachusetts, strongly protest the contemplated action of closing the veterans' contact offices. Many

of our members have been especially trained for this work and are rendering necessary service to the veterans of the State. To close these offices would deprive these amputee veterans of their employment and take away from other amputees a service which they deserve. Your help in this matter will be appreciated.

JOSEPH BANTUONO,
Commander, Department of Massachusetts, Amputee Veterans of America.

BOSTON, MASS, *March 20, 1952.*
EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you use every effort to prevent passage of H. R. 7072, cutting Veterans' Administration staff 90 percent, as their help badly needed now by all veterans.

UNITED SPANISH WAR VETERANS,
Department of Massachusetts.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 20, 1952.*
Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives:

AMVETS urgently request that independent offices appropriation bill be amended to restore drastic curtailment of vital veterans' services. Present bill pending in House virtually wipes out the very much needed contact service and curtails to alarming extent progressive medical research program of Department of Medicine and Surgery. Last year over 13,000,000 contacts were handled by contact service. They involved letters, personal contacts, telephone contacts, and a very good itinerate service. To wipe out this function of VA means that there will be large backlogs in every phase of VA activities. Veterans will be unable to obtain adequate information on claims, hospitalization, education, GI loans, and other veterans' benefits. Veterans' organizations' service officers already overworked and will not be able to take up additional load. The Nation's obligation to its veterans cannot be carried out if this service is reduced. If medical research program is curtailed needed progressive improvements in hospital program of VA will not be realized resulting in longer hospitalization and increased cost to the Government. In our considered opinion this curtailment of veterans' service will cost taxpayers additional money rather than effect any savings. We earnestly request your continued efforts to restore these veterans' benefits.

RUFUS H. WILSON,
Acting Legislative Director.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that in addition to the Army and Navy hospitals there are many of them scattered throughout the United States in Public Health hospitals, State institutions, and private institutions?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; that is true and it is especially necessary to have that service in mental institutions.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Why, certainly; and a contact officer should be at each institution.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And these boys cannot pursue their claims without that help.

In 1922 I was requested by the President of the United States to make an inspection trip of the veterans' hospitals of the country. Conditions were very bad as shown by the report I brought back from a western trip which took me to California and back and up north. I brought back hundreds of veterans' claims because there had not been enough persons to help them with those claims. I have tried to help those men ever since. It is a very vital service.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the kind and able fighter in Congress, a great warrior in World War II, and a badly disabled one.

Mr. PATTERSON. Does not the gentlewoman believe it would be a good idea to have these contact officers stationed at areas where our boys are discharged so that before they go out into civilian life they are told of their various rights and privileges under the veterans' regulations?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; and I would say to the gentleman that today that is not done. At Fort Devens, which is in my district, during World War II they had a contact officer and a man who was discharged from the service or separated from the service up to a few years ago was always told of his rights; they had a contact man there to advise him of his rights.

Did the gentleman wish to say something further?

Mr. PATTERSON. I was just going on to say that some of these veterans would have special privileges under civil service if they established the fact that they have a service-connected disability. In clarifying their records at time of discharge would entitle them to an extra 10 points on any Government examination they might take. Yet as things are now they go out into civil life and many times do not know their rights. Then it means a letter to a Congressman or Senator who has to probe into the various records in order to find and establish the veteran's rights, something he should have been told of at the time he was discharged. I am sure the gentlewoman from Massachusetts who is the veteran's best friend here in the House will agree with me. I personally believe the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is the best-informed Member of this body where the disabled veteran is concerned. There should be more contact representatives protecting the interests of our veterans. I support wholeheartedly the McGrath amendment. The American Legion, DAV, and all other veteran contact officers are to be commended for the great work done for our veterans of all wars.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And no civilian has the privileges or information that a Veterans' Administration representative has. He is the man to tell the veteran what rights he is entitled to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO], who is such a friend of the veterans, for a question.

Mr. FURCOLO. I support the gentlewoman in her argument and shall support the McGrath amendment.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. When you visit one of these hospitals you first go into the ward where the sickest men are, men who are not going to live, to find out whether they have established their claims for compensation. I have known men to leave hospitals because their claims were being worked on, they had not established service connection and they had to have money for their families. If they established service connection they could stay hospitalized and try to get well; they would probably hemorrhage and die if they leave the hospital. Many men do not know their rights in insurance matters; in compensation; for housing or loans, and so forth; they do not know their rights for training. Only the other day I found a case of a man in the South, a double amputee, he was a colored man. He was a World War I veteran. He did not realize he was entitled to compensation. And that is not an isolated case. You have had hundreds of cases in your office and have seen hundreds of cases in the Veterans' Administration and you realize how much those men need help. Go into a regional office and see the widows and the children waiting because there was no contact man available. And, remember, last year the blind men were taken off of the contact rolls, the amputees and others. You may remember last year a good many contact men were removed from their jobs.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that when we created the contact office in VA we took a lot of work off the shoulders of Members of Congress?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; but it is not that. The Members are very glad to do that work. Most of them do not have the staff for that purpose; they are glad to help, but they cannot do it. They cannot go into the files of the VA at any time. It takes a long time to get a file down here to the Capitol and you do not give the men the service they are entitled to. Then a Member does not have the necessary information.

J. Leo Ashe, the commander of the Massachusetts American Legion, and Mr. John Walsh, the chairman of the Disabled Veterans Committee of Massachusetts, came to Washington and led the fight to restore the cuts in the contact men in the VA.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members will support the McGrath amendment, which restores the budget request, and defeat the Davis amendment, which would only restore a part of the committee cut. The distinguished

gentleman from Georgia has called our attention to the fact that if his amendment is adopted a number of reductions will take place in these large contact offices, but the process of elimination of the contact offices will be the result in my part of the country. Down my way, there are only two people in these contact offices as a rule.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The reductions which I read and referred to were not if my amendment was adopted, but if the committee amendment went with it.

Mr. MORRIS. Yes; but the gentleman's amendment also will destroy the contact offices down my way, and I certainly do not want them destroyed if I can possibly prevent it. I have had the honor, the privilege, and the experience of having served as a post commander of the American Legion and as a service officer for about 12 years. Being a lawyer, an ex-judge, and so forth, I have had some legal experience. I know—it is not guesswork with me—that if you cut out these contact offices you are going to do a great injustice to thousands of these boys, not just a few. If a veteran does not start his claim out right in the beginning, if experienced advisers do not assist these boys, these veterans, with their claims to start with, and get them started on the correct theory, not any manufactured theory but on the correct theory, based on their injuries and what their rights are, and explain the law and the rules and regulations, which are quite often complicated, to them, then oftentimes because of a bad start, for lack of proper advice, they will later lose their cases regardless of how good and valid they actually are.

And again, without these offices, many emergencies will arise where even deaths will occur for lack of proper and immediate advice and attention. Also, not only in regard to claims of veterans is this contact work most important but it affords a proper and necessary convenience if fairness to the veteran is to obtain. It also takes some of the workload off of the regional offices and prevents delay in decisions. It is my judgment that this contact service is essential to the welfare of our veterans who need VA service. I truly hope the McGrath amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I shall support the McGrath amendment.

I know I am considered proveteran—and I am. I want to stand on the side of the veteran in this fight, as I have in every other battle on the floor of the House. I hope the friends of the veterans will unite here this afternoon to prevent the unwarranted cut in the contact representatives of the Veterans' Administration.

Every Member of Congress should be aware of the usefulness and the importance of the contact representatives to the veterans of all wars. Curtailing this service to the veterans will result in depriving thousands of them of the assistance they require in preparing their claims—will deprive them even of a chance to learn of their entitlement for benefits under laws passed for their welfare by this Congress.

Certainly I am interested in economy, but when you attempt to cut this service to our war veterans by 80 percent, that is not the kind of economy I will support. I know something about the veterans' needs. I have handled hundreds of claims for worthy veterans and I have learned from experience how valuable is the aid furnished by these contact representatives. If anything, we need a few more of them.

The action of the Appropriations Subcommittee in cutting the budget estimate and Veterans' Administration request practically eliminates contact services for veterans throughout the entire country. Yet the demand for this service is constantly increasing due to the large numbers of Korean veterans being discharged.

Yes; I am for the veteran, and I am proud of it. I make no apologies for fighting for the veterans here this afternoon. I urge my colleagues in the House to support the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH] and restore the full amount approved by the Bureau of the Budget. Do this for the veterans. If we do not restore this cut, a great hardship will be worked on our disabled veterans.

This is a service our Nation owes our disabled veterans. Let us help our veterans secure the benefits to which they are justly entitled.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask one or two questions of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]. Assuming we provide for 5,000 or 10,000 contact officers, would that necessarily give the boys the information? I mean the fellows who are uninformed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It would help enormously.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand it would help, but if we were to have 15,000 contact officers we could still argue that the boys do not know their cases.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But not to any great extent.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me ask another question: Is there a Member of this House who will admit that he takes a less interest or that she takes a less interest in one of these cases than does a contact man? Of course, you take as much interest as any contact man in the United States.

Will any of you admit that you have had veteran after veteran after veteran tell you that he could not get any service out of the Veterans' Administration or out of the contact officer? I think all of you have had that experience.

It seems to me that we need to do a lot of thinking on this proposition if the desire is to actually give the veteran what we think he is entitled to.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry we do not have more genuine, down-to-earth, straightforward information on this proposition before we have to vote on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG].

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, occasionally some of us in this House who work hard to cut out or cut down appropriations that we think are not necessary are accused of blind cutting. Well, we are not in this instance trying to do any blind cutting. Some of us honestly try at every opportunity to cut where there are waste and extravagance. But we now come to a bill where we feel that too much cutting would itself result in no benefit to this country.

As one who has worked for many years as chairman of child welfare for the American Legion in my State, closely in touch with the rehabilitation of the veterans of the First World War, I may say to you that I am of the opinion that intelligent work on the part of the contact officers can save the taxpayers a lot of money. I thoroughly agree with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], who from his great knowledge of veterans work, has so ably stated the case for adequate support of our Veterans' Administration contact officers. I believe it would be a mistake to cut out what was in the budget request for this item of the Veterans' Administration.

I hope that all Members who have in the past joined with many of us in economy moves will consider seriously the real need for this appropriation by our veterans. I repeat, adequate service for veterans by contact officers can actually save money.

(Mr. DEVEREUX asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. PHILLIPS.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I favor the McGrath amendment, which insures the money necessary for the pay of the veterans' contact officers in the Veterans' Administration budget. This puts back the amount cut out by the committee bill from the budget request.

I believe that these veterans' representatives are vitally necessary for assisting our veterans on their claims. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] that we people in Congress should be standing up in every respect for the rights of these veterans and their representatives before the Veterans' Administration. We must remember that the Veterans' Administration is a large bureau. It contains many branches, and many levels and types of bureau services, beset with many technical rules.

These people who are the veterans' representatives as contact officers are actually the men taking the veterans' point of view before the veterans' bureau. Unless we have contact officers that stand up for the veterans' interest and take the veterans' slant on the Veterans' Administration problems, we then have these veterans individually, without previous experience in many cases, and often sick or disabled, coming up against

a large bureau and a great variety of procedures that they know nothing of.

I believe that we have had good service from these veterans' representative contact officers in the Pittsburgh area and the State of Pennsylvania, and generally in the United States. I would like to see these contact officers maintained as they have been, and give this good service to our veterans, and the good veterans' organizations. The small amount for the salary of these veterans' contact representatives is money well spent.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SECREST. I would like to point out that in my district alone there have been over 3,500 home loan applications made, and that every one of those veterans has received his information from the contact officer.

Mr. FULTON. That shows the fine work of these veterans' contact officers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this or any other reasonable amendment to restore, in whole or in part, funds approved in the budget estimates intended to support and maintain our veteran-contact service throughout the United States.

In my humble judgment this cut of more than $5,000,000 goes far beyond any point that is wise and in the interest of efficiency or economy. This reduction would for all practical purposes destroy this essential service. Essential because, in addition to the millions of veterans who lean heavily on the contact service for help, thousands of our service men and women in returning to civilian life will require guidance and attention insofar as their adjustment problems are concerned. To a certain degree, it is a responsibility of our Federal Government to provide out-post service to our deserving veterans and I believe these veteran-contact offices aid in a measurable degree to bring about efficiency in this important governmental service and operation.

Mr. Chairman, although I have supported, and I shall continue to support, every reasonable proposal to reduce the staggering cost of government, I do not believe we should destroy this vital service and I hope that the Members of this House will support this worth-while adjustment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the move to cut the Veterans' Administration contact representatives at the present time. I think it would be a great mistake to reduce these offices by 80 percent at a time when we are calling into active service men to fight in Korea. I support the Korean rotation policy and I believe that we should release the men who have been in Korea for a long period of time. At least we should bring back home men who have been over in Korea a long period of time. I notice that the Defense Department recently stated the high point in the release of Korean veterans will be reached during the present summer and will continue through the year 1953. With tens of thousands of Korean veterans returning to this country and being released from service, I think it is a very poor time to reduce the veteran-contact offices. These men are being taken out of civilian life, are being required to spend many months in foreign and combat service and then are being returned to civilian life. This is a time when we should be prepared to protect their veterans' rights and aid them in asserting Veterans' Administration claims where they need assistance.

I have the figures on what the proposal to reduce these offices will mean to my State of Louisiana. In the New Orleans district office at the present time there are 28 contact representatives. They are located either in the central office or in suboffices in Lafayette, Baton Rouge, Houma and other places throughout south Louisiana. This proposal would reduce the number from the present 28 down to 2 or 3 contact representatives, all located in the New Orleans office.

As for the Shreveport regional office, at the present time we have 15 contact representatives there. They are located either in the central office in Shreveport, the veterans' hospital there in Shreveport or the suboffices in Alexandria, Bastrop, or Monroe. This proposal would reduce to two veteran-contact representatives for that whole area of north Louisiana, leaving them in the central office.

The New Orleans regional office has handled 7,000 cases in the offices and 118 cases away from the offices. Shreveport regional office has handled 1,928 in the office and 8 away from the central office. The State of Louisiana does provide for State representatives. They are doing an excellent job and work without regard to political factionalism and serve the needs of our veterans efficiently and well. I would do nothing to disturb that set-up in Louisiana. On the other hand, I think we should have the help which the Budget Bureau recommends even in my own State of Louisiana. In the other States which do not provide so well for this service, the need for veteran-contact representatives is overwhelming and most pressing. I hope that we will restore the budget cut.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at the conclusion of my remarks the telegram which I recently received from Commander Donald R. Wilson, national commander of the American Legion, in regard to this matter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 17, 1952.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Independent offices appropriation bill which comes up for consideration March 19 practically eliminates contact services for veterans throughout entire country. Demand for this service constantly increasing due to large numbers Korean veterans being discharged. Respectfully urge restoration to amount approved by Bureau of Budget. Thanks and regards.

DONALD R. WILSON,
National Commander, the American Legion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, in the short time of 1¾ minutes available to us it is rather hard to go into the details of some of the problems I have had, and I know that every Member of the House has had many of the problems I have received from veterans. I have a file 2 feet high of veterans' problems that have arisen since the Korean mess broke out.

It does happen that as a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars for 28 years, and having played quite an active part in the post to which I belong, I have had considerable experience, because in Minneapolis and St. Paul we have the Fort Snelling Veterans' Hospital, and problems have come to me on many occasions because of the proximity of that hospital to my district.

Just yesterday I had to take up with the central office here in Washington the question of the Korean veterans. I wrote the department down here with regard to the reissue of section 2, circular 26, to provide out-patient treatment for these Korean veterans who are pending adjudication of their claims to the out-patient list; in other words, our Korean veterans are on the waiting list even for out-patient care.

I want to subscribe to the McGrath amendment and ask for the defeat of the Davis of Georgia amendment. I have every respect for him in his effort to try to compromise this situation, but in his explanation he certainly described to this House the very severe cut that is going to be occasioned in many of these hospitals. I think that contact work is the most important work there is in connection with the needs of veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

(Mr. COTTON asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. PHILLIPS.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSS].

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Davis amendment, which would restore only approximately 612 Veterans' Administration contact officers to the pending bill, and in support of the McGrath amendment, which would reinstate an additional 1,226, making a total of 1,526.

I oppose the Davis amendment without at all reflecting upon the sincerity of purpose of the gentleman from Georgia. I know from personal knowledge of his great interest in the welfare of the veteran and I have reason to believe that he has introduced his amendment to restore 612 contact officers because he is concerned that the McGrath amendment will be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, when I was here in the Congress in 1947 and 1948, I had the honor of serving on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I know some of the problems of the veterans and of the necessary service performed by the Veterans' Administration contact officers, and I concur wholeheartedly with the views presented here by the distin-

guished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], and the ranking minority member, the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

I hope the McGrath amendment will pass, Mr. Chairman, because I believe it would be a serious mistake to eliminate these contact officers at this time, when they are performing such vital service to the veteran, and when so many new veterans are returning from the Korean war.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, in the short time allotted to me, it is very difficult to present any strong argument to you. I want to say I am 100 percent in favor of the McGrath amendment, and opposed to the amendment presented by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS]. I hope that the Members of the Congress realize the good work that the contact officers do. In Philadelphia they have done an outstanding and admirable job. I can only think of what would happen to my office if they cut down the contact officers. How any Member of Congress who has daily contacts with his people, and with the great number of veterans we have in our districts today, and the number we are going to have as a result of the Korean situation, could keep up with that work, it is hard for me to believe that an economy of this kind is reasonable. I think that everything should be done to help the veterans of the country. Giving the veterans these fine benefits is part of the job, but we must give them assistance, counsel, and advice. The contact officer does this. I think this is one way we can show these fellows that we want to do everything that we can to help them because although our offices serve them, and my office serves them well, and we do a good job for them, many times I would be tickled to death to turn a particular matter over to somebody who is a specialist in a particular field, and most of these contact officers are specialists. They not only handle Federal matters but handle State and local matters for the veterans. They do an excellent job and I hope there is no cut in the contact officers. We can do this by voting down the Davis amendment and passing the amendment of my good friend from New York [Mr. MCGRATH].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, nobody has a right to speak in this debate any longer on a cumulative basis. I should like to take but a minute to share two thoughts with my colleagues.

One is the relationship here. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGRATH], which I support, seeks to restore a budget estimate of $7,231,329. If you will look at page 38 of this committee report, you will find that we are spending something like $3,500,000,000 for the services upon which contact officers are to advise. These include compensation, pensions, readjustment benefits, hospitalization, and so forth.

This seven and a quarter million dollars is the human element, which is involved here. You can give a man all the benefits in the world, but if he is frustrated, lost, and has to wander around to get them, and feel his soul seared in the process, he will not appreciate it. So the budget provision for contact officers is to make it convenient and comfortable and sensible for the veterans to get with a full heart almost $3,500,000,000 of benefits. I submit to you, it is just not right and it just does not add up. The least we ought to do is to provide for these contact officers. Secondly, I think I am one of a group of those veterans in the House of Representatives who are very careful about any measure which has dealt with bonuses or other efforts to just compensate the veteran because he was a veteran. Therefore, I think it is up to us as veterans to fight the hardest for an amendment like this, which represents tangible and intrinsic value important to a man's soul as well as to his well being and that of his family. I hope very much the House will grant this very meritorious increase.

The whole situation is well put in a telegram from the American Legion, Department of New York, in support of the amendment of our colleague [Mr. MCGRATH]. This telegram is signed by State Commander James V. Demarest, and I quote from it:

> The American Legion, Department of New York, vigorously protests drastic reduction in Veterans' Administration contact service budget * * * if enacted would virtually wipe out that service and place tremendous additional burden on veterans' organizations who are not physically equipped to assume it. The service which is to be reduced in New York State handles over 200,000 operations monthly with 262 employees. Proposed reduction amounts to approximately 90 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE].

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the McGrath amendment, which will restore this money for contact officers in the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. Chairman, in all this deliberation on whether or not we should retain the Contact Services Divisions of the Veterans' Administration, it seems to me that our decision should be based on sensible consideration of the basic facts involved, which have mostly been overlooked.

In the first instance, I would like to emphasize that the original appropriation to maintain these services was not recommended by the agency itself nor by any prejudiced source but by the Bureau of the Budget.

A few other fundamental facts to be observed are that the advice and guidance provided through the Veterans' Administration Contact Service to our some eighteen million veterans is extended to the widows and orphan children of the heroes who gave up their lives, which brings the number of persons involved to approximately sixty million; God forbid that we should forget the needs of the families and veterans of the Korean war which are still to be met.

It is said that a part of the work performed by the contact services can be done by the service officers of the various veterans' organizations but in analyzing that shallow claim we need but reflect that about one-fifth of our veterans belong to such organizations and the service officers are chosen each year at annual post elections; substantially what this means is that, just as the service officer is beginning to acquaint himself with the multitudinous rules surrounding veterans' benefits and entitlements, he is replaced by another individual who must start the learning process all over again. Earnest and industrious as such service officers are admitted to be, we cannot sensibly compare them with the skilled and trained contact man in the Veterans' Administration office who is doing the job every day.

I am in entire sympathy with those who would mainly place their judgment in this matter on the basis of economy. No one has been more energetic than I in advocating the elimination of nonessential Government spending in this time of heavy taxation burdens due to our necessary war-production program. As I have said before, and will repeat again, we must not blind ourselves to the fact that there is a real difference between sound economy and false economy. In my conviction the approval of an adequate appropriation to provide the veterans of this country, and their surviving family members, with the skilled guidance of the contact-services personnel of the Veterans' Administration is very sound economy.

It would be an obvious contradiction, as well as an unwarranted cynical rebuff to our own American citizens to say, in one and the same breath, that we can give financial assistance to almost every country on the earth, including some with totalitarian governments, and we cannot afford to insure adequate services to the most deserving of our American citizens and families. It might, indeed, be a course fraught with tragic consequences if at a time when we are recalling veterans and drafting young men, we deliver this morale destructive blow under the guise of picayune economy by wiping out the full and adequate services offered by the Veterans' Administration contact personnel.

The amount of money is comparatively little and the morale factor involves the very heart of our defense preparations, the individuals who are being compelled to leave their homes and employment to enter the military service.

In full justice to them and their families, I urge you, my colleagues, to join with me in supporting their cause.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONOHUE. I yield.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I am also supporting the McGrath amendment. I think it is a proper amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the McGrath amendment. I hope the House will vote to reinstate the services of the contact officers both in my State and in every State throughout the country.

The cuts which have been made by the subcommittee in the Veterans' Administration Contact Service budget would, if they are not nullified by the House, work the greatest of hardship upon veterans and their families throughout the country.

In the State of Massachusetts alone, these cuts, if they were carried out, would leave only one single office at Boston to serve the entire State. I think that the House can readily understand just what this means. It means that widows, dependents, and disabled veterans, sick and infirm veterans, will in a large number of cases receive no contact advisory service whatever, or be compelled to travel long distances in order to get it.

Obviously, the single office at Boston would be overcrowded, its personnel overworked and not in a position to render the advice and assistance which this Congress intends should be accorded to every veteran and every veteran case. Such a situation will unquestionably have a grave effect upon veterans and their families in my State, and what is true of my State applies generally to the whole country.

The record shows that I have favored economy and efficiency in the Federal Government, but, frankly, I must unalterably oppose a policy masquerading under the name of economy that will deny to our veterans, their families and dependents, the very meager and minimum advice and assistance they require to secure proper hospitalization, disability allowances, pensions, compensation, clinical services, educational training, and other rights to which they may be entitled by laws which the Congress has enacted for their benefit.

I have received a very large number of protests against the proposed closing of contact offices in my district and State, not only from various veterans' organizations but from very many individual veterans, members of their families, as well as civic-minded organizations and citizens, all of whom realize that a distinct and great injustice would be done the cause of the veteran by the application of this most unwise curtailment.

We have been spending billions and billions of dollars for the benefit of peoples and nations all over the earth. The very least we can do, in my opinion, is to see to it that nothing is left undone by this Congress to help our own veterans and people who in so many ways have unselfishly served our Nation and to whom we are so greatly indebted.

I hope and urge that the House will take a realistic, as well as a humane, position on this question and not be swerved from our purpose by popular catch words. One of the first and most sacred duties of this Congress is to protect the rights and entitlements which Congress itself has so wisely conferred upon our loyal veterans. This is a good chance to show where we stand toward the veteran.

I will, therefore, vote for this amendment and I hope that the cuts that have been made in this important budgetary item will be promptly restored.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I yield.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I likewise am supporting the McGrath amendment.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I think we would be very unwise at this time to limit the veteran's contact with his Government. Korean veterans are now being discharged at the rate of 20,000 per month. They have performed an epic service for the people of this Nation. They are entitled to every consideration. They should be given the same rights, benefits, and privileges as are enjoyed by veterans of World War II.

The subcommittee has cut, or recommended the cut of, the contact service by 80 percent.

I urge the House to adopt the McGrath amendment. It will restore a substantial portion of the contact service, though it will still be less than the service enjoyed by veterans this year by one-third.

The veterans' organizations themselves do a wonderful job in this field, but it must be remembered that not more than one veteran out of four belongs to a veterans' organization. I am interested in seeing the unorganized veteran have good contact with the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, undoubtedly when the members of the subcommittee speak they will endeavor to point out that already the several States are appropriating millions of dollars for service officers which duplicates the contact officers furnished by the Veterans' Administration. May I say to the members of the committee that 26 States appropriate funds to aid organized veterandom in providing service officers to assist veterans, while 24 States, including 2 Territorial posts, do not provide a penny.

The American Legion last year spent $650,000 for rehabilitation work; the Veterans of Foreign Wars spent $450,000; the Disabled American Veterans spent $300,000. But you cannot stop there. The several State departments of these veterans' organizations spend thousands of dollars likewise, and so do the county councils, so do the district organizations, and likewise the posts.

Mr. MORRIS. Does it not stand to reason that with the Korean war on we should expand the service rather than contract it?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is what I am coming to. With 61,000,000 American people eligible for benefits, the contact officers provided by the VA and the service officers provided by the various veterans' organizations only scratch the surface when it comes to assisting the veteran and his dependents.

Go into the various hospitals, whether they be Army, Navy, VA, or what, and you will find long lines of veterans waiting to receive assistance from VA contact officers.

Frankly, the VA contact officers and the veterans' groups' service officers today cannot do the job of assisting the veteran and his dependents simply because the veteran population is already too large, or, in other words, the load is too great.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] is recognized.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and yield the balance of my time to Mr. KLEIN.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the McGrath amendment. I believe that the budget estimate for the Veterans' Administration was a fair and proper one and that it should not have been cut as proposed by the Appropriations Committee. I urge the Congress to increase the amount as contained in H. R. 7072 to the amount as recommended by the Budget Bureau.

I have received many letters and telegrams from veterans and veterans' organizations, urging this action. Time will not permit me to read all of them. I do desire to read at this time the letter received by me from Bernard Weitzer, national legislative director of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, as follows:

MARCH 19, 1952.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULTER: I know that you have been on the floor all afternoon fighting against the monstrous cut in the Veterans' Administration appropriations included in H. R. 7072. It is difficult to picture adequately the harm which will be inflicted upon veterans all over the United States should the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee as embodied in this bill, be accepted.

The Bureau of the Budget had already made a cut in the request from the VA, which the VA had already pared down from last year's budget.

May I call your attention to just one item which if approved by the House, could very well cause chaos in the VA to the great disadvantage of veterans, and which would entirely negate the intent of Congress in authorizing the veterans' benefits program. I am referring to the cut from the Budget Bureau's request for contact, offices and personnel, from $7,231,329 to $1,435,499. This is not meat-ax economy; it is steam-roller

economy. Typical is the result which you would see in the New York regional office where contact personnel would be reduced from 199 employees to approximately 30. Can we imagine how effectively such a cut would block veterans from filing or getting action on their claims? The chances are that you and other Members of the House would have to add one or two clerks in your offices just to handle the complaints that would pour in on you, and you would not be able to get much action from VA headquarters because the contact personnel at headquarters are likewise due for a cut. Headquarters would be flooded with complaints which would slow up the entire VA operation. Remember that Korea has already created 100,000 more veteran claimants and unfortunately, will probably create thousands more. These claimants, in many cases, will have problems which are urgent and their needs will require prompt attention. There will, of course, also be the millions of veterans from among those currently in our Armed Forces who will be entitled to GI benefits whose needs may not be so urgent but who are entitled to prompt and clear answers to their questions and adjudication of the rights which they may have. Is it fair to frustrate these men whom we have called to serve their country, by undue delays? I am confident that you will see to it that this injustice is not perpetrated.

This item is a key cut but there are many others which are just as serious and which I hope you will fight by restoring to the appropriations, the original amounts recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

With all good wishes,

Cordially yours,

BERNARD WEITZER,
National Legislative Director, Jewish War Veterans of the United States.

I also would like to read the telegram from Edward I. Condren, department commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 19, 1952.*

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Members Veterans of Foreign Wars your district urge and petition you to vote favorably for Budget Bureau estimates for Veterans' Administration. Reduction in VA personnel and appropriations would deprive veterans and their dependents of adequate and efficient service. Members of VFW this State will be ever grateful for your support.

EDWARD I. CONDREN,
Department Commander.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] is recognized.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, in supporting the McGrath amendment, I do so with the feeling that while cuts can be made in the cost of operation in the Veterans' Administration, the cuts should not be made in the contact officers' services.

I have been of the opinion for many years that thousands of employees of Government could and should be severed from the Federal payroll. The difficulty in this proposed cut is that it goes to the heart of the veterans' program. With the cost of the rehabilitation program running well over $3,000,000,000, a necessary complement of contact officers all over the country are necessary for the proper processing of veterans' claims. Bear in mind the tremendous case load now before the Veterans' Administration and compare that with the additional case load of the various veterans' organizations and the tremendous amount they are spending which runs into the hundreds of thousands of dollars. Bear in mind the thousands of cases that are being returned from the so-called police action in Korea and no one knows how long it will continue. The case load is increasing—not decreasing. The proposed cut will work immeasurable harm to the disabled both in and out of the hospitals. The care of the disabled is first; make the cuts in other bureaus of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the McGrath amendment.

Taxes are going up, but the services we promised to the veterans of all wars are being slashed.

Now economy is a fine thing when it works.

Penny-pinching savings that cause far more damage than good have a way of being far more expensive in the end. When the hatchet strikes at one essential service of the Government without thought as to the consequences, the inevitable bill for surgical repairs doubles the cost.

Why the Government should pick on the veterans first is beyond understanding or sufferance.

Especially when a $6,000,000 cut, in round figures, in contact office service to the veterans will eliminate local aid to the disabled and throw the burden on the VA staffs in the few and scattered big cities.

One would expect the Government to go after the billion or more in legitimate taxes from the vice lords and others, which these elements are withholding from the Treasury, instead of crippling the functions of the VA with small but disastrous economies.

First, let us look at the savings themselves on the basis of figures alone.

Percentagewise, the reduction for the VA contact offices amounts to about one fourteen-thousandth of the budget for the fiscal year 1952.

Or one hundred and fortieth of 1 percent. Maybe less.

It would take a microscope to see the tiny gain in this economy "bloodcount."

On the other side of the ledger there is our solemn promise to help the veterans, their widows, and dependents, which can be seen in the laws and can be felt in our conscience.

The credit of the United States Government is not measured simply by the soundness of the dollar, or its record in meeting financial obligations. There is also the yardstick of character, determining its success or failure in living up to the obligations it has undertaken in behalf of its own people.

If we default on the veterans who have always carried the heaviest burden of citizenship in sacrifices not limited to a budget, then we shall forfeit all claims to respect and trust.

I cannot conceive of a more callous inconsistency then to meat-ax the Veterans' Administration at a time when thousands of veterans are returning, broken in health, from the fighting in Korea. The new casualty list of widows and orphans is increasing daily. And the young of the land are being summoned to military service, some to take the places of the fallen in Korea, others to stand strong for us in strange places and under conditions so difficult that time alone will reveal.

The Veterans' Administration cannot ignore its continuing and increasing responsibilities. True there is a tapering off in educational and-on-the-job training benefits with consequent savings to the Government for promises fulfilled. But the disabled will be with us for so many years to come that a grateful Nation will insist that all pledges made to them will be adequately and honorably maintained. The VA will do its job well for them; as long as it is not hampered by impulsive and ill-considered economies that cause a breakdown in servicing the needs of our veterans and their dependents.

The contact offices not only give advice and help in filling out forms for benefits due under legislation concerning veterans, but give additional assistance to the disabled, particularly the amputees. These range all the way from securing license, registration and plates for the automobiles of amputees, to special tax counsel, and information on civil-service opportunities for the millions of others who are physically impaired.

Bear in mind that the contact officers and clerks will be assigned to central offices in the few large cities, cutting off personal calls at the homes of sick veterans, the infirm, and widows tied down by youngsters. Under the proposed consolidation, there will be heartbreaking delays. We cannot expect disabled vets to travel long distances and then wait in long lines for attention to their problems. And we cannot see the value of getting a monthly disability check to a sick veteran months after he has passed away. Overburdened VA staffs in the larger cities will be overwhelmed and unable to keep up with the concentrated workload.

We in Massachusetts are up in arms over this squeeze play, because we are veteran-minded. There are many hundreds of thousands of veterans in the Commonwealth, and the concentration of schools and colleges and hospitals in this area is a service to veterans from New England and beyond.

We recall with a mingling of "I told you so," and "It can happen again," the economy wave of 1943–44 that hit the VA and how it backfired.

To cure the resulting paralysis, the employees who were let go had to be called back in a hurry. But this was not enough to untangle the pile up of claims. More employees had to be hired and trained in VA operations before they could be of help.

We cannot afford to repeat that foolish experience in the name of economy that turns out to be extravagance in disguise.

The veterans of this Nation know what it is to be the target of enemy action, and many of them will endure the painful effect of that experience for life. The least we can do for them now and for the rest of their days is to protect them from the snipers who would cut down the benefits and services that we owe to all men and women who have given to their country in a manner that can never be repaid in full.

The VA needs this amendment to head off the proposed curtailment of service not of its own making.

This can be compensated for many times over in other agencies of Government where economy will not directly affect human beings.

Before that time, it is necessary for us to authorize an appropriation to maintain contact offices at the local level.

And by so doing to keep faith with all veterans, past and future

I sincerely hope that the McGrath amendment will prevail.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I have yielded so much time that I probably have left just about enough time to say that I support the McGrath amendment, and am opposed to the Davis amendment.

To cut this item I think is foolish economy. There may be room for economy in the Veterans' Administration, but I say to my friend the gentleman from Texas, chairman of the subcommittee, that if I had my way while I might make the Veterans' Administration take a cut, I would not do it in this item. I would cut General Gray; I would cut him out entirely. I think the Veterans' Administration has a great deal to learn about public relations, and particularly its administrator. If you want to cut, I would start with the office of General Gray, and the first one should be Mr. Gray, himself.

We had a situation in New York, and not only in New York but in Massachusetts and Virginia, I believe, where they decided to cut out certain offices and consolidate them. This was done under the guise of economy. So they went into Philadelphia and either leased or bought a building, uprooted the employees in those three offices, many of whom either had to sell their homes and move to Philadelphia, or in many other ways break up families. This meant that many employees had to leave their families, with double expense of maintaining the family in one city, and themselves in another. This naturally led to worry and unhappiness on the part of the employee, with the attendant loss of efficiency on his or her part.

Yet, when Members of Congress from these three States, led by the very able and distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] attempted to see Mr. Gray to protest, he would not give us the courtesy of seeing us, and passed us off to one of his deputies. In my own city, we have a splendid VA regional office. Its manager, Charles Reichert, a man of great ability, who has devoted a lifetime to the veteran and his affairs, is doing a great job—both he and his staff.

It is regrettable that Mr. Gray does not follow the example set by Mr. Reichert and so many others in the VA, particularly with regard to courtesy to Members of Congress, whose only desire it is to better the welfare and treatment accorded to the veterans of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the McGRATH amendment.

The testimony I am receiving from the Legion, the VFW, the Disabled Veterans, and the Amvets, is distinctly contrary to the testimony being received by the gentleman from Texas. I could never justify my voting for an 80 percent cut in this veterans' item, particularly at a time when we are making new veterans every day.

Now, our Korean veterans have some beefs against this Government and those beefs are well grounded. One is that we do not call that conflict a war. Another is that the Congress has been slow and remiss in legislating benefits for those veterans. News of any such cut will not be well received by them.

I was secretary to a Member of Congress for many years after World War I and, believe me, if there was ever a veterans' contact officer on Capitol Hill I was that individual. Most of my time was spent upon hundreds, yes thousands, of cases that came in over the years. Our files got so big and so extensive we had to get a special room up in the attic of the Old House Office Building to store the same, and if anybody wants to see them today I can show them.

I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], who has fought in World War I and in World War II, who was thrice Commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, that we in our own offices are going to take on a new and onerous task if we do not maintain these contact officers in the Veterans' Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, as I sat here and listened to the debate on this particular amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] my mind went back to 1917 when an outfit I had the honor to serve with was stationed at Camp Mills in New York. Before we sailed overseas the Governor of the great State of Illinois came down there to give us a talk. He stood on the platform before our regiments and with tears streaming down his cheeks he said: "Boys, when you come back nothing will be too good for you."

They all said that. Many of these boys never came back. You can visit these hospitals and see men, veterans of World War I, who will never get out of them alive.

If we are going to entrust the destiny of this Nation to people who are going to lead us into wars, we better think about the cost of it when the wars are over or when these boys come home. It would be a sad and unfortunate thing for this Congress not to furnish contact men as provided under the language of the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH]. Yes, I am not one of those who agreed to the philosophy that the serviceman is not entitled to special preferences. If we are going to pick these boys up, put them on the battlefield to be shot at and possibly be killed, disrupt their regular way of life and their future hopes of getting into business and getting an education, the least we can do is furnish a few contact men for them. I sincerely believe the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH] should be supported by the Members of this body.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, the issue before the committee today is not whether the veterans are going to have contact offices, but what amount is necessary for that contact advice, and whether we duplicate other services. That was in the minds of the subcommittee members when this item was brought to us. Some of us in this House are old enough to remember the Economy Act of 1933 and the tragedies that came from that Act, which was the outcome of the spending movement in the days prior to 1933.

I think we should remember, Mr. Chairman, that when our hearts bleed upon the floor of the House, they do not always bleed blood; they bleed dollars. I think we should wonder whether, for a few moments' temporary credit in this debate, we can take the chance of paying the veterans not with a 50-cent dollar, as we are paying them with now, but with a 40-cent dollar, which is inevitable if we continue deficit spending. The veterans, with the consent and the support of all Members of this House, are the recipients of over $2,700,000,000 of this budget alone, indemnities and benefits, which is a thousand times the amount proposed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS]. Do you want those payments made in cheaper dollars? I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia will be adopted, because that would be adequate, in the opinion of the subcommittee, and would allow $4,333,085 for contact work in the next year.

Contact work is presently carried on by the States, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said, by the counties, by the cities, by the American Legion, by the VFW and the DAV and other organizations.

The finest contact man in my experience was a man who never drew a dollar

from any public fund but who, in the post of which I myself have been a member for more than 25 years, made his job in that post, as a volunteer, to see that the veterans knew what their benefits were. The place to provide veterans with this kind of information, as the gentleman from Connecticut has said, is when they get out of the service. I hope that the Members of this House will consider very seriously whether it is necessary to return the full request of the Bureau of the Budget. This would probably be the only item in the bill of an administrative nature, in which we allowed the full amount. It would be desirable, if we support either amendment, to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS]. In my opinion, that is as far as this Congress ought to go if we are to protect the money which gives the veterans the compensation and the other benefits which they so well deserve.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman mentioned a moment ago about the member of his post who handled the veterans' affairs.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes, I did.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. He is not a contact officer; he is an accredited representative of the American Legion to the Veterans' Administration, and for that reason he does not have the same right or the same privileges that the contact officer has.

Mr. PHILLIPS. He did as good or better job than the paid contact officers.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. Does not the gentleman feel that this is a very unfortunate time to make this reduction when the Defense Department tells us, and tells us in no uncertain terms, that the high point in releasing Korean veterans will be reached this summer and will continue at least during the year 1953?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No, I do not think there is any bad time in the history of a nation to prevent a deterioration of its money, especially when duplicating services are given, in the opinion of the members of the committee, you set up to save you from bankruptcy.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. I have been advised, and I think I recall that this is so, that this Congress appropriated money in the past to have a management survey made of the whole Veterans' Administration.

Mr. PHILLIPS. And it is not yet in.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. That survey is now being made by Booze, Allen & Humphreys, a management-survey firm.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. And that is due sometime early in April, in the next couple of weeks, and that will cover this subject.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is correct. We could well wait for that report before making this decision.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, we have heard some very fine, clear, lucid statements on the subject, but in the beginning let me kindly state to the House that there is not a one of us now—let us not kid ourselves—who has a monopoly on our desire to help the veteran. Let us get that debunked first. And there are so very few men on the floor of this House who have ever voted against a single veterans' benefit that you can put them in the palm of your one hand. Now let us "debunk" that. As far as this subcommittee is concerned, with one little tiny deflection, there is not a single man on it that has ever voted against a single dime of benefit, and certainly I have not.

Now, let us not arrogate unto ourselves all the patriotism and all the knowledge and all the sanctity. Now the amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGRATH]—and I love that New York Irishman; he is a gentleman and a scholar—restores the cut. Our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] restores half the cut.

I do not yield to any of you in the desire to help the veterans. I do not think you know too much more than we know about it. We are going to say you know a little bit more, but we are not going to give you too much of the edge, now. But I repeat to my colleagues with every ounce of sincerity that I possess that it will not hurt the veteran—get my word—one iota, and you know it deep down in your conscience. You are not taking one red 5 cents worth of service from him that cannot be dispensed with. If anybody is going to be hurt it might be a little handful of jobholders. How many do they have over there now? Let us get right down to the case. If we had almost that many troops in Korea we would be a whole lot better off. We just have 180,000 jobs in the Veterans' Administration now. You make all this noise about taking off about 1,000 or 1,200 that are not rendering one red 5 cents worth of service, and you know it and I know it. There are some people who get up here on the floor——

Mr. VAN ZANDT. A statement like that is not true, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman can use his own judgment and I can use mine. The gentleman does not have a monopoly on this subject, I may say to my friend.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Nor do you.

Mr. THOMAS. Even though he may think he does.

It has been suggested here that they ought to restore these contact offices to get the pressure off Members. That is not fair to the Members. I venture to say that every Member on this floor writes his veterans, and when he is at home through speeches, he says, "Write me if I can help you." I know you do because I do it, and I have never turned one down yet, and you have not either, and you know you have not and you will not. That is a part of your job, and you do your job and you do it well.

Back in your home county and in your home city you have contact officers paid for by your local people and these great service organizations back home. I have been a member of the Legion for 20 years, with pride and joy. My post helps, your post helps, and every post will. Why? Those posts are set up for just one thing. It is not profit. It is for service. Service to whom? To the veterans. They put that army to work in addition to your civilian helpers, that army of 180,000 in the Veterans' Administration.

Now, think about your service offices paid for by your cities and your counties and your Legion posts. Is that all? Why, no. In those budgets you are going to consider next week there is more. In the Labor Department there is $285,000 in the budget to help contact work for the veterans. Is that all? No. In this bill you are considering now there is some money in the item for the Civil Service Commission to help the veterans.

Are we going to spend our money on jobs, unnecessary jobs? What did the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] say, and bless him, he is shot all over the map so far as his body is concerned. Do you think he would misrepresent it? You heard what he said. But who is going to get hurt? Are you taking one penny away from the veterans? In this budget alone there is approximately $3,500,000,000 for benefits. I am not going to call the number of figures because I have been told that that might hurt our security and give away the number of troops in Korea. Those chaps are entitled to these benefits and you know it, and you are going to give it to them sooner or later, just as soon as that great committee headed by my friend from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] bring in the bill. You know it is coming. What will it cost? $1,000,000,000 extra, $2,000,000,000 extra? Regardless of what it is, we are going to pay the bill.

Now, are you going to spend some money for jobs or are you going to give it to these veterans who rightfully deserve it in the form of benefits?

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment offered by my good friend from New York be voted down and I ask that the substitute be voted down. If you must adopt one of the two, I ask you to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time for debate on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGRATH].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia) there were—ayes 47, noes 117.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGRATH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McGRATH) there were—ayes 109, noes 93.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. McGRATH and Mr. THOMAS.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 134, noes 108.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this paragraph? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

PAYMENT OF CLAIMS

For payment of claims, as authorized by the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, from funds deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the war claims fund created by section 13 (a) of said act, such sums as may be necessary, to be available to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment of claims under sections 4 (a), 4 (b) (2), 5 (a) through (e), 6, and 7 of said act to the payees named and in the amounts stated in certifications by the War Claims Commission and the Secretary of Labor or their duly authorized representatives, which certifications shall be in lieu of any vouchers which might otherwise be required: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That no claims shall be allowed or paid under the provisions of said War Claims Act of 1948 from any funds other than those covered into the Treasury pursuant to the provisions of section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended, as provided by section 13 (a) of said War Claims Act of 1948.

CHANGE IN PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word on page 42 under War Claims Commission, for the purpose of making a brief announcement for the benefit of the Members.

On yesterday I announced that the bill (H. R. 5012) amending the Navy ration statute relating to oleomargarine would be on the program for next week. At the request of the chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services that bill is being displaced and will not be any part of the program for next week.

The Clerk read as follows:

Public Housing Administration: Of the amounts available by or pursuant to law for the administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration in carrying out duties imposed by or pursuant to law including funds appropriated by title I of this act and not to exceed $205,000 of the funds appropriated for such expenses under the head "Defense Housing" in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, not to exceed $11,455,000 shall be available for such expenses, including purchase of not to exceed three passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only; not to exceed $620,000 for expenses of travel; and expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the Administration: *Provided*, That necessary expenses of providing representatives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects in connection with the construction of such non-Federal projects by public housing agencies with the aid of the Administration, shall be compensated by such agencies by the payment of fixed fees which in the aggregate in relation to the development costs of such projects will cover the costs of rendering such services, and expenditures by the Administration for such purpose shall be considered nonadministrative expenses, and funds received from such payments may be used only for the payment of necessary expenses of providing representatives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects: *Provided further*, That all expenses of the Public Housing Administration not specifically limited in this Act, in carrying out its duties imposed by or pursuant to law shall not exceed $31,690,000: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $50,000 of funds made available by the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2035) shall be available for necessary expenses, including administrative expenses, of the Public Housing Administration in carrying out the provisions of the act of May 19, 1949 (Public Law 65).

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS: On page 59, line 12, strike out "$11,455,000" and insert "$10,455,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. Hereafter no part of the funds of, or available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this or any other act, including the government of the District of Columbia, shall be available to pay for annual leave accumulated by any civilian officer or employee during any calendar year and unused at the close of business on June 30th of the succeeding calendar year: *Provided*, That the head of any such corporation or agency shall afford an opportunity for officers or employees to use the annual leave accumulated under this section prior to June 30 of such succeeding calendar year: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to officers and employees whose post of duty is outside the continental United States: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply with respect to the payment of compensation for accumulated annual leave in the case of officers or employees who leave their civilian positions for the purpose of entering upon active military or naval service in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 62, line 17, after the words "United States", insert ", or employees who are entitled to less than 15 days of annual leave."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, it adds additional duties and it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] on the point of order.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is, in my judgment, only a limitation. It is legislation, of course, on an appropriation bill, but points of order have been waived by the House and I do not see how it can be construed to be legislation on an appropriation bill. It is an amendment to a proposal that has already been accepted, although it is part of the appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLS). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has offered an amendment to line 17, page 62, to which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] makes a point of order on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair has had an opportunity to analyze the language of the amendment and feels that the amendment is an exception to the legislative limitation starting on line 5 of page 62 of the pending bill. Section 401, which starts on line 5 of page 62, is a legislative provision allowed by waiver of points of order to remain in an appropriation bill. The pending amendment appears to the Chair merely to be a perfecting amendment which is germane to the provision to which it applies and one which does not add legislation. Therefore, the point of order is overruled.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto, and in reference to the limitation dealing with annual leave, close in 10 minutes after the gentleman from Kansas has finished his statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I have sent to the desk an amendment which relates to section 401 of the bill we are considering. The section itself places a restriction on the accumulation of annual leave by providing that Federal employees must use the annual leave accumulated in any calendar year before June 30 of the succeeding calendar year. My amendment will eliminate the application of this restriction to those employees who are entitled to less than 15 days of annual leave each year.

May I first of all state that I oppose the trend toward legislating in appropriation acts on matters with respect to Federal employees. As long as there is an established committee of the House having the legislative jurisdiction over substantive laws for any specific field, I believe matters relating to changes in these laws should be referred to the committees concerned. The provisions of section 401 are a good example of what can happen when legislation is included in an appropriation bill.

May I remind the House that in a law approved by Congress and signed by the President on October 30, 1951, we completely changed the leave provisions for Federal employees. These new leave provisions were effective January 6 of this year—just a little more than 2 months ago.

The new leave act placed Federal employees on a graduated leave system whereby those employees with less than 3 years' service would be entitled to approximately 13 days of annual leave each year; those employees with more than 3 years but less than 15 years service would be entitled to approximately 20 days' leave per year; while those with more than 15 years' service would be entitled to 26 days' annual leave a year.

My amendment would give those employees entitled to less than 15 days annual leave a year the privilege of continuing to accumulate their leave. At the end of 3 years service, these employees would be entitled to 20 days annual leave a year and no longer ex-

empted under my amendment from the reqiurement of section 401 of the bill.

Even if these employees saved every day of leave to which they would be entitled during their first 3 years of service, the maximum amount which they could save would be approximately 40 days. Employees who come from far distances cannot afford either the time or the transportation to travel home unless they are able to combine their first year of leave with some of the leave of the succeeding year.

I should like to remind the House that the employees which my amendment exempt from these restrictions on accumulation of leave took the biggest reduction of any group when we revised the leave act. In fact, we cut the leave in half, from 26 days to 13 days a year, for these employees.

When we passed the leave act we limited the accumulation of leave for any employee to 60 days. Those that have already accumulated 60 days annual leave must take their leave currently or lose it. I believe that the sponsors of section 401 themselves will agree that it is unfair to restrict the leave of those employees who are only entitled to 13 days of annual leave a year. Certainly every Member whose district is located far from the seat of government where many of these employees work must join with me in disapproving of this limitation on leave.

There is nobody in this House who believes more in economy than I do but if we are to have economy we must have it with equity. I challenge any Member of this House to stand up and say there is equity in adding an additional restriction on the leave of these employees within 60 days after we have cut their leave by 50 percent. In fact, virtually the entire savings in annual leave came out of the annual leave taken away from the very employees with which my amendment is concerned. The question of savings through the restriction on the accumulation of annual leave is very hard to justify.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, who is a former member of our committee.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, no Member of this House has been more critical of abuses in the matter of leave than the gentleman from Kansas, and no one has done more to correct those abuses. I think the message he is giving us now ought to receive the consideration and attention of all Members of the House.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the distinguished member of our committee.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I also would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Kansas: Is it not a fact that this section is primarily to correct some abuses in the very highest brackets and not to correct any abuses—which have never occurred—in the lower brackets, where many of the employees are entitled to only 13 days or 2 weeks vacation?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentlewoman is exactly right. This section is leveled at a group of people who are in the lower brackets and who do not abuse the feature we have discussed here with respect to annual leave.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. Chairman, when we passed the leave act we limited the accumulation of leave for an employee to 60 days. Those who have already accumulated 60 days of annual leave will take it now or lose it within a certain specified time.

I think the sponsors of section 401 will agree that it is unfair to restrict the leave of those employees who are entitled to only 13 days. You talk a lot about equity and fairness. Here is a place where you should do equity where it ought to be done. I do not think there is anyone on the floor of the House who can claim to be more careful with reference to expenditures of the taxpayers' money than I, but there is one place where I do not believe any Member can show that any amount of money is being saved by reason of the amendment you have placed in this bill. You are keeping some folks from going home to spend their 13 days or 15 days or 20 days of leave, that is all you are doing.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, for whom I have profound respect.

Mr. THOMAS. The admiration is mutual, and I have shown it to my distinguished friend, but surely my good friend does not want to leave the idea with anybody on the floor that this amendment is taking one minute of leave away from any employee? Certainly the gentleman does not want to do that?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not want to do that, but I say you put them in a position where they cannot use their leave, as they ought to have to do it if you are going to let them have it.

Mr. THOMAS. Read the amendment. It directs the agencies to give them their leave.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Thirteen days, but they must use it within the year. All I am saying is that you ought not to restrict these people who have only 13 days leave in a year. You know, as a practical matter, these people are bound to take off a few days during the year—perhaps to look after business matters, go to a dentist or something else. So, generally speaking they do well if they have as many as 7 or 8 days left during the year.

Mr. THOMAS. We are not restricting them at all. All we are saying is, "You either use it or else you do not get cash for it."

Mr. REES of Kansas. But the gentleman fails to observe this amendment does not affect those in higher salaries or who have been in the Government longer. Here you restrict the folks in the lower brackets. It is those in the higher categories, who get the large amounts of cash leave. This amendment is inequitable.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the gentleman believe they come to work for the Government with the idea of getting paid for their annual leave?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Of course not. That is the reason I say you do not save any money for the Government by this section of the bill. They just hope that, after they have been in Government service 2 or 3 years, they may have accumulated enough time to go home, if they want to do so, for 3 weeks. I am sure those who live near their place of employment will take their 13 days off during the year. You do not seem to realize that those who are in higher brackets, and who get 26 days or more, are not affected by your amendment. You just hit the lower salaried people of whom most have little cash when separated from the Government. If I thought this amendment were equitable and would save any substantial amounts of money I would be the first to support it. I had no idea you were submitting this kind of proposal. There is not a word in your hearings that supports your contention that it will save any money. You are hitting the little fellow in this case.

I agree with you that there are too many employees on the payroll of our Government. I have spent a lot of time and effort in dealing with that problem. Furthermore, we do not have a competitive merit system. But that is another. In this legislation you do not reach the fellow who abuses the leave provisions of the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas. This question of annual leave was given very careful consideration by the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and I think they worked out a formula which was conceded to be an acceptable compromise. It is true that both the gentleman from Kansas and the chairman of the committee have stated that nothing will be taken away from present employees in terms of number of days. But they will not be able to get any kind of effective annual leave unless the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas is adopted by the committee.

I think it only fair, particularly when many of these employees do not have any permanent status; when they are here in a sense serving the country and making a sacrifice to do it, that we should permit them to accumulate their annual leave in the manner which is proposed by the gentleman from Kansas. I understand that Chairman Ramspeck of the Civil Service Commission has expressed his support of the proposition which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has made.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman is correct in his statement.

May I say that we are not saving any millions of dollars by reason of this provision. We have already cut these people by 50 percent of the annual leave they formerly had. Now we are saying to many of them that as a matter of practice they will not get to use any of it. Is that not correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is quite correct. I think it should be added that Mr. Ramspeck has been most cooperative with those Members of Congress who have been trying to reform the civil service.

The fact that he has expressed his opposition to the committee amendment should carry considerable weight.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, surely there cannot be any misunderstanding about this amendment. I submitted it to our good friend, the ranking member of the Committee on the Civil Service, 6 weeks ago. Perhaps I misunderstood him. I thought he was very favorable to it. If I am in error, it is my error. I submitted it to the chairman of that committee and he said he is for it. The chairman came by less than 2 minutes ago and said, "I just want to tell you I am still for it." This amendment does not take away 1 minute of annual leave. Now get that straight. Certainly, no one can claim, if he reads the amendment, that it takes away 1 minute of annual leave from anybody—not 1 minute. Do you know what it says? "Either take that annual leave or you do not get paid for it." That is all that it says. What is the purpose of annual leave? Its purpose is to refresh the employee so that he will be able to do a better job when he comes back to his work after he has had his leave. Does industry pay people for not taking their annual leave? Why, certainly not. This amendment as drawn by the committee will save the taxpayers $125,000,000 a year.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] is exactly correct when he said he conferred with me about this provision. I endorse it and I say it is a good provision and ought to be kept in the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. It will save the taxpayers $125,000,000.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. The chairman stated that anyone reading this provision could understand it, and I am sure most Members who read it can understand it, but perhaps the distinguished chairman will forgive my ignorance—there is just one point I would like to have perfectly clear.

Mr. THOMAS. If the gentlewoman cannot understand it, I would not claim to understand it either.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the chairman, but what I would like to ask is this: Do I understand that leave can be accumulated as long as it is not paid for?

Mr. THOMAS. Up to January 1 of this year, if an employee had $500, $600, $700, or $1,000, or $2,000 worth of annual leave coming to him, he can get the cash for it. That is after January 1 of this year. Then, beyond that he can accumulate that year's leave and use it and if he does not use it, he cannot be paid for it. Is there anything wrong in that? That is exactly the same principle that industry has.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Does not the distinguished chairman foresee that we may run into some trouble if before that date a great many of the employees with accumulated leave choose to take it?

Mr. THOMAS. Not a bit in the world.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Suppose I, as an employee, have 6 months' annual leave coming to me.

Mr. THOMAS. Most of the Members of the House by their votes have indicated they believe there are too many employees in most of these agencies now anyway. May I say, because I do not want to be facetious, our distinguished friend the gentlewoman from New York, is honest and sincere, and is trying to do a good job, and is doing a good job—as I say, this will not hurt anybody. I remind you that the purpose of annual leave is to protect the health of the employees, and to give them rest so that they will be able to do a better job when they come back to their work.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. But may it not hurt the offices downtown where a large number of these employees might decide to take their annual leave?

Mr. THOMAS. Do not worry about the offices, they are all right. They are going to do all right.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I am not worrying about that, but I am afraid the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and his party may be worried about them.

Mr. THOMAS. If we adopt this amendment, offered by my good friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], the conservative estimate is that that amendment will cost the taxpayers of this country $50,000,000 a year. Now, if you want to add $50,000,000 or more a year to our burden, that is what this amendment does.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Is it not true that the bill also gives the employee 18 months in which to take his leave?

Mr. THOMAS. After the 1st of January 1952, it does.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is not according to the way the bill is written.

Mr. THOMAS. That is the way it is, I must say to my friend the gentleman from Kansas, and I hope my friend will withdraw his amendment. I know he wants to do the right thing. I know he does not want to hurt anybody, and I know he wants to save some money. The Federal employees are not kicking about this because they know it is not retroactive. They are not kicking because we are not taking anything away from them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 402. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRAY: Page 64, after line 7, insert the following:

"SEC. 403. In no event shall the number of passenger-carrying vehicles which may be operated during the current fiscal year at the seat of Government under any appropriation or authorization in this act exceed 50 percent of the number in use as of June 30, 1951."

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment to the appropriation bill is very simple. It provides that all of the departments in Washington under this appropriation bill are limited to one-half of the passenger automobiles that they had this last year. Washington has a good bus service and the various Federal buildings are relatively close together. Let those employees walk or ride the bus who do not care to use their own cars. There is no reason why the Washington bureaucrat should joyride in a Government automobile at the taxpayer's expense. The citizens in my district are having a most difficult time paying the present high taxes and I assure you that I do not intend, if I can help it, to allow the Washington bureaucrats to ride around Washington at their expense. This committee has already done a fine job in cutting the budget, but this amendment which I offer is just

one more step in the long way that we must go to bring our Government back to the people, eliminating Government extravagance and bringing taxes back to the place where the taxpayer can afford to pay them. I ask you to support this amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. The committee wants to commend our colleague for his motive and the purpose he has in mind. I think what the gentleman seeks to do in his amendment is just about what the committee has done.

I may say to the gentleman that the committee will be glad to accept his amendment with the reservation that after we study it in some detail, should it develop—I do not think it does—but should it develop that it goes too deep, then we reserve the right to reject it in conference. But I think what the gentleman's amendment does is just exactly what the subcommittee has done already.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think the minority would be glad to accept it without reservation.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask my friend the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] if this amendment does not accomplish about what the subcommittee has done already?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 404. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government, whose principal or primary duties consist of acting as chauffeur or driver of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance). This section shall not apply with respect to any person whose duties consist of acting as chauffeur for the President of the United States.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUSBEY: Page 64, after line 21, insert the following:

"This section shall not apply with respect to any person whose principal or primary duties consist of acting as chauffeur for the American Battle Monuments Commission."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, the reason I have offered this amendment is due to the fact that the cars of the American Battle Monuments Commission are used overseas, principally in France.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman has made a rather minute study of the situation abroad, and the committee is inclined to accept his amendment, because really it has only one purpose and that is to do right by everybody.

The committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am familiar with the situation which the gentleman seeks to correct. It applies actually to only one person in the employ of one agency situated in France. I think there is a fear, perhaps, that the gentleman's amendment is so broad it would act as a loophole for other agencies of which the House is not advised at this time. Could the gentleman's amendment be confined to this one instance in which it might be desirable?

Mr. BUSBEY. I may say to the gentleman from California that this applies only to the American Battle Monuments Commission, the work of which agency is taking care of the cemeteries and battle monuments in Europe. According to the language in the bill it must employ American chauffers or be driven by someone in the agency. That is impossible. Let us take a situation in France of some years ago. There was an American driver of one of the automobiles of the American Battle Monuments Commission in Paris going out to a cemetery on official business. A French woman was killed.

Now, the United States Government does not go into a tribunal in protection of the drivers of its automobiles if he is an American citizen. In the particular case to which I just referred the driver was convicted and sent to prison.

We must have native drivers for more reasons than one. It is the native driver's responsibility then and not the responsibility of the United States Government and one of our American citizens.

I think the amendment is very necessary. It only applies to one or two automobiles, so it is very insignificant.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Is this for the special protection of one or two individuals who are employed by the American Battle Monuments Commission? There is an amendment in here that will apply to the entire bill. Is this for the benefit of one or two individuals?

Mr. BUSBEY. No. The chauffeurs of these cars that go out to the cemeteries which are located in far, out-of-the-way places. One cannot get to them by train or bus. This is the only agency in this bill that operates overseas.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk again report the Busbey amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the Busbey amendment.

Mr. BUSBEY. In other words, Mr. Chairman, it applies to one agency in Europe that takes care of American cemeteries.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Can the gentleman inform me if you have a chauffeur, an American chauffeur, driving a car for a consulate, whether he will be protected from civil suit?

Mr. BUSBEY. The consulates overseas always have native drivers. There are no American drivers for consulates.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Supposing they did have an American driver, would he be so protected?

Mr. BUSBEY. The Government would not go into a tribunal and protect that man under any circumstances if he is employed by a commission. That is a policy of the United States Government. The subject of my amendment is so we can have native drivers employed by the American Battle Monuments Commission in the country in which the cemeteries are located.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Why select this one agency? Why not take in all of the drivers? It is the only agency involved in this bill. No other like agency is operating overseas.

These chauffeurs and the chauffeurs of the President of the United States should be in a like category; is that the idea?

Mr. BUSBEY. My amendment has nothing to do with the chauffeurs for the President of the United States.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Well, it is right in the bill that the gentleman is amending.

Mr. BUSBEY. This is the only agency involved overseas where we need native drivers of the country in which the cars are driven.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this seems to be a trivial amendment, but I just want to suggest for the consideration of the Committee that this bill makes one exception, and one only, on this matter of chauffeurs, and that one is the President of the United States. Now, if all this story about liability and all the rest which the gentleman has suggested to us is sound, we are still adopting a poor policy if we exempt this one agency. This agency can take care of the situation very well without being exempted. They have messengers. They have many French-speaking people in their employ, but if you put in one more exception next year you will have some more requests. It will be just the beginning of another flock of chauffeurs. Let us keep one exception only, the President of the United States. Nobody can ever misunderstand that, Mr. Chairman, or take it as an invitation for more Government chauffeurs.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. Well, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to fact that none of the other agencies have this peculiar situation operating overseas like the American Battlefields Commission.

Mr. COTTON. I will say to the gentleman that I never saw an agency that could not develop a peculiar situation in a few months. We will have

them back here with more peculiar situations than you can now imagine if we open the door. Limit it to the President only and let us not have any more chauffeurs.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COUDERT: On page 64, after line 21, add a new section 405 as follows:

"SEC. 405. Money appropriated in this act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate expenditures of all agencies provided for herein beyond the total sum of $6,900,000,000."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. However, I will withhold it for a moment.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, this bill before us now offers a particularly striking example of the importance of regaining control here in the House not only of the requests in the pending bill for new appropriations but control of all expenditures, including those hanging over from prior years.

Now we are confronted with a bill asking us to authorize an additional $6,200,000,000, and you think that is all that we are going to be confronted with in spending in 1953. The President's expenditure budget provides for expenditures in 1953 of $8,268,000,000 for the very agencies for which we are now appropriating new money. Now, all my amendment would do would be to put a ceiling on the funds we are now appropriating, so that together with the old funds they will not exceed $6,900,000,000 which is $700,000,000 more than you are being asked to appropriate in this bill for 1953. Actually, the country will face on July 1 next a total carryover of some $70,000,000,000, plus the $85,000,000,000 that we will probably vote this year in our budget bills, making a total of $155,000,000,000 to be expended in 1953 if the administration wants to, and can spend it.

I have offered an amendment to Rules of the House that was introduced yesterday which, if the Committee on Rules will adopt, would confer upon this House, when considering a bill of this sort, the right to act upon all of the moneys, all of the appropriations available for all of the agencies presently before the House, so that instead of dealing piecemeal with appropriations we would be able to reach out, rescind, limit and do whatever we like with all of the money that is available for any agency. I think that is vital for the recapture of the purse strings. Without it we have no control. I hope the Committee on Rules will act favorably on it.

In the absence of the willingness of the leadership to give the House a chance to vote on House Joint Resolution 371, to require the President to offer a new budget within our income for 1953, the only way we can operate is in this difficult, rather complicated fashion, through the back door of hitting each appropriation bill and limiting the use of new appropriations to such a point that with the old ones they will not exceed the total income of the country. Vote this amendment, if it is not overruled, and if we will do the same on every other bill we will not spend more than our income of $71,000,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, the country is confronted not with one $85,000,000,000 budget but with three $85,000,000,000 budgets in successive years.: The spending budget of $85,000,000,000, the new requests of $85,000,000,000, and the carryover into the third year, which certainly cannot be less.

If the point of order is insisted upon and is then sustained—and I do not think it should be sustained, for this does not touch any of the old appropriations, it only limits the use of these funds—then we have no resort whatsoever except the Rules Committee and the resolution or some resolution like it that would amend the rules and give the House an opportunity to deal in over-all fashion with the total expenditures for the fiscal year we are entering.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas insist on his point of order?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, we insist upon the point of order that it is legislation. It changes figures heretofore voted upon in the House in the last 3 days. Therefore, that is legislation. It puts duties on the various agencies not otherwise called for in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. COUDERT. I most certainly do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. COUDERT. This clearly does not touch the funds of prior years; therefore, it does not appropriate with respect to them. It only places a limitation upon the use to which the funds requested in this bill, the new obligational authority, may be put. It limits the freedom of expenditure and nothing else.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] proposes as an amendment to the bill, on page 64, after line 21, a new section, 405, against which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] makes a point of order on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair appreciates the fact that the author of the amendment afforded the Chair an opportunity earlier in the day to read the amendment and gave the Chair some time to study the language of the amendment.

The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is a limitation upon the funds which are contained in the bill H. R. 7072, presently before the Committee; that it is nothing more than a limitation on those funds. The Chair is, therefore, constrained to overrule the point of order and hold the amendment in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may again be reported.

There being no objection, the Clerk again read the Coudert amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, naturally the subcommittee finds itself in the same position the Chair is in. I do not mean to say that is any fault of the gentleman from New York, because, as well as I remember, he came by 4 or 5 minutes ago and said he was going to offer an amendment. Still, under the circumstances at that time, the subcommittee did not have an opportunity to read it.

I want to be very frank and fair with the House. His amendment limits expenditures under this bill to $6,900,000,000.

Mr. COUDERT. Not under this bill.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I am seeking light. I surely will.

Mr. COUDERT. This amendment does not in any way, shape, or form limit the total that can be spent except to $6,900,000,000, which is $700,000,000 more than this bill carries.

Mr. THOMAS. Does it limit the expenditures under all the items in this bill, H. R. 7072, to $6,900,000,000?

Mr. COUDERT. If the agencies choose not to spend a dime from the old, overhanging appropriations, then they can spend every dime that is appropriated in this bill.

Mr. THOMAS. What is the limitation on the over-all amount of fresh money they can spend for 1953?

Mr. COUDERT. There is no limitation on the fresh money in this bill. This is on over-all limitation, period:

Mr. THOMAS. For how much?

Mr. COUDERT. Six billion nine hundred million dollars. It is $700,000,000 more than you are asking for new money for 1953.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, in order to arrive at a half-way sensible conclusion so far as this amendment is concerned, we have to rapidly calculate those funds in the Veterans' Administration which are continuing funds in the way of veterans' benefits. And, if my memory serves me correctly, there is probably a billion dollars for pensions, benefits, and for hospitals for the Veterans' Administration. They are continuing funds. According to the gentleman's limitation then, you would not be able to spend 1 nickel of that $1,000,000,000 for veterans' benefits.

Mr. COUDERT. Not at all. The gentleman does not correctly interpret the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. I hope my friend will listen. We understand him and know him. He works hard on the committee, and has done a fine job. Why will the gentleman not withdraw this amendment? We have not had sufficient time to learn what his amendment really does. No one knows what it is.

Mr. COUDERT. In my humble judgment, it is one of the most important amendments to come on the floor of the House in a long time.

Mr. THOMAS. Frankly, I cannot give the members of the Committee of the Whole any advice, or any help, so far as coming to a decision on this amendment. I know nothing about the amendment, and I am not going to get up in Committee of the Whole and talk to you about something and ask you to do something, when I do not know what I am talking about. That is my position here.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York some questions. The evident intent of the amendment is to limit expenditures. I am trying to think of some of the funds which would be involved. How about the maritime construction, and how about the atomic-energy construction? Has the gentleman made any estimate of how much would be involved here?

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman has made approximate estimates of how much would be necessary to limit the spending of these agencies in order that application of a similar ratio to other agencies of the Government would result in not spending more in 1953 than the President's estimate of income of $71,000,000,000.

Mr. PHILLIPS. In other words, the gentleman is attempting to avoid a deficit?

Mr. COUDERT. Precisely. And if this amendment passes, it will become the duty of the President, as obviously the head man of all these agencies, to adjust these various budgets so that the total of them will fall within the maximum limitation of $6,900,000,000, which is still $700,000,000 more than the committee is asking for in this bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may ask a question of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. You have stated what the limit would be on spending, if your amendment passes. How much money could be spent if your amendment is rejected?

Mr. COUDERT. Eight billion two hundred and fifty million dollars by these agencies, and that is the amount set forth in the President's expenditure budget for these agencies in 1953, and that is one of the reasons we are going to have a $14,000,000,000 deficit.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I want to ask the gentleman from California a question, which can probably be answered by the gentleman from New York. Is it not conceivable that a situation may arise under this amendment which would have an effect on the amendment just adopted by the committee with respect to the contact men for the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I do not see how it could affect any specific individual or group of individuals.

Mr. EBERHARTER. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is adopted, will it not cut the funds for these contact men for the Veterans' Administration as well as the funds for any of the other agencies upon which the committee has acted this afternoon?

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may answer the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. The amendment, I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, will not in any way, shape, or form limit payments to veterans for compensation or pensions or for contact men or anybody else. All the amendment does in effect is to say to the President, through his agencies, that altogether they cannot spend more than the given amount, and it is up to him to adjust the budgets.

Where there are legal obligations, fixed obligations, such as pensions and veterans' rights, of course they have priority and will come first and will be paid 100 cents on the dollar.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to ask the gentleman one question. Am I correct in understanding your statement to the effect that if your amendment is adopted, this will make it possible to spend $700,000,000 additional, above that allowed by the committee in the bill brought in?

Mr. COUDERT. May I explain to the gentleman: I wonder if the gentleman does not lose sight of the fact, as I so often do—I have to pinch myself, whenever I get on these subjects, to remind myself that we are dealing every day with two parallel budgets. You are dealing with the over-all, total-expenditure budget, which includes money left over from last year, the year before, and the year before that, and this new requested budget of obligational authority. Those things are parallel.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman understands that in addition to the money appropriated in this bill there are carryovers. Therefore, the amount expended, even without the gentleman's amendment, would be more than the amount we have in the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As I understood the gentleman, he said his amendment, if allowed, would carry $700,000,000 extra.

Mr. COUDERT. No, no. We are talking about the spending budget, not new authorization.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think we are dealing with something very dangerous. I very seriously doubt if the House would want to take action like this without more consideration.

This is what I fear: You cut this amount this much, without allotting the funds here, there, and yonder, and I fear that the departments of Government would be legislating on this money that is voted. In my opinion, under this amendment—and I looked at it this morning—in my opinion, these departments could get together and say whether they are going to spend any money for this activity or how much money they are going to spend for this or other activities. I do think that an amendment which is as far-reaching and fundamental as this one, and which I fear is dangerous, should be considered a great deal more carefully than it is going to be considered in the House this afternoon. I am speaking to you out of fear of what the departments may do to the legislative body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT]

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COUDERT) there were—ayes 115, noes 148.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to trespass upon the time of the Committee at this late hour. I wish to direct attention to the item for appropriation for the annuity fund that is administered by the civil service for Federal funds for those who have retired, and for those who will retire from employment in the Government service.

Under the law employees are required to contribute 6 percent of their pay to the retirement fund and the Government is expected to contribute a similar amount. The thing to which I want to direct your attention is that the subcommittee in charge of this bill takes credit for having reduced the request of the Commission by $136,869,000. The report describes this item as a "saving." I wish that were true. You do not really save anything by so-called reduction of this item. The fact is by reducing this item, the annuity fund is further decreased. On an actuarial basis, according to Civil Service it is in the red in the amount of $4,875,000,000 as of June 30, 1951. The rather startling thing is that three billion seven hundred million of this deficit was incurred in the last 4 years.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, also a diligent member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CANFIELD. I think the chairman of the committee is ready to admit that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to quote for the record from the hearings at page 453. It is a colloquy between Mr. Ramspeck, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee:

> Mr. RAMSPECK. Well, the assets as of June 30, 1951, are $4,419,927,112.89, and the liabilities as of that same date are $9,294,927,112.89.
>
> Mr. THOMAS. Leaving there a total deficiency as of June 30, 1951, of $4,875,000,000.

So, the fact remains if this Congress is going to follow a policy of maintaining a fund that is claimed to be actuarially sound, there is a further deficit, or indebtedness in our Treasury to the tune of $5,000,000,000 right now, although it is not shown in the Treasury statement. If you have a further explanation, I would like to have it. All I am trying

to do is to lay this matter before the Members of this House.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: Page 64, after line 21, insert a new section as follows:

"No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1952: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within a department, independent executive bureau, board, commission, corporation, agency or office, provided for in this act;

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to all employees in veterans' medical facilities, exclusive of medical departmental personnel in the District of Columbia;

"(e) to employees in grades CPC 1, 2, and 3;

"(f) to employees of the General Accounting Office:

"(g) to employees of the Tax Court of the United States;

"(h) to the American Battle Monuments Commission;

Provided further, That when any department, independent executive bureau, board, commission, corporation, agency or office, contained in this act shall, as the result of the operation of this amendment reduce its personnel to a number not exceeding 90 percent of the total number provided for in this act, such amendment may cease to apply and said 90 percent shall become a ceiling for employment during the fiscal year 1953, and if exceeded at any time during fiscal year 1953 this amendment shall again become operative."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, and on the further ground that it places extra burdens and duties on the various boards, agencies, and bureaus.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman point out the specific language in the amendment to which he refers?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, it is near the end:

As the result of the operation of this amendment reduce its personnel to a number not exceeding 90 percent of the total number provided for in this act, such amendment may cease to apply and said 90 percent shall become a ceiling for employment during the fiscal year 1953, and if exceeded—

There is an alternative there, as the Chair will see—

at any time during fiscal year 1953 this amendment shall again become operative.

Somebody has got to make some decisions there; it places extra duties in order to arrive at decisions; and on top of that it is legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Iowa briefly if he desires to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the best evidence that this amendment is germane to the bill and is not legislation is the fact that the amendment was adopted by the House last year and was held to be germane by the Chair. Points of order were raised against it at that time, as I recall.

The amendment is not mandatory in the sense that the word "may" is used where the additional burdens and responsibilities might be placed on the agencies other than the 10 percent reduction that must be made which is purely a limitation on an appropriation bill and comes within the language and the intent of the Holman rule.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa is legislation on an appropriation bill for the following reasons: As stated in the next to the fourth line from the bottom, upon the attainment of that condition under operation of the amendment, thereupon the amendment affirmatively legislates in the following language:

Said 90 percent shall become a ceiling for employment during the fiscal year 1953.

That language, I respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, is legislation, it is affirmatively fixing a legal ceiling upon the employment upon the attainment of a condition in the amendment; therefore I respectfully suggest it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLS). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has offered an amendment to line 23, page 64, of the bill presently before the Committee. To this amendment the gentleman from Texas makes a point of order on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair has listened attentatively to the statements made by both the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. The Chair has also had an opportunity to study the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa and has paid careful attention to the statements made by him.

The Chair will read for the benefit of those who are interested from the so-called Holman rule, clause 2, rule XXI:

Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

The gentleman from Tennessee says that the language contained in the amendment "said 90 percent shall become a ceiling for employment during the fiscal year 1953" is legislation.

The Chair is of the opinion that even if that language is legislation, it is clearly within the Holman rule, as suggested by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. This, in the opinion of the Chair, is a limitation within the meaning of the Holman rule by limiting the number of employees within these agencies of Government covered by this bill and the amount of money to be made available under this bill.

The precedents of the House have been called to the attention of the Chair and the Chair has given consideration to those precedents also. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is in order and therefore overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto as well on the bill close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the first provision of my amendment applies to "any appropriation or authorization contained in this act," and it also restricts the payment of compensation therefrom to any position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1952, with certain specified exemptions.

The first exemption—paragraph (a)—not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies. This simply prohibits affected governmental units covered in this bill for fiscal year 1953 from filling more than 25 percent of their vacancies during the year.

Paragraph (b) permits the affected governmental units contained in the bill to fill positions within their same organization.

Paragraph (c) exempts offices or positions required by law to be filled by Presidential appointment by and with advice and consent of the Senate.

Paragraph (d) provides that the inhibition contained in the first paragraph of the amendment shall not apply to employees in our veterans' medical facilities, exclusive of the departmental medical personnel in the District of Columbia.

Paragraph (e) exempts employees in grades CPC–1, 2, and 3. The work being performed by the employees in these grades has been defined by the Congress in the Classification Act of 1949, Public Law 429, of the Eighty-first Congress.

Briefly the duties of CPC–1 employees are to run errands, check parcels, or perform light manual tasks with little or no responsibility. Employees in this grade consist chiefly of messenger boys and girls and their salary ranges from $1,510 to $2,170 and the Civil Service Commission has advised me that as of June 30, 1951, the various departments and agencies of the executive branch in the continental United States employed only 63 persons in this classification.

Grade CPC–2 is the lowest grade for adult employees. Positions in this grade, generally speaking, are unskilled laborers, char employees, adult messengers, elevator operators, and kitchen helpers and waiters in the various governmental institutions. Positions in this grade range from $2,120 to $2,840 and the various departments and agencies of the executive branch in the con-

tinental United States employed 27,362 in this grade, as of June 30, 1951.

The employees of CPC-3 includes custodial or office-labor positions, the performance of which requires some skill, training, or experience, or involving some degree of responsibility. This grade includes semiskilled laborers, chauffeurs, truck drivers, straw bosses of a group of charwomen, firemen of low-pressure heating boilers, and messengers who also do light manual or office-labor tasks with some responsibility. The pay scale ranges from $2,252 to $3,032. As of June 30, 1951, in the various departments and agencies of the executive branch in the continental United States the Civil Service Commission advised me that there were 23,323 persons in this grade.

The purpose of exempting the employees in these three low-paid pay scale grades is because of the nature of work performed and the extremely high turnover within these grades.

I have provided in this amendment that the employees of the General Accounting Office should be exempt from the provisions in the inhibition. This proviso was in the amendment last year, and I am quite sure that every Member of this House is cognizant of the excellent job being done by our former colleague the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, the Comptroller General of the United States. Mr. Warren, with the aid of his efficient and loyal assistants, improved the efficiency of his organization each succeeding year.

Paragraph (g) exempts employees of the Tax Court of the United States. This proviso likewise was in the amendment offered to the bill last year. The purpose is to make uniform the exemption provided to the judiciary as was contained in the Justice Department appropriations bill last session.

The last paragraph of the amendment provides that when any governmental unit contained in this bill shall, as the result of the operation of this amendment, reduce its personnel to a number not exceeding 90 percent of the total number of employees provided for in this bill, this amendment shall cease to apply and the said 90 percent shall become a ceiling for employment during fiscal year 1953, and if exceeded any time during the year this provision shall again become operative. This last paragraph provides an option by permitting the governmental unit to make a 10-percent cut at the outset or, as provided by paragraph (a), they have the option of filling only 25 percent of their personnel vacancies until the 90-percent ceiling for employment has been achieved.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure it is not necessary for me to go into a complete explanation of this amendment due to the fact that a similar amendment was adopted to the independent offices bill and to four other appropriation bills during the last session of the Congress. There are, however, a few minor changes in this amendment compared to the amendment which was adopted last year. Last year I excluded from the provisions of the amendment employees in CPC grades 1 and 2. In this amendment I have also excluded from the provisions of the amendment the CPC grade 3 employees. Then, also, we have excluded the employees of the Tax Court of the United States. Under present conditions I am sure they will have their hands full and need all the employees this bill provides to handle the job properly. I have also excluded the employees of the American Battle Monuments Commission. There are only some 400 employees, and many of them are in the low-grade salary positions.

I must say, in fairness to the subcommittee dealing with independent offices appropriations, that they have done what I think is a very good job, generally speaking. However, I do not think they went far enough in the reduction of personnel. It is true they did reduce the personnel that was requested by the Bureau of the Budget by approximately 8 percent. This amendment provides for another reduction which will amount to approximately 6 percent, or in other words, will keep approximately 10,000 off the Federal payroll during fiscal year 1953, and will effect a dollar saving to our taxpayers of $50,000,000. Do you not believe that is worth saving?

If the amendment I am now offering is made the law of the land, funds are provided for about 260,000 employees in this bill now before us, costing over a billion dollars. When you take into consideration the travel pay, per diem pay, leave pay, office rental, furniture, and so forth, it will run in the neighborhood of a billion and a quarter dollars.

There is a limit to all things. I am sure they would get along very nicely if they had even less than 200,000 people handling this job if properly managed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Ten minutes remain under the limitation of debate.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that 2 minutes of that time be allotted to the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Iowa may proceed for two additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Thank you—the chairman of this subcommittee, Mr. THOMAS, is one of the most gracious, lovable gentlemen I have ever known. It gives me no pleasure to disagree with my friend, but I must in this instance.

In conclusion, I do want to bring to your attention the investigation that was made in 1950 by the committe headed by our colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. Look at this chart on government service employees in four departments of Government, which I am sure is a fair example of all department personnel.

Please note they have just as many grade 9's as you have grade 1's. The line should come from the head man, No. 15, and start on a gradual incline up to about grade 5 and then level off, but these departments are so thoroughly and completely subdivided into divisions, units, and bureaus and with head men with big, fine-sounding titles, each put at the head of a few employees, then he is raised to grade 9, 10, 11, 12 and up. Yes and up, up, up goes the expenditures for personnel, no end.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I do hope the House will vote down this amendment. I at least have been laboring under the impression that the subcommitte had done a pretty fair job.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sorry the gentleman was not listening, because I said that.

Mr. THOMAS. There was nothing personal in my remarks. I love my friend. He handed me a bouquet that I do not deserve, but I appreciate it just the same.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman deserves a whole bushel full of bouquets.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentleman. Still, I am going to ask the House to vote down the amendment offered by my distinguished friend. His objective is fine, and the subcommittee has no argument to enter into with him on his objective. We cut these agencies very hard, and I think the House realizes that. Now, the gentleman's amendment and it only applies to this bill, reduces it 10 percent below what we have already done, and, frankly, I do not believe they can stand it. I say this advisedly and I believe the House, and my friend from Iowa, will back me up in it, that this subcommittee has cut the independent agencies over the last three consecutive years right to the bone, and that is right where they are now.

Mr. JENSEN. If this bill goes through as is, it will only cut the employment in all these agencies during the last 3 years about 11 percent.

Mr. THOMAS. But you exempt the veterans' medical facilities, and I want to point out to my friend that the veterans' medical facilities has 127,000 employees, of which 20,000 are dentists, doctors, and nurses. Now, there are 107,000 other employees: finance officers, warehousemen, cooks, pantry people, maintenance and repair people, scrub people, gardeners, chauffeurs, stenographers, and clerks, and so forth. You exempt them. I am complaining about it because I think we have already cut them enough. But, if you are going to make your amendment apply to independent agencies here, there are only 282 or 283 thousand people altogether in the independent agencies, and in one fell swoop you have exempted 127,000 under the item of medical facilities of the Veterans' Administration, when in truth and fact, there are only 20,000 dentists, doctors, and nurses out of that 127,000 in the medical facilities. I hope my friend will not insist on this amendment because this committee, with the good help of the House, has really cut these agencies right to the bone.

Mr. JENSEN. If my amendment does not amount to much, why all the fuss? Why worry about it?

Mr. THOMAS. You are going to take it out of the other agencies.

Mr. JENSEN. Another thing, the gentleman said in answer to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts the other day when she criticized the committee for taking 300 people off the payroll in a certain agency—as I say, the gentleman said "Well, the mistake we made was that we did not take all 1,526 off."

Mr. THOMAS. That is right. Do you want to take those other 300 off? But the House did not want to take them off. That is water over the dam. I certainly agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, when the independent offices appropriation bill, H. R. 7072, was before the House for consideration, the limited time for debate did not permit full expression of views of all Members of the House on the many features embodied in this piece of legislation. While I had no disposition to impede the passage of this appropriation bill, I would like to go on record as opposing in principle some of its features. I am referring now to the maritime activities section of the bill. In this section the appropriation committee imposes a limitation upon the number of subsidized voyages which may be operated, and specifies that a particular number of those so authorized shall be reserved for contracts which may in the future be awarded to new operators. The policy of the United States concerning the building and operation of an adequate privately owned American merchant marine has already been decided and set forth in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. Our merchant fleet has not yet reached the size and capacity to conform to that policy. We are today carrying only about 34 percent of our own commerce in United States flag ships. I do not consider, nor do I think the majority of the Members of Congress considers, that this represents the substantial proportion stated in the policy declaration of existing law. Therefore, it seems to me that it is contrary to existing congressional policy to place a ceiling upon the development of our merchant marine by means of limiting the number of ships or the number of voyages which may be operated by appropriations for the year 1953 or any other fiscal year.

I appreciate that any activity supported by the Government should be subject to strict congressional control. It should certainly be limited to the amount of money which the Congress is willing to make available for such purpose. In the present instance there is no controversy over the amount of funds appropriated. What I am objecting to, and what the friends of American shipping are objecting to, including management, sea-going labor, shipbuilders, shipyard workers, and others, is a specification in an appropriation bill as to particular voyages and ships which are authorized. This is in direct conflict with the practice and policy embodied in other appropriation bills. When money is made available for the Army, Navy, or any other governmental department, it has never been the policy of the Congress to specify the particular items which may be purchased or the ships, divisions, airplanes, or whatnot authorized to be purchased and/or operated through the use of such funds. Certainly when these governmental departments request funds they send up through the Bureau of the Budget what is properly termed "justification material" which states in general terms the purposes for which it is proposed to use the funds so requested. However, to my knowledge, the Congress has never limited the funds when available to such specific and detailed purposes. All of these functions, including the maritime, are of a purely technical character. They are influenced by changing conditions during the fiscal year. It is not only a ceiling upon the development of our merchant marine, but is a hampering restriction upon the use of the technical knowledge and discretion of our governmental departments to follow this policy.

I hope that we may soon cease this unwise procedure, and that we may return to appropriating such funds as Congress is willing to make available in annual appropriations bills without taking over the function of the Government departments, and without changing the established policy of the Congress through restrictive provisions in an appropriation bill. These provisions would have been subject to a point of order, and I believe such a point of order would have been made but for the fact that a closed rule was granted for consideration of H. R. 7072.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 157, noes 108.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 578, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Fisher amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], reducing the appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority, on page 35, line 14, by $14,000,000.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The so-called Fisher amendment relates to the reduction of housing units, does it not?

The SPEAKER. That is correct. It is the Yates amendment as amended by the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas. The amendment that will be voted upon will be the Yates amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Fisher amendment is also the Yates amendment, is it not?

The SPEAKER. No. It is vice versa.

Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment upon which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISHER as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. YATES: Page 24, strike out line 11, all the language down to and including the word "Congress" in line 25 and insert the following: "*Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, the Public Housing Administration shall not, with respect to projects initiated after March 1, 1949 (1) authorize during the fiscal year 1953 the commencement of construction of in excess of 5,000 dwelling units, or (2) after the date of approval of this act enter into any agreement, contract, or other arrangement which will bind the Public Housing Administration in respect to loans, annual contributions, or authorizations for commencement of construction, for dwelling units aggregating in excess of 5,000 to be authorized for commencement of construction during any one fiscal year subsequent to the fiscal year 1953, unless a greater number of units is hereafter authorized by the Congress."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, on that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 192, nays 168, answered "present" 1, not voting 71, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—192

Aandahl	Bennett, Fla.	Byrnes
Abernethy	Bentsen	Carlyle
Adair	Berry	Chatham
Allen, Calif.	Betts	Chenoweth
Allen, Ill.	Bishop	Chiperfield
Allen, La.	Blackney	Church
Andersen, H. Carl	Bonner	Cole, Kans.
	Bow	Cole, N. Y.
Anderson, Calif.	Bramblett	Colmer
Andresen, August H.	Brehm	Cooley
	Brooks	Cotton
Arends	Brown, Ohio	Cox
Armstrong	Bryson	Crawford
Baker	Budge	Crumpacker
Barden	Buffett	Cunningham
Bates, Mass.	Burleson	Curtis, Nebr.
Beamer	Burton	Dague
Beckworth	Busbey	Davis, Ga.
Belcher	Bush	Davis, Wis.

Dempsey
Denny
Devereux
D'Ewart
Dolliver
Doughton
Durham
Ellsworth
Elston
Fenton
Fisher
Ford
Gamble
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
George
Golden
Goodwin
Graham
Gross
Gwinn
Hagen
Hale
Hall,
Edwin Arthur
Harden
Harris
Harrison, Nebr.
Harrison, Wyo.
Harvey
Hébert
Herlong
Hill
Hillings
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Hope
Horan
Hunter
Ikard
Jackson, Calif.
Jarman
Jenison
Jenkins
Jensen
Johnson
Jonas
Jones,
Hamilton C.
Jones,
Woodrow W.
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kilburn
Kilday
King, Pa.
Latham
LeCompte
Lovre
Lucas
Lyle
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McIntire
McMillan
McVey
Mack, Wash.
Mahon
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Meader
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Murray, Tenn.
Nelson
Nicholson
Norblad
Norrell
Osmers
Ostertag
Patterson
Phillips
Pickett
Poage
Poulson
Prouty
Radwan
Redden
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Regan
Richards
Riley
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Ross
St. George
Schenck
Schwabe
Scrivner
Scudder
Shafer
Sheehan
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stanley
Stockman
Taber
Talle
Teague
Thompson,
Mich.
Thompson, Tex.
Vail
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vinson
Vursell
Werdel
Wharton
Whitten
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wood, Idaho

NAYS—168

Addonizio
Albert
Andrews
Anfuso
Angell
Aspinall
Ayres
Bakewell
Barrett
Beall
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Boggs, Del.
Boggs, La.
Bray
Brown, Ga.
Buckley
Burnside
Camp
Canfield
Cannon
Carnahan
Case
Celler
Chelf
Chudoff
Clemente
Cooper
Coudert
Crosser
Curtis, Mo.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Deane
DeGraffenried
Delaney
Denton
Dingell
Donohue
Donovan
Dorn
Eberharter
Elliott
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fernandez
Fine
Forand
Forrester
Frazier
Fulton
Furcolo
Garmatz
Gordon
Gore
Granahan
Green
Greenwood
Gregory
Hand
Hardy
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Heller
Heselton
Hess
Holifield
Holmes
Howell
Irving
Jackson, Wash.
Javits
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Judd
Karsten, Mo.
Kean
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Kennedy
Keogh
Kerr
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Lane
Lanham
Lantaff
Lesinski
Lind
McCarthy
McCormack
McGrath
McGuire
McKinnon
McMullen
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Magee
Mansfield
Marshall
Merrow
Mitchell
Morris
Morrison
Moulder
Multer
Mumma
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Neill
O'Toole
Patman
Perkins
Philbin
Polk
Powell
Preston
Price
Priest
Rains
Ramsay
Rankin
Reams
Rhodes
Riehlman
Robeson
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Sabath
Sadlak
Sasscer
Saylor
Scott, Hardie
Scott,
Hugh D., Jr.
Secrest
Seely-Brown
Shelley
Sheppard
Sieminski
Sittler
Spence
Steed
Stigler
Sutton
Tackett
Taylor
Thomas
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Walter
Watts
Wier
Williams, N. Y.
Withrow
Wolverton
Yates
Yorty
Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Patten

NOT VOTING—71

Abbitt
Auchincloss
Bailey
Baring
Bates, Ky.
Battle
Bolling
Bolton
Bosone
Boykin
Brownson
Buchanan
Burdick
Butler
Carrigg
Clevenger
Combs
Corbett
Dollinger
Dondero
Doyle
Eaton
Flood
Fogarty
Fugate
Granger
Grant
Hall,
Leonard W.
Halleck
Harrison, Va.
Hart
Hedrick
Heffernan
Herter
Hinshaw
Hull
James
Kee
Kersten, Wis.
Larcade
McConnell
Martin, Iowa
Miller, Calif.
Morano
Morgan
Morton
Murdock
Murphy
Murray, Wis.
O'Hara
O'Konski
Passman
Potter
Rabaut
Ribicoff
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers, Tex.
Short
Sikes
Staggers
Velde
Vorys
Weichel
Welch
Wheeler
Wickersham
Widnall
Wolcott
Wood, Ga.
Woodruff

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Fogarty against.

Mr. Velde for, with Mr. Morgan against.

Mr. McConnell for, with Mr. Granger against.

Mr. Dondero for, with Mrs. Bolton against.

Mr. Rogers of Texas for, with Mr. Widnall against.

Mr. Butler for, with Mr. Bolling against.

Mr. Fassman for, with Mr. Corbett against.

Mr. Carrigg for, with Mr. Herter against.

Mr. Wolcott for, with Mr. Bailey against.

Mr. Clevenger for, with Mr. Doyle against.

Mr. Weichel for, with Mr. O'Konski against.

Mr. Hull for, with Mr. Auchincloss against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Ribicoff against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Hart against.

Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Bates of Kentucky against.

Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Dollinger against.

Mr. Vorys for, with Mr. Hedrick against.

Mr. Patten for, with Mr. Murdock against.

Mr. Murray of Wisconsin for, with Mrs. Bosone against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. James.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Scudder.

Mr. Combs with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Grant with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Fugate with Mr. Potter.

Mr. Flood with Mr. Martin of Iowa.

Mr. Wood of Georgia with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. Welch with Mr. Brownson.

Mr. Wheeler with Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Morano.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. MURDOCK. If he were present, he would vote "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. KEARNEY changed his vote from nay to yea.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 35, line 14, strike out "$185,270,000" and insert "$171,270,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 199, nays 159, answered "present" 1, not voting 73, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—199

Aandahl
Adair
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Allen, La.
Andersen,
H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen,
August H.
Arends
Armstrong
Ayres
Bakewell
Barden
Bates, Mass.
Beall
Beamer
Belcher
Bender
Bentsen
Berry
Betts
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Boggs, La.
Bonner
Bow
Bramblett
Bray
Brehm
Brooks
Brown, Ohio
Budge
Buffett
Burleson
Burton
Busbey
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Carlyle
Case
Chatham
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Cole, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.
Cooley
Cotton
Coudert
Crawford
Crumpacker
Cunningham
Curtis, Mo.
Curtis, Nebr.
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Denny
Devereux
D'Ewart
Dolliver
Durham
Eberharter
Ellsworth
Elston
Fallon
Fenton
Fisher
Ford
Fulton
Gamble
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
George
Goodwin
Graham
Greenwood
Gross
Gwinn
Hale
Hall,
Edwin Arthur
Hand
Harden
Hardy
Harrison, Nebr.
Harrison, Wyo.
Harvey
Hébert
Herlong
Heselton
Hess
Hill
Hillings
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Hope
Hunter
Ikard
Jackson, Calif.
Jenison
Jenkins
Jensen
Jonas
Jones,
Hamilton C.
Jones,
Woodrow W.
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kelley, Pa.
Kennedy
Kilburn
King, Pa.
Lantaff
Latham
LeCompte
Lind
Lovre
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McIntire
McMillan
McVey
Mahon
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Meader
Merrow
Miller, Md.
Miller, N. Y.
Mumma
Nelson
Nicholson
Norblad
Osmers
Ostertag
Patterson
Phillips
Pickett
Polk
Poulson
Prouty
Radwan
Reams
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Regan
Richards
Riehlman
Robeson
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Ross
Sadlak
St. George
Sasscer
Saylor
Schenck
Schwabe
Scott, Hardie
Scott,
Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Scudder
Secrest
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Sheehan
Simpson, Pa.
Sittler
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stanley
Stockman
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Teague
Thompson,
Mich.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Vail
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vinson
Werdel
Wharton
Wigglesworth
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Wolverton
Wood, Idaho

NAYS—159

Abernethy
Addonizio
Albert
Andrews
Anfuso
Angell
Aspinall
Baker
Barrett
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Bishop
Blatnik
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buckley
Camp
Cannon
Carnahan
Celler
Chelf
Chudoff
Clemente
Colmer
Cooper
Cox
Crosser
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Deane
DeGraffenried
Delaney
Dempsey
Denton
Dingell
Donohue
Donovan
Dorn
Doughton
Elliott
Engle
Evins
Feighan
Fernandez
Fine
Forand
Forrester
Frazier
Furcolo
Garmatz
Golden
Gordon
Gore
Granahan
Green
Gregory
Hagen
Harris
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Heller
Holifield
Holmes
Horan
Howell
Hull
Irving
Jackson, Wash.
Jarman
Javits
Johnson
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten, Mo.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kerr
Kilday
King, Calif.

Kirwan	Moulder	Roosevelt
Klein	Multer	Sabath
Kluczynski	Murray, Tenn.	Shelley
Lane	Norrell	Sheppard
Lanham	O'Brien, Ill.	Sieminski
Lesinski	O'Brien, Mich.	Simpson, Ill.
Lucas	O'Neill	Smith, Miss.
Lyle	O'Toole	Spence
McCarthy	Patman	Steed
McCormack	Perkins	Stigler
McGrath	Philbin	Sutton
McGuire	Poage	Tackett
McKinnon	Powell	Thomas
McMullen	Preston	Thompson, Tex.
Machrowicz	Price	Trimble
Mack, Ill.	Priest	Vursell
Mack, Wash.	Rains	Walter
Madden	Ramsay	Watts
Magee	Rankin	Whitten
Mansfield	Redden	Wier
Marshall	Reece, Tenn.	Williams, Miss.
Miller, Nebr.	Rhodes	Winstead
Mills	Riley	Withrow
Mitchell	Rodino	Yates
Morris	Rogers, Colo.	Yorty
Morrison	Rooney	Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Patten

NOT VOTING—73

Abbitt	Fugate	Murray, Wis.
Auchincloss	Granger	O'Hara
Bailey	Grant	O'Konski
Baring	Hall,	Passman
Bates, Ky.	Leonard W.	Potter
Battle	Halleck	Rabaut
Bolling	Harrison, Va.	Ribicoff
Bolton	Hart	Rivers
Bosone	Hays, Ohio	Roberts
Boykin	Hedrick	Rogers, Tex.
Brownson	Heffernan	Short
Buchanan	Herter	Sikes
Burdick	Hinshaw	Staggers
Burnside	James	Velde
Butler	Kee	Vorys
Carrigg	Kersten, Wis.	Weichel
Clevenger	Larcade	Welch
Combs	McConnell	Wheeler
Corbett	Martin, Iowa	Wickersham
Dollinger	Miller, Calif.	Widnall
Dondero	Morano	Wilson, Tex.
Doyle	Morgan	Wolcott
Eaton	Morton	Wood, Ga.
Flood	Murdock	Woodruff
Fogarty	Murphy	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Fogarty against.

Mr. Butler for, with Mr. Bolling against.

Mr. McConnell for, with Mr. Granger against.

Mr. Dondero for, with Mr. Morgan against.

Mr. Weichel for, with Mr. Doyle against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Hedrick against.

Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Hart against.

Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Bates of Kentucky against.

Mr. Vorys for, with Mr. Dollinger against.

Mr. Patton for, with Mr. Murdock against.

Mr. Carrigg for, with Mr. Flood against.

Mr. Harrison of Virginia for, with Mr. Rivers against.

Mr. Herter for, with Mr. Boykin against.

Mr. Corbett for, with Mr. Roberts against.

Mr. Clevenger for, with Mr. Wheeler against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mrs. Bosone against.

Mr. Velde for, with Mr. Combs against.

Mr. Potter for, with Mr. Wickersham against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Battle against.

Mr. Widnall for, with Mr. Kee against.

Mr. Wolcott for, with Mr. Wood of Georgia against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Grant against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Staggers with Mr. James.

Mr. Barring with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Bailey with Mr. Burdick.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BISHOP changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. MURDOCK. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. COUDERT. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COUDERT moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 64, after line 21, add a new section 405 as follows:

"SEC. 405. Money appropriated in this act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate expenditures of all agencies provided for herein beyond the total sum of $6,900,000,000."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COUDERT) there were—ayes 112, noes 209.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO CORRECT SECTION NUMBERS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 3 minutes today, following the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday next week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CONSUMERS PRICE INDEX FOR FEBRUARY 1952

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, our vigorous anti-inflation program is beginning to achieve results. I am delighted to see that the Consumers Price Index for February shows a slight decline of six-tenths of 1 percent. This means that the load which the consumer has had to carry is beginning to ease off. Our anti-inflation program has arrested the upward swing of prices and is slowly bringing them back to decent levels.

Let us not be premature in our self-congratulations. We are achieving stabilization—yes. But we are achieving it at a level which places the necessities of life beyond the reach of millions of Americans whose incomes have not kept pace with the price rises. Price levels are still unfair to fixed income families: school teachers, clergymen, white-collar workers, veterans living on pensions and disability allowances, and senior citizens living on savings and annuities.

NO TIME TO ABANDON INFLATION CONTROLS

This will no doubt be the occasion for a loud chorus of demands to kill OPS. It will spark hundreds of lobby campaigns for special amendments to prohibit any controls over individual products even though their prices may rise seriously in the future.

This is no time to talk of weakening the Defense Production Act. The wolf is off the front porch, but he may still be lurking in the garden.

We know not what dangers lie ahead.

Some factors continue to militate for higher prices. Increases allowed under the Capehart amendment have already resulted in annual price increases of

$800,000,000. The tempo of military production has yet to reach its peak.

To demolish our dikes against inflation at this time would be a historic folly.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE KATYN FOREST MASSACRE OF SOLDIERS OF POLAND

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, may it please the House:

I want to very briefly discuss the Katyn Forest massacre of thousands of Polish soldiers. I serve on the congressional committee investigating it.

I cannot possibly tell you the story of Katyn Forest in the few minutes' time I have today. I can merely tell you a fraction of it. I think the very first time it will be told in its entirety will be some months from now when we file our report.

Katyn is the name of a forest in Russia near the ancient city of Smolensk. Katyn Forest has existed for centuries, but its significance in world history begins in September of 1939.

POLAND IS ATTACKED

On September 1, in that year, Hitler had attacked Poland and the mechanized might of the Nazis swept into Poland across the western borders. Great as were the odds against them, the Polish troops fought magnificently. They were the first to resist Nazi aggression.

After 17 days of heroic resistance, an ominous rumble came from the east and Soviet Russia swept across the undefended eastern border of Poland. They came, they said, to aid Poland and to defend the Polish Nation against the Nazi onslaught. They asked the leaders of Poland's gallant army to cooperate with Russia against the common enemy. They promised to respect the territorial integrity of Poland and they made many other promises, none of which was kept.

OFFICERS SEPARATED FROM ENLISTED MEN

There is much to the story but, to shorten it as much as possible, let me simply say that thousands of Polish warriors were taken and held in custody by the Russians. Then, gradually, the Russians began to separate the Polish enlisted men from the officers. Finally approximately 15,000 officers were quartered in three prison camps in Russia—the camps of Kozielsk, Starobielsk, and Ostáshkov. There they were allowed to write home to their families and, by correspondence, they kept in touch with their loved ones.

SILENCE

That was the situation from fall of 1939 until spring of 1940—then silence, and nothing more. It was as though the earth had suddenly opened, and swallowed up thousands of Polish prisoners.

RUSSIAN-POLISH RECONCILIATION

During all this time, world events were happening in rapid sequence. In September of 1939 the Nazis and the Russians had joined forces. That alliance continued until June of 1941. That month the Nazis attacked Russia. Immediately after that Russia joined the Allied Powers and, in that capacity, became the ally of Poland, too. On August 12, 1941, there was a formal reconciliation between Russia and Poland, with a clause stipulating that Russia would release all Polish citizens. Poland agreed to form a Polish Army to help in the fight against the Nazis. Russia accordingly issued a decree releasing all Polish prisoners, and the gates of prisons and camps were opened. Polish soldiers began reporting to places where the Polish Army was forming—they came by the thousands—but very few officers reported.

"WHERE ARE OUR OFFICERS?"

Of course it was a puzzling circumstance and the Polish leaders renewed their inquiries of the Soviet authorities. "About 15,000 of our Polish officers are missing," they said, "officers who were taken in custody by Soviet Russia in September of 1939. Since early 1940 no one has seen or heard from them, or of them, directly or indirectly. Where are our missing officers?" was the question Polish officials asked of Russian officials.

The inquiries went as high as Stalin himself, and the question was asked time after time, month after month, year after year. The answer? There was no one answer—in fact, often there was not even any reply at all. But when there were replies, they ranged from evasions to outright denials.

"They have all been returned home," the Russians said. But the Polish families knew better. "They have gone to join the Polish Army," the Russians said. The Polish Army knew that was not true. "They escaped into Manchuria; they were given to Germany; we do not have records," were other answers.

Words, words, words—but no Polish officers.

KATYN FOREST

At any rate, in June of 1941 the Nazis had surged into Russia. In August of 1941 they took control over Russian territory in the Smolensk area, including Katyn Forest, that secluded woods near Smolensk.

Quiet, peaceful, beautiful Katyn Forest was an ideal place for a family picnic, a sheltered glen in the beautiful countryside. It seemed to be a majestic island of peace in the sea of inhumanity and brutality of warring nations, somehow detached and apart from the savage war that had steeped the civilized world in blood.

That was Katyn Forest, its lofty trees reaching up into the heavens, the limbs spread protectingly over the world below, the foliage sheltering the soft earth. Yes, that was Katyn Forest; a place of quiet and beauty; and it was here that Poland found some of her missing sons.

THE GERMAN ANNOUNCEMENT

The German announcement was in the form of a crisp, official bulletin, issued on April 13, 1943:

Bulletin: From Smolensk comes news that the native population has revealed to German authorities the spot where, in secret mass executions, the Bolsheviks murdered 10,000 Polish officers. German authorities made a horrible discovery. They found a pit 90 feet long by 50 feet wide in which, 12 deep, lay the bodies of 3,000 Polish officers. Search and discovery of other pits continue.

END OF THE TRAIL

The long search was over. The missing Polish officers had been found.

THE INVESTIGATION BEGINS

Events moved rapidly after that. Russia said the prisoners had been in camps in that area, that they fell into German hands and, if murdered, the Germans had done it. The Polish asked the International Red Cross Committee at Geneva, Switzerland, to investigate. The International Red Cross was a neutral organ. Germany also made the same request, but Russia did not. As a result of Russia's refusal, the International Red Cross Committee did not conduct an investigation. Russia not only refused to ask for an investigation but Russia also broke off diplomatic relations with Poland.

GERMANY ACCUSES RUSSIA

The next step was taken by Germany. A commission was appointed composed of medical authorities from many nations. There were doctors and university professors from Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Finland, Italy, Croatia, the Netherlands, Bohemia, Rumania, Switzerland, Slovakia, Hungary, and Moravia. This so-called German investigation was made from April 28 through the 30th, in 1943. The conclusion was that the murders had been committed by the Russians approximately 3 years before.

RUSSIA ACCUSES GERMANY

The war continued and in August of 1943 Russia recaptured Smolensk and the Katyn Forest area. In January of 1944 the so-called Russian investigation was conducted by Russian doctors. The conclusion was that the murders had been committed by the Germans in 1941.

THE FULL STORY

There is so much more to tell. It would take hours to recount details of each investigation; of reports filed by United States investigators, missing or concealed; of the farcical trial at Nuremburg; of United States broadcasts during the war; and of testimony of witnesses heard by our congressional committee in the past few months.

It would take hours to tell. And there is much that has never been told.

WHY A KATYN FOREST COMMITTEE?

If I may digress for just a minute, that is one of the reasons for the establishment of a committee of the Congress of the United States to investigate the massacre. The Katyn Forest Massacre Committee was formed for several reasons. Without listing them all, because time does not permit, let me just enumerate a few of them:

NAME THE GUILTY NATION

First, the nation guilty of committing the murders must be identified after an investigation that will be considered to be unbiased, impartial, and fair. It is not only that this generation should know but it is also imperative that the

verdict be recorded for history. Regardless of what our own opinions may be, certainly posterity is not going to accept the investigation report of either Germany or Russia when those two nations each stand accused of the crime.

AMERICA'S DUTY

Second, America is the world's major neutral country. We stand for truth and justice. We have told all the nations of the world that we will seek truth and justice for any people who have been victims of totalitarian atrocities. All nations in the world, even those behind the iron curtain, know that is our proud boast. They also know of the Katyn massacre. What better test of our good faith than an American investigation? Is that not a duty we in America—the leader of the free world—owe to all the people of the world?

MAKE THE ACCUSATION

Third, eventually of course, the United Nations should take action. America should assume leadership in making such a recommendation to the United Nations and I have already asked President Truman to be ready to assume that responsibility.

But of course no one in America would want to make such a recommendation solely on the basis of any conclusion reached by either Germany or Russia, when it is agreed that one of those two nations committed the murders. An investigation by the committee of the Congress of the United States should result in a carefully documented presentation of facts to the President of the United States on which he would be completely justified in asking the United Nations for action.

It will be more difficult for the United Nations to refuse consideration of a request that carries the dignity and weight of a carefully considered and fully documented investigation. If America is to take leadership in asking for United Nations action, America of course must first have taken the time and trouble to study the case, prepare the evidence, and present a factual indictment. That is the purpose, the function, and the responsibility of a congressional committee.

REVEAL THE FACTS

Fourth. Aside from everything else, there have been stories for years that one or more departments or agencies or branches of the United States Government have covered up and hushed up some phases of the Katyn massacre. Reports filed by United States investigators have been missing or misplaced or concealed. There is also some question about the truth of certain statements made by official information bureaus of the United States Government. Of course in that situation no other nation in the entire world except America has the right or duty to investigate that phase of the case.

IT WILL SAVE LIVES

Fifth. American boys and the boys of other nations are being captured in Korea. They will be prisoners of some nation just as the Polish officers had been prisoners. Let us let every nation in the world know that America will not overlook treatment of prisoners. Let the Katyn investigation be an example of that. If any nation is disposed to ill-treat prisoners, knowledge that the United States will take action—and the Katyn investigation is the proof—may cause such nation to think twice. The Katyn investigation may save prisoners in the Korean war or in other wars. It may save the lives of American boys as well as boys of other nations.

GENOCIDE

There are many other reasons, but they take too long to discuss in the time available to me today. But it does not take long to tell one part on which everyone agrees: the bodies of about 5,000 Polish officers were found in Katyn Forest. Each one had been killed by one bullet fired in the back of the skull, coming out at the forehead.

Murder? Yes; but more than that. It was genocide.

The dictionary defines genocide as, "the deliberate and systematic extermination of a racial, political, or cultural group." Let me tell you what the 15,000 murdered Polish officers meant to Poland. I say 15,000 even though less than 5,000 bodies have been found. The other 10,000 are still missing, but there is no real doubt of their fate.

THE MEANING OF GENOCIDE

What did the fifteen thousand mean to Poland? Let me tell you in the words of former Ambassador Tadeusz Romer. Here is part of his testimony before our committee, and I quote:

> Among them were top- and high-ranking Polish Army officers; also well-known scientists, politicians, lawyers, editors, physicians, economists, and clergymen. They were the flower of the Polish intelligentsia. These men were, of course, badly needed, not only for our war effort, but also in connection with future plans for mutilated Poland.

It was put another way by another witness, Colonel Grobicki, who had been in the prison camp at Koziélsk. He said, and I quote:

> In Kosiélsk there was concentrated the brain of the Polish Nation. By killing these men, they wanted to put away the brain of the Polish Nation. It is much easier to handle the people when the intelligentsia, the brain of the nation, is put away.

Or, as it was put by a witness at the hearing in Chicago:

> The massacre at Katyn destroyed the creative force of Poland.

SELECTIVE MURDER

The massacre at Katyn Forest was genocide—a cold-blooded, deliberate, calculated attempt to destroy the leadership of Poland. There have been many mass exterminations and wholesale killings that far exceeded the number murdered at Katyn. But there has never been such a wholesale case of selective murder.

There have been exterminations of millions—ruthlessly, indiscriminately—without regard to which were leaders and which were rank and file. But Katyn marks the first time in recent history, at least, of genocide in the sense of selective, discriminate, and carefully planned murder intended to eliminate solely the leadership of a nation, yet keep the masses, the rank and file, alive—for exploitation, for slavery, or for whatever purpose was in the minds of the murderers.

The aim was to eliminate the leadership that might lead those masses in resistance; to destroy the intelligentsia that might teach the less educated the truth; and to kill the creative force that might rebuild a nation. It was genocide—to keep a gallant nation from its true destiny.

The perpetrators of the Katyn massacre well knew how easy it is to lead the flock of sheep once the shepherd has been removed.

Oh, yes, there have been greater mass murders and exterminations than at Katyn. That is not its significance. Its significance lies rather in the attempt to enslave an entire nation by destroying its leadership. The purpose was to cut off the head, but keep the body to work.

A CRIME AGAINST HUMANITY

There is much more to the Katyn Forest story. As I said in the beginning, it cannot possibly be told in this brief time. All I have hoped to do is to awaken your interest a little because it is important that you know about it. It is not a crime against only the Polish people: It is a crime against humanity.

I know of the interest of those of Polish descent. In fact, I have received literally dozens of invitations to speak on Katyn from Polish organizations in half the States of the Nation. But it should not be a matter solely of concern to the Polish people. It concerns everyone.

THE WORLD MUST REMEMBER

You may never have heard even the name of Katyn before, but now you have. And you will hear more of it—and your children will. Every generation born in every country in the world must hear of it, learn the truth about it, know what it means, and understand its significance in the history of mankind.

Until we all know the terrible truth about it, the ghosts of Katyn will haunt the world—not merely crying out for vengeance—far more than that—pleading for truth and knowledge and justice, so that never again will there be another Katyn.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

IS THERE A SUBVERSIVE MOVEMENT IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS?

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the somewhat voluminous documentation which I am presenting here may be charged against a practice in which Congressmen—and perhaps even others—sometimes indulge. It is proof that a public speaker's departure from text can have unanticipated results.

This document might be described as the product of freedom rather than planning—in this instance, freedom of speech.

The whole thing started innocently enough. Its origins were entirely casual and unpremeditated.

The initial incident occurred during the recess of Congress, at a dinner meeting of a Republican club in my home State, although outside my own district, at which I was the guest speaker.

In the course of my address, and by way of elaborating a point which I do not now even recall, I mentioned that I had recently received an invitation from a superintendent of schools in my district to deliver a nonpolitical talk in the high school but that the invitation was subsequently withdrawn by a somewhat embarrassed superintendent who explained that there had been objections from school board members. In referring to this occurrence, I commented in my speech that the school board "evidently had knuckled under to the Democrats." I further remarked that it was not the only such experience I have had, and I added that invitations to Congressmen to make such nonpolitical talks in the schools had become rare, although they were a commonplace in times past.

Subsequently I was queried by my home-town newspaper about these remarks. I repeated them and added the comment that there are "subversive activities and movements in some of the schools of the country and in some teachers' colleges."

There was one other item in my original remarks which is part of this narrative. In connection with a comment I made to the effect that Americans need to find some means of creating greater interest and activity in local elections—including school elections—I raised the question as to whether this lack of interest was not due, in part at least, to the trend toward nonpartisan local elections. I offered the observation that partisan elections generally create greater public interest than those conducted on a nonpartisan basis. This was later inaccurately quoted in the press as an advocacy of partisan school board elections. I did not and do not advocate such a policy and I certainly am unalterably opposed to injecting party politics into the schools.

The sequel of this incident and of the publicity given my remarks—with some elaborations—by the Battle Creek newspaper, was the appearance of a newspaper article quoting anonymous spokesmen of teachers in the public schools of the Battle Creek area. These spokesmen denounced me for my comments and demanded that I either clarify and prove my charges or retract them. I was not, however, contacted directly by any representatives of the teachers at that time.

I immediately replied, through the press, calling attention to the anonymous character of this criticism and demand for retraction. While making clear that I had offered no blanket indictment of teachers and had not stated or implied that the canceled invitations to speak had occurred in the Battle Creek area, I did elaborate the subversive comment to the extent of stating the obvious truth that "an increasing number of Americans at the grass roots are concerned and disturbed over trends in educational philosophies and methods which run counter to the traditional American philosophy and principles of government."

The alleged spokesmen of the teachers thereafter made their identity known, and later the executive body of the Calhoun County branch of the Michigan Education Association adopted a resolution demanding that I prove or retract my charges.

Thereupon I invited representatives of the schools in Calhoun County to meet with me to discuss the matter. Some 60 individuals, including school superintendents, teachers, and school board members, attended. Also present was a representative of the Michigan Education Association, apparently on the invitation of the teachers' group.

The demands for proof or retraction of my charges were repeated at this meeting.

I stated that I saw no valid reason for precipitating a community controversy over the cancellation of my invitation to speak by identifying the school involved, especially since it was not located in the Battle Creek area and since my criticism, in that instance, had been directed at the school board and not at the superintendent or any teacher.

I repeated my disclaimer of "any intention of making a blanket criticism of the loyalty, conscientiousness, or good faith of members of the teaching profession." I pointed out that I had made no accusation against any individual teacher or specific school system in my district so far as my reference to subversive movements was concerned. I added, however, that I was fully aware of the fact—as they must also be—that "there are movements afoot in educational circles which are dedicated to the promotion through the schools of a system of planned and controlled economy and a system of world government to which national sovereignty in matters of national defense is to be subordinated."

I stated my conviction that there could be no question as to the right to discuss publicly the broad issues posed by this educational movement. I urged, however, that I not be required to extend that discussion or document the subject, under the circumstances, lest I appear to be making it a local issue or one based on personalities, to the detriment of the schools and the community.

Nevertheless, the demand was insistently repeated that I document the allegation, and I reluctantly agreed to do so.

Curiously, following the meeting, the two principal spokesmen for the teachers' group expressed the opinion that the matter could well be dropped. I reminded them that, at the insistence of several members of the group, I had promised, in the presence of some 60 persons, that I would provide the documentation. I added that I could not lightly break that promise.

Some weeks thereafter I received a letter from the two spokesmen repeating their insistent request for the documentation.

So far as I am concerned, there is no question as to the major issue upon which the insistence of the teachers' spokesmen is focused.

I am convinced that it is focused upon my reference to an educational movement which I labeled as "subversive."

Accordingly, I am not going to quibble over side issues.

The matter of the canceled invitations to speak is a matter of personal knowledge and first-hand experience which requires no proof or elaboration. Furthermore, it involves confidences that I will not violate.

As for the major item, the movement in public school circles which I described as "subversive," I welcome the demand that I document that subject.

As I will make abundantly clear, I make no blanket indictment of the schools or teaching profession, and I am engaged in no witch hunt.

Instead I am addressing myself to an existing educational movement which is closely identified with the program of the national "social planners"—a program which I believe bodes no good either for the schools or for the Nation.

I use the term "subversive" in the connotation of "undermining allegiance and faith." I use the term in the sense in which I assume that it was used by Dean Henry W. Holmes of the graduate school of education of Harvard University when he cautioned that "Teachers must see that their teaching is neither subversive nor reactionary"—Progressive Education, October 1933, pages 414–418.

I am certainly realistic enough to recognize that America is not perfect—neither is its government, nor its economic system, nor its social arrangements. But I believe that it is still "the last best hope on earth."

America is not perfect—but I believe that an educational movement and philosophy which "accentuates the negative," which minimizes, ignores or denies the strengths, accomplishments and potentialities of our Government, our economic system and our social arrangements, is subversive.

I believe that an educational movement and philosophy which minimizes or denies the potentialities of individual and collective self-improvement of the American people and American institutions, save through the expanding agencies of government, is subversive.

I believe that an educational movement and philosophy which pits class against class in America, which attributes only evil and viciousness to one class or group of citizens and only virtue to another class or group, and which proposes that the schools teach and promote such a belief and attitude, is subversive.

I believe that an educational movement and philosophy which brands the capitalist or owner as the inevitable and implacable foe of human rights, as incapable of social conscience or responsibility, and as hostile to improvement or opportunities for improvement for his fellow men, is subversive.

I believe that an educational movement and philosophy which insists and would teach in the public school classroom that the only solution—and the desirable solution—of the problems of Americans, of the problems of self-government, economics and social well-being, lies in increasingly bigger government, in increasing concentration of

power in centralized government, is subversive.

I believe that an educational movement and philosophy which proposes to convert the public schools into an agency for the promotion of socialism, a planned collectivist economy, government regimentation or the welfare state, is subversive.

I believe that an educational movement and philosophy which arrogates to the educational profession—or which undertakes to assign to any other profession or segment of the national life—the awful responsibility of "social reconstruction," is subversive.

I believe that an educational movement which urges the teachers or any other single group in the national life "to reach for power and then make the most of its conquest," and which claims for any single group a freedom from accountability to the public and an immunity from public criticism, is subversive.

I believe that an educational movement and philosophy which proposes to convert the public schools into an agency for the promotion of supernational sovereignty or world government and which urges the systematic eradication—beginning in the kindergarten—of nationalism, and which decrees that nationalism and the loyalties which it involves must go, is subversive.

I believe that an educational movement and philosophy which, in the name of so-called progressive education and academic freedom, attributes supreme virtue to the new, to the attitude of critical skepticism, to cynical distrust of human motives and impulses, and which, at the same time, belittles the old, decries inherited loyalties, and minimizes truths and values established by past experience, is subversive.

In all of this I am expressing my own opinion and judgment.

But in the material which follows I am not presenting personal opinion. I am documenting a movement in public-school education from the record and testimony of its own leaders and adherents.

I. A STATEMENT OF THE SUBJECT UNDER DISCUSSION

This is a documentation of a movement and a trend in present-day public-school education in the United States.

Basically, the fact here documented is that a significantly influential segment of public-school leadership in the United States proclaims—as it has been proclaiming for some 20 years—the right and duty of teachers, school administrators, and educational leaders to undertake to remake American society and government through the agency and medium of the public schools.

This movement and trend have found, and continue to find, advocacy, expression and implementation through the policy pronouncements of educational organizations, through professional books and journals, through the counsel and instruction of teachers of teachers in colleges of education and at educational conferences and workshops, and through the activities of disciples of the movement in developing curricular content and classroom procedures in elementary and secondary public schools.

I have used the two terms "movement" and "trend" advisedly, although I will use the single term "movement" hereafter for brevity. What is here described is a movement, since it involves planned and organized activities directed to specific ends; it is also a trend, in the sense that the effects and influence of the movement extend beyond specific, organized, and planned activities.

Certain basic premises characterize this movement:

First. It proclaims that capitalism in the United States is doomed—that it is dead, or dying—and that its replacement by some form of collectivism, by some form or degree of planned economy, government control, or outright socialization, essentially new and different in character, is both desirable and inevitable.

Second. This movement and its sponsors hold that the schools should participate actively in building a new social order along these collectivist lines, that this activity should be carried on either through outright indoctrination of these premises and concepts or through processes of guided group study and discussion and uncoerced persuasion within the classroom, and that the schools, through both the content and methods of instruction, should prepare and condition the child for participation in that new social order.

Third. The movement calls for such revision of the educational system, and of its philosophy, procedures, and subject matter, as is necessary to advance and accomplish these purposes.

Fourth. More extreme educational sponsors of this movement also hold that the transition to collectivism will, in all probability, involve class conflict; that the schools, accordingly, should adopt the class approach in their educational activities, aline themselves with the worker class, and utilize class consciousness and conflict as a "potential resource."

Fifth. Advocates of the program of social reconstruction through the schools recognize the inevitability of opposition to that program and accordingly propose certain "steps to power" designed to enable the schools and the profession to deal, both offensively and defensively, with the anticipated resistance.

Sixth. The movement also includes advocacy of a variety of other subsidiary proposals for changes in the form, philosophy, and procedures of government in the United States.

Seventh. Since teachers are envisioned by this movement as "engineers of social change," the political-economic-social views of teachers become a matter of vital concern to advocates of social reconstruction through the schools.

Eighth. Since the Second World War, the program of social reconstruction through the schools has received significant restatement in a formally adopted program of the progressive education organization.

Ninth. A further postwar development in the movement has been the addition of the goal of world government and a supernational sovereignty to the program of social reconstruction through the schools.

These are the main features, the principal tenets, of the movement here being described, and the foregoing summary constitutes a brief outline of the material documented herein.

There should be further preliminary understandings with respect to this documentation.

I make no claim that it is complete or exhaustive. The source material itself is too voluminous even for complete perusal; moreover, constant additions are being made to the literature of the movement. I do claim, however, that the documentation offered is fairly typical and representative of the basic premises and objectives of the movement as stated by its own advocates and adherents.

I have attempted to identify my sources with painstaking care. A partial bibliography of the movement is appended to this document. I have also attempted to indicate accurately the official educational position held by the professional leaders quoted and the exact professional status of any educational organizations referred to.

I have made no attempt to estimate or compute, on any statistical basis, the extent of the acceptance of the tenets of this movement among members of the teaching and school administration professions. I do not know of any information available in this form. In any event the influence of such a movement can scarcely be gauged in such terms. Later I will have occasion to cite certain estimates of the influence of the progressive education movement, offered by its own spokesmen, including a statement of the peak membership of the organization. In another instance, I will cite the tabulations of a survey of teacher sentiment on political-economic-social issues, polled by leaders of the movement here documented. But that is the extent of my statistical information.

I make no attempt to single out individual teachers or specific school systems which may be adherents of this movement. I do not have access to such information and I am engaged in no such enterprise. Responsibility for alertness to this movement, at the local level and in specific school systems, rests with local boards of education, parent-teacher and other community groups, and with all interested parents and citizens.

If this documentation adds to the general knowledge and understanding of the movement and increases public awareness of need for local vigilance, it will serve its purpose.

I wish particularly to emphasize that I am not indulging, and have never indulged, in any blanket indictment of the public-school system or of the teaching profession. I will have more to say on that point a little later.

By the way of summing up the basic facts which are the subject of this documentation, I cite a statement made by the late Dr. William H. Kilpatrick, long professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University, a gentleman who was by no means hostile to the movement here being documented. Speaking at a meeting of the Department of Superintendence of the Na-

tional Education Association—now the American Association of School Administrators—on February 27, 1935, Dr. Kilpatrick said with respect to members of the profession:

There are many who think that our social-economic system should be radically reconstructed. To this proposal, opinion responds over a wide range from an extreme yes to an extreme no, with all gradations in between. Some who are most anxious to bring about this social-economic reconstruction urge the school to take an active part in helping to build the new social order. To this proposal also, opinion responds over a wide range from an extreme yes through intermediate positions to an extreme no. (NEA Proceedings, 1935, p. 567.)

This documentation is concerned with the segment of the profession falling in the area "left of center"—veering in the direction of what Dr. Kilpatrick called the "extreme yes" with respect to the two propositions he mentioned. More specifically, this documentation is concerned with the organized, vocal and aggressive element of the educational profession dedicated to the support of the social reconstruction through the schools movement.

II. THE SMEAR CHARGE

No responsible American would wish to place the public school system or the teaching profession generally under a cloud of suspicion.

Unfortunately there are those who are willing to take advantage of that very fact in order to forestall legitimate criticism or exposure of abuses.

There are those who instantly respond to a discussion and documentation of the type here being undertaken with the cry of "smear."

The ultimate effect of cowering before that outcry would, of course, be to estop all necessary and proper criticism.

If this documentation does result in misgivings with respect to the public schools and the teaching profession, the responsibility for those misgivings must rest upon the movement being documented, not upon the documentation.

Indeed, as I see it, one of the potential values of this documentation is that it defines—or at least undertakes, in good faith, to define—the particular movement under discussion with sufficient objectivity and accuracy that the interested American will be able clearly to distinguish between those who are advocates or adherents of the movement, and those who are not. That, certainly, is the complete opposite of a blanket indictment or an indiscriminate smear.

It is regrettable that there is currently prevalent an official and widely expressed attitude among many leaders of public school education which adds to public confusion and misunderstanding and so tends to cast an unmerited shadow of suspicion upon the public schools and the teaching profession. I believe it is important to call attention to this attitude before moving into my actual documentation.

I refer to the attitude of hypersensitivity, resentment and hostility to criticism of the schools verging upon a persecution complex, which has even produced a blanket denunciation of critics of the schools as "the enemy."

It is not an exaggeration to say that educational officialdom has declared an open season on critics of the schools.

Typical of the official pronouncements on this score is a resolution adopted by the Michigan Education Association on August 25, 1951, condemning "the irresponsible attacks which are now being made on our schools, their personnel and procedures, attacks which often are designed to discredit the public schools, reduce their financial support, curtail their program, and destroy free public education for all children." The MEA pledged its resources "to expose and combat" these "vicious attacks."

The National Education Association at its San Francisco convention, July 6, 1951, adopted a resolution asserting that—

The NEA believes that one of the year's most challenging problems is presented by attacks of front organizations and pressure groups on the public schools, on their teachers and administrators, and on the quality of instruction. The Association believes in and welcomes honest and constructive criticism but condemns general and irresponsible attacks on schools. Often the real purpose of such attacks is found to be the reduction of school costs and the curtailment of the public school program. (NEA Journal, September 1951, p. 383.)

The thirtieth yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators, entitled "The American School Superintendency," devotes several paragraphs to the subject "Attacks on the Schools." It quotes an article by Arthur D. Morse in McCall's magazine—September 1951—to the effect that—

Public education in America is under the heaviest attack in its history. This attack is not aimed at the improvement of free education. It is aimed at its destruction.

The yearbook charges:

In some cases this pressure may be sparked by organizations or individuals who are authoritarian in intent, seeking to destroy the American way of life by undermining public confidence in the schools. They are persistent, devious, and clever in the way they twist statements and acts of educational leaders and by innuendo and association create doubt of the motives and methods of the entire public-school system (p. 258).

One current interpretation of criticisms of the public schools is that these attacks are the result of "a central command," and that they emanate from persons "who have no competence to judge educational matters"—Fact Sheet, Community Relations Service of New York City, March 1, 1951. This same publication cites as proof of the "central command" the fact that there have been flare-ups in widely separated communities. My own home city of Battle Creek, Mich., is listed as the scene of one such flare-up, despite the fact that within the last 2 or 3 years its citizens, with the active support of the real estate and property owner groups, voted a million and a quarter dollars in extra tax funds for needed school rehabilitation and despite the fact that my home city was cited by the superintendent of schools in a national educational magazine as a model of public cooperation in support of the schools.

The same charge of a planned attack on the schools is made by David Hulburd in his book, This Happened in Pasadena, 1951:

It is a fact that certain forces, vicious, well organized, and coldly calculating, would like to change the face of education in the United States (p. ix).

Perhaps the most shocking manifestation of the "persecution complex" was the official report on the Pasadena school controversy made to the National Education Association at its San Francisco meeting last July. In this report—Bulletin No. 35, National Commission for the Defense of Democracy through Education of the NEA—the commission chairman, Harold Benjamin, branded the opposition to the Pasadena superintendent as "the enemy" and proceeded to describe the stereotype "enemy" of the public schools.

The consequences of this defensive attitude toward criticism are extremely serious so far as the public relations of the schools are concerned. Any individual who ventures a criticism of the schools finds that he has spoken at his own peril and that he has thereby incurred the wrath of a powerfully organized pressure group. Even elected public-school officials—school-board members—discover that they are not immune from organized retaliatory pressure measures.

The impression created by this hypersensitivity to criticism is that those in educational circles demand a double standard of freedom. They seem to insist upon virtually absolute academic freedom for themselves. At the same time, they insist that criticism of the schools by the public must be restricted to what they designate as constructive—and therefore permissible.

The situation has an ironical aspect. Criticism of the public schools is not a new phenomenon. Indeed, one of the most prolific sources of criticism of the schools over the past three decades has been the very movement here being documented. This criticism has come both from within the profession and from lay supporters of the movement. Yet this criticism has brought no answering denunciations from educational officialdom, no labeling of the critics as "the enemy," no accusations of a plot under central command" to destroy the schools. Instead, spokesmen of this movement have often been welcome speakers at educational conferences, applauded to an echo for their attacks on the schools.

Leaders in this movement have repeatedly insisted—and continue to insist—that the schools are "in need of thorough reconstruction." They have charged that "educational leadership has too much interest in the matter of pleasing boards of education." They have accused the schools of furthering social chaos. They have alleged that "after 150 years, American education has left us as vicious socially and as dishonest as we were before that education began." They have denounced "the commonplaces of American education" as "faint voices from a distant and mythical land" when compared with the social and educational developments in Soviet Russia in the 1930's.

A spokesman for this movement branded a report of an NEA commission as "full of pompous idealistic expressions and threadbare axioms—a shallow and spineless analysis."

There have been bold pronouncements that "the public generally has registered its loss of faith in its educational system," and that education "must clean house of a multitude of rubbish." Teachers have been told, by leaders of this movement, that they must emancipate themselves from the domination of the business interests and that they must "cease cultivating the manners and associations of bankers." That last, by the way, was written back in the days when there was no more fighting word than "banker."

Teachers have been told that they must "abandon smug middle-class tradition"—a somewhat unkind and sweeping generalization about the so-called middle class. Teachers have also been warned that they would have "to restate their philosophy of education, reorganize the procedures of the schools, and even redefine their own position in society." Talk about blanket indictments.

These are typical of the attacks upon the public schools and the teaching profession which have emanated—and still emanate—from the progressive education movement. And the Progressive Education Association has not been bashful in its claims as to the accomplishments and influence of the movement and its attacks.

Vinal H. Tibbets, director of the Progressive Education Association, declared in 1945, that "the impact"—of the association—"upon educational thinking and practice is immeasurable." He further commented that the association's largest annual membership was under 11,000, and that "probably no group so small, except the early Christians, has ever made such progress in so short a time in changing the direction of a social movement"—Progressive Education magazine, March 1945, page 3.

That the attacks upon school and teacher philosophy and practices have been intense is further attested by the comments of a letter, appearing in the same issue of the magazine, from Dr. Virgil M. Rogers, superintendent of schools of Battle Creek, Mich., then a vice president of the Progressive Education Association and now president of the American Association of School Administrators. Dr. Rogers wrote:

> Some of us who have been associated with the Progressive Education Association * * * for many years, rejoice in the fact that we have been able to maintain a good magazine in spite of the depression years, and notwithstanding the terrific battles which progressive education has had to fight during these recent years of reaction to modern education.
>
> I especially like the friendly and forthright fashion in which news articles deal with serious conflicts in American education (p. 2, ibid).

Since public school education—including progressive education—has obviously flourished heretofore on criticism and conflict, it is passing strange that criticism now suddenly becomes the mark of "the enemy." Of course, human experience records that there have been other instances in which former heretics, having achieved power and the status of orthodoxy, proceed to denounce the new generation of dissenters.

III. SKELETON IN THE CLOSET

The sensitivity of educational officialdom to criticism is particularly acute with respect to any charge or suggestion that collectivism or socialism is being fostered in the public schools. The official reaction to such an accusation is an air of injured and indignant innocence.

Since the phrase "socialism in the schools" is a man-in-the-street version of the movement here under discussion, it becomes relevant to this documentation to record some of the official denials of this allegation.

I quote, first of all, from a monthly bulletin issued by Superintendent C. C. Trillingham of the Los Angeles County, Calif., public schools. This bulletin was published in the October 1950 Education Digest, page 39:

> Anyone who knows about the general educational program of the schools today knows that the charges that the schools are leading the country toward socialism, that the fundamental skills are being ignored, and that there is no attempt to discipline youngsters, are untrue. That these are the results of a premeditated program of so-called "progressive education" is sheer nonsense.

In the report on the recent Pasadena, Calif., school controversy, entitled "The Pasadena Story," issued by the National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education of the NEA—of which commission Superintendent Virgil M. Rogers, of Battle Creek, Mich., was a member at the time—attention is called to "certain general charges" made by groups critical of the schools:

> They apparently claim that this country has already moved into, or is rapidly moving toward, some form of socialism, collectivism, or statism. They contend that subversive elements have sifted into public education and that many teachers are seeking to change the American way of life. They charge that John Dewey's progressive education is an instrument designed to break down American standards and weaken the fabric of American society. They oppose Federal aid to education on the ground that it is a collectivist measure. They oppose certain educators who they assert are seeking to indoctrinate the youth of the country for a changed social and economic order (p. 23).

Commenting on this summation of charges, the Commission's report says:

> Many explanations could be given for these criticisms. Probably the most general one is the wave of reaction which has swept over this country as the result of the fear of communism (p. 22).

Similarly, the Defense Bulletin issued by Harold Benjamin, chairman of this NEA commission, and previously cited, refers to these allegations in a sarcastic vein. In his description of the so-called Enemy and his tactics, Mr. Benjamin says:

> He has whipped up pseudo-popular revolts there (in Pasadena) against teachers, administrators and school programs on the grounds that they are indoctrinating the children in communism, socialism, or at least mentioning democracy, and they are helping to increase taxes.

Dean Ernest O. Melby of the New York University School of Education, writing in the pamphlet, "American Education Under Fire," 1951, explains that such accusations may arise from a misunderstanding:

> Often * * * when schools deal with controversial issues they are accused of communism or leftist leanings merely because various viewpoints are presented and arguments are carried on with regard to the various issues (p. 32).

This same "explanation" is elaborated by Dean Melby in an article in the October 1951 NEA Journal—pages 441–442—in which he says that "most of the attacks being made on public education are dishonest and unjustified":

> Schools must deal with controversial issues. In doing so they are sometimes accused of leftist leanings by persons who fail to realize that teaching about communism is not the same thing as teaching communism. What the schools are trying to do is to equip boys and girls to deal with the present ideological conflict successfully.

Dean J. B. Edmondson of the University of Michigan School of Education was even more emphatic in an article in the September 1951 NEA Journal—pages 381–382. Writing on "the threats to public education," Dean Edmondson listed as one of these "threats":

> The insidious efforts of some persons to create the false impression that teachers are committed to a "progressive philosophy of education" that is socialistic and communistic in its influence on children and youth.

As a final example, I quote a newspaper report of an address in February 1952, before the Battle Creek (Mich.) Exchange Club by Superintendent Virgil M. Rogers:

> "Economic education has become a necessity today, where once the American way of life was looked upon as a subject everyone knew about," Dr. Rogers said. "Not until this generation have the free-enterprise system and the democratic way of life been seriously challenged by socialism and communism and this creates a difficult situation for teachers," Dr. Rogers said.
>
> "In order for boys and girls to know what it is that imperils our way of life, it is necessary to teach about communism and socialism," said Dr. Rogers, emphasizing the word "about."
>
> He said the teachers "teach about these other forms of government carefully, always pointing out the dangers to our way of life."

If I am capable of understanding the English language as used by the educators in the foregoing statements, those statements are a categorical denial of the existence of the movement and trend here being documented. In view of the record which this documentation clearly establishes, this denial is inexplicable. It means to me that educators who speak and write in this vein are less than frank with the American people. They are hiding a skeleton in the closet. The effect of these denials can only be to create confusion, misunderstanding and the very attitude of suspicion which they profess to be so anxious to avoid.

In the documentation that follows, there will be abundant evidence that advocacy of socialism is one item of belief identified with the movement under discussion. Even more to the point is the fact that the movement calls for the

remaking of our society by and through the schools, and that it claims the right and duty of the teacher to engage in that enterprise in the classroom under the guise of academic freedom.

IV. MEET DR. COUNTS

Some 4 or 5 years after his appointment as a professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University, Dr. George S. Counts, read a paper before a conference of the Progressive Education Association in Baltimore, Md., in February 1932.

This paper, bearing the title "Dare Progressive Education Be Progressive?" proved to be an epochal event in the history of modern American education. It is also the necessary starting point in the documentation which I am here undertaking.

Because of the major—even dominant—role which Dr. Counts played in the early history of the movement under discussion, it is important to become somewhat acquainted with him and his views. In doing so, I am not indulging in personalities or undertaking to cast Dr. Counts in a villain's role. And my interest in Dr. Counts' relationship to the movement being described here is not limited to its origins.

If I am any judge of the record, Dr. Counts is an educator who has himself gained considerable education in the past 20 years. Indeed I am convinced that he is today a wiser and possibly sadder man than the 43-year-old Columbia professor who issued the ringing summons to social reconstruction through the classroom in his paper before the Baltimore meeting. I believe he is not only a man with the courage of his convictions and the courage to change his convictions in the light of experience and reflection, but also a man who has demonstrated real physical courage by carrying his convictions into the enemy's camp with brave defiance—the enemy's camp being a Communist-sponsored "international cultural" gathering held in New York City in 1949.

Dr. Counts' dominant leadership in the launching of the social reconstruction movement is attested not only by the Baltimore address but by his authorship of the monograph, "Dare the School Build a New Social Order?" in 1932; his chairmanship of the Progressive Education Association committee on social and economic problems which issued the 1933 Call to the Teachers of the Nation; his service as research director of the American Historical Association Commission on Social Studies, and his editorship, for several years, of the Social Frontier, official journal of the movement.

It contributes to an understanding of the background of Dr. Counts' paper before the Baltimore meeting of the Progressive Education Association to know that at the time he was an enthusiastic observer and commentator on the "great collectivist experiment" in Soviet Russia. He was one of several American educators who, in keeping with the custom of the times—a custom encouraged by the Communist organization in the United States—had made several pilgrimages to Russia to view first hand, under proper chaperonage, the workings of that experiment. In 1931 Dr. Counts wrote a book entitled "The Soviet Challenge to America."

His estimate of the importance of the collectivist experiment in Russia is expressed in this statement:

The world today is full of social experimentation. There is one experiment, however, that dwarfs all others—so bold indeed in its ideals and its program that few can contemplate it without emotion. Because of the clouds of passion which still envelop it, there is serious danger that its most revolutionary, though least sensational, features may escape adequate notice. Soviet Russia is endeavoring with all the resources at her command to bring the economic order under a measure of rational control. She may fail in the attempt, but in the meantime every student of human affairs should follow the effort with breathless interest. She issues to the Western nations and particularly to the United States a challenge—perhaps one of the greatest challenges of history. But she issues it not through the Communist International, nor through the Red Army, nor through the Gay-Pay-OO (political police), as most of our citizens naively and timorously believe, but through her State Planning Commission and her system of public education. (The Soviet Challenge to America, pp. ix-x, foreword.)

Dr. Counts drew a contrast between Soviet Russia's approach to economic problems and that of the United States which left no doubt as to where, in theory at least, his sympathies and inclinations lay. He wrote:

In the societies of the West in general and the United States of America in particular the evolution of institutions proceeds for the most part without plan or design, as a sort of byproduct of the selfish competition of individuals, groups and enterprises for private gain. In Russia, on the other hand, since the days of 1917, the Soviet government has sought to promote the rational and orderly development of the entire social economy. * * * In the great 5-year plan of construction, which was launched in October of 1928 * * * a whole civilization is harnessing its energies and is on the march toward consciously determined goals (ibid., p. 7).

He said further:

If the revolution is sucessful the social order which is emerging today in Soviet Russia will first of all be collectivistic. In its essence this means that the institution of private property, at least insofar as it applies to land and the tools of production, will be abolished. It also means that no individual will be able to acquire great wealth, that the motive of personal gain will cease to drive the wheels of the economic order, that the senseless competition in the conspicuous consumption of goods will come to an end, and that land, railroads, factories, mills, shops, houses, and natural resources will be owned collectively and administered in the interests of all (pp. 24–25).

There are further comparisons drawn, again by no means favorable, in Dr. Count's judgment, to the American system:

No sensitive mind can remain long in the Soviet Union without feeling himself in a veritable furnace of the world where the elements composing human society are in a state of fusion and new principles of right and wrong are being forged. Under such conditions the commonplaces of American education sound like faint voices from a distant and mythical land (p. 324).

And again:

The revolutionary movement embraces much that is rich and challenging in the best sense of the word. The idea of building a new society along the lines developed by the Communists should provide a genuine stimulus to the mind and liberate the energies of millions. It is certainly no worse than the drive towards individual success which permeates not only the schools but every department of culture in the United States. If one were to compare the disciplined effort of the Soviets to industrialize the country, to socialize agriculture, to abolish poverty, to banish disease, to liquidate unemployment, to disseminate knowledge, and generally to raise the material and spiritual level of the masses, with the selfish scramble for wealth and privilege, the cruel disregard of the less sensational forms of human suffering, the relative absence of a sense of social responsibility, the reluctance to come honestly to grips with the major problems of the time, and the apparent decay of the political, ethical, and religious life in America, one would find small grounds for complacency. Whatever may be said on the other side concerning the regimentation of opinion and the restriction of individual freedom, there exists in Soviet Russia today an idealism and a driving passion for human betterment which contrast strangely with the widespread cynicism of the United States. It is only natural that this idealism and this passion should sweep through the schools as well as through the rest of the social order (pp. 328–330).

Finally, consider these rhapsodical lines with which Dr. Counts closes his book:

This cultural revolution possesses a single mighty integrating principle—the building of a new society in which there will be neither rich nor poor, in which the mainspring of all industry will be social rather than private profit, in which no man will be permitted to exploit another by reason of wealth or social position, in which the curse of Eden will be lifted forever from the soul of woman, in which a condition of essential equality will unite all races and nations into one brotherhood. Although the cultural applications of this principle often assume crude and exaggerated forms, as in the case of the Proletcult and the censorship of art, it is nevertheless authentic and vital. There is consequently in the Soviet Union today a sensitiveness to the more fundamental human wrongs and a passion for social justice that simply cannot be matched in any other quarter of the globe. A devotion to the common good and a deep interest in the oppressed of all lands penetrate and color every aspect of the cultural life of the country. That the pursuit of the goal may often be blind and unintelligent during the current period of stress and experimentation is only to be expected. The school, the press, the theater, the cinema, and life generally in Russia are full of excesses and imbecilities and of sound conceptions poorly executed. But back of it all, even the excesses and the imbecilities, there stands a great and challenging ideal which the rest of the world cannot continue to ignore and which may in time serve to bring art, science, and philosophy into essential harmony. In the meantime the leaders in American industry, politics, and thought, instead of dissipating their energies in the futile attempt to erect barriers against the spread of Communist doctrines, would do well to fashion an alternative program of equal boldness and honesty to discipline the energies and humanize the spirit of industrial civilization (pp. 338–339).

Let me interject at this point in the interests of complete fairness and accuracy that 20 years later—and 20 years

wiser and sadder—Dr. Counts recorded a much more sober judgment with respect to Soviet Russia. Writing in the January 1951 National Education Association Journal, Dr. Counts said:

The Soviet leaders boast every hour of the day about their grandiose achievements in economy and government, war and revolution, science, art, and culture. While some of these claims are justified, others are dubious, to say the least. Yet they have to their credit one truly staggering achievement about which they say nothing—their all-embracing system of mind control. * * *

The Soviet system of mind control is the product of perverted genius. It is the most comprehensive thing of its kind in history, surpassing immeasurably its predecessor under the Tsar. * * * Employing with complete ruthlessness and singleness of purpose all the resources of science, of mechanical invention, of medicine and psychology, it is able to attain power and reach heights of efficiency which dwarf the efforts of earlier despotisms.

The system embraces all of the organized processes and agencies for the molding of the minds of both young and old.

Pointing out that during the closing months of the Second World War the high command of the Communist Party in Russia "decided to reverse completely the war-time policy of friendly collaboration with the western democracies and to revive the policy of revolutionary aggression in the spirit of 1917," Dr. Counts goes on to observe, with obvious sorrow:

The reason for this tragic action * * * is not difficult to discern. But in order to know the truth we must renounce all wishful thinking and face the fully authenticated reality—the ultimate goal of the Soviet high command has not changed since the revolution and probably will not change for many years.

That goal is the overthrow at all costs, and by all means available, of the entire "capitalist," "bourgeois," or non-Soviet world. (Mind Control in the Soviet Union, pp. 29–32, NEA Journal, January 1951.)

While Dr. Counts as recently at least as 1945 had by no means abandoned his concept of the desirability of "general economic planning" in the United States, there are noteworthy modifications in his view of the American economic system and of the role of the school in reconstructing that system. Writing in "Education and the Promise of America," he said:

The young * * * should study critically the values and weaknesses of the "system of free enterprise," the dangers and possibilities in collective action (pp. 127–128).

As we will have occasion to see, Dr. Counts had come a long way from his 1932 views when he acknowledged, in this 1945 statement, that there are values in the system of free enterprise, and dangers in a system of collective action.

Something of the same eye-opening and disillusioning experience which Dr. Counts had with respect to the Soviet Utopia was repeated insofar as the American brand of Communists were concerned. After a bitter experience with Communist Party units of Teachers College, Columbia University, Dr. Counts wrote as follows regarding Communist tactics—The Social Frontier, February 1939, pages 135–140:

Seemingly even the editors of the Social Frontier live and learn.

A concluding word on the broader significance and implications of the story here unfolded may not be inappropriate. * * * Those who resort to the tactics and strategy reflected in that story should know that they are playing with fire. They profess to be fighting the growth of fascism in America and the world. Yet they indulge lightheartedly in irresponsible provocation, vilification of character, and distortion of history. They appear to operate on the principle that they will destroy by any means at hand whatever they cannot rule. Thus, by a strange dialectical process, they serve as a midwife of fascism; they prepare the very food on which fascism feeds. With my own eyes I have seen them create Fascist attitudes at Teachers College. They profess to be defending democracy against reaction and preach the united front of all popular forces. Yet they proceed to violate the most elementary democratic virtues of fairness and integrity, and by their methods bring inevitable discord into the ranks of the popular cause. They meet fundamental criticism with the cry of "red baiting," and then reserve to themselves all the other colors of the rainbow.

One lesson contemporary history teaches with unmistakable clarity—ends and means cannot be separated—undemocratic means destroy democratic ends. Such means if long continued and widely practiced may bring twilight both to Teachers College and to American democracy.

Two years later Dr. Counts wrote:

The Communist Party, as an instrument of popular advance, must be completely repudiated. My experience convinces me that it poisons everything that it touches. * * * Democracy must stand on its own feet and formulate its own program for dealing with the problems arising out of a world in revolution. (Frontiers of Democracy, May 15, 1941, pp. 231–232.)

Truly, Dr. Counts had lived and learned.

One more reference to the metamorphosis of Dr. Counts:

Following publication of his monograph, "Dare the School Build a New Social Order?" in 1932, a review was published in the Progressive Education magazine—February 1933, page 71 and following pages—written by J. I. Zilberfarb, a member of the State Scientific Council at the Commissariat of Education of the Russian Republic. In a letter accompanying this review, Zilberfarb expressed his pleasure to Dr. Counts at "the remarkable progress which you have made in challenging capitalism." In the review he expressed the belief that Dr. Counts "continues to make great strides ahead" and added the hope that he would come to take "a firm stand on dialectic materialism" which will bring him to "socialism, communism." Clearly he saw in Dr. Counts the makings of a true comrade.

Sixteen years later, the Daily Worker—March 28, 1949—denounced Counts, along with several others, as "a vociferous group of Trotskyites and other anti-Communists." Occasion of this blast was Dr. Counts' uninvited appearance at the Communist-sponsored International Cultural and Scientific Conference in New York City late in March 1949. Dr. Counts had invaded the meeting to challenge Communist delegates to account for the disappearance in Russia of several scholars who had displeased the Stalin regime. And, as a further offense, Dr. Counts was one of the sponsors of a rival mass meeting held at the time of the Communist-sponsored conclave.

Incidentally, one of the invited and warmly applauded speakers at the International Cultural and Scientific Conference was John J. DeBoer, professor of education at the University of Illinois and a former president of the Progressive Education Association. And a cosponsor of the conference was Dr. Theodore Brameld, professor of education of New York University, who served as vice president and board member of the Progressive Education Association at the time Dr. Virgil M. Rogers, of Battle Creek, held the same offices.

Obviously Dr. Counts has gained wisdom with the years, as has many another well-intentioned and overzealous "liberal" who once hailed the Soviet collectivist experiment as the hope of humanity. I have recorded that change of attitude in the interests of complete accuracy and fairness.

This change of attitude, on the part of Dr. Counts, is only incidental, however, to the social reconstruction through the schools movement which he pioneered. That movement, as we shall see, persists to this day. And there likewise persist the collectivist and socialistic premises which characterized that movement from the outset.

V. "CAPITALISM IS DEAD; LONG LIVE COLLECTIVISM"

The fundamental premise of the movement which I am here documenting is stated categorically and with almost monotonous repetition in the literature of that movement.

That premise is that capitalism is doomed—that it is dead, or dying—and that its replacement by some form of collectivism, by some form or degree of planned economy, governmental control or socialization, essentially new and different in character, is both desirable and inevitable.

Whatever later modifications and qualifications of this premise we may encounter, and whatever the euphemisms in which the theories and proposals may later be expressed, they must still be appraised in the light of this original premise. For it was this premise which gave birth to, and still gives vital impulse to, the movement here under discussion.

This premise is stated by Dr. Counts in his original paper delivered before the Baltimore Progressive Education Association meeting:

We live in troublous times; we live in an age of profound change; we live in an age of revolution. (Dare Progressive Education Be Progressive?, Progressive Education magazine, April 1932, p. 261.)

A new world is forming, he asserted, a world in which economic issues will be fundamental and "the center of bitter and prolonged struggle." Citing the evils, abuses and contradictions in the economic situation disclosed by the depression, then at its worst, Dr. Counts ex-

pressed the belief that nonetheless "we hold within our hands the power to usher in an age of plenty, to make secure the lives of all, and to banish poverty forever from the land." But—

The achievement of this goal * * * would seem to require fundamental changes in the economic system. Historic capitalism, with its deification of the principle of selfishness, its reliance upon the forces of competition, its placing of property above human rights, and its exaltation of the profit motive, will either have to be displaced altogether, or so radically changed in form and spirit that its identity will be completely lost (ibid. pp. 261–262).

Dr. Counts makes very clear what this involves. In his own words, it means development of "a coordinated, planned, and socialized economy."

Continuing, Dr. Counts says:

The important point is that fundamental changes in the economic system are imperative. Whatever services historic capitalism may have rendered in the past, and they have been many, its days are numbered. With its deification of the principle of selfishness, its exaltation of the profit motive, its reliance upon the forces of competition, and its placing of property above human rights, it will either have to be displaced altogether or changed so radically in form and spirit that its identity will be completely lost.

* * * The growth of science and technology has carried us into a new age where ignorance must be replaced by knowledge, competition by cooperation, trust in Providence by careful planning, and private capitalism by some form of socialized economy.

* * * The day of individualism in the production and distribution of goods is gone. The fact cannot be overemphasized that choice is no longer between individualism and collectivism. It is rather between two forms of collectivism: the one essentially democratic, the other feudal in spirit; the one devoted to the interests of the people, the other to the interests of a privileged class (ibid. pp. 47–49).

The same basic premise is summarized in "A Call to the Teachers of the Nation," issued in 1933 by the Committee of the Progressive Education Association on Social and Economic Problems, of which Dr. Counts was chairman. This committee had been created as a sequel to Dr. Counts' Baltimore address. Although Dr. Willard W. Beatty, president of the PEA, carefully emphasized in an introductory statement that the report "does not commit either the board of directors of the association or the members of the association to any program or policy embodied in the report," the committee included outstanding leaders in the progressive education movement—Merle Curti, John Gambs, Sidney Hook, Jesse Newlon, Dr. Beatty, Charles Easton, Frederick Redefer, and Goodwin Watson, in addition to Dr. Counts.

The premise of the doom of capitalism and its inevitable replacement by collectivism is stated in the "Call" as follows:

To those who may see a threat to freedom in such a program he addresses these remarks:

That under such an economy the actions of individuals in certain directions would be limited is fairly obvious. No one would be permitted to build a new factory or railroad whenever or wherever he please; also, no one would be permitted to amass great riches by manipulating the economic institutions of the country. On the other hand, by means of the complete and uninterrupted functioning of the economic system the foundations would be laid for a measure of freedom in the realm of personal life that mankind has never known in the past. Freedom without a secure economic base is simply no freedom at all. Thus, in comparison with the right to work and eat, the right to vote is but an empty bauble (ibid., pp. 261–262).

It is noteworthy that in this superficial line of thinking, government prohibition of the freedom to start a legitimate business is classed in the same category as government prohibition of obviously improper speculation and financial manipulation. It is also noteworthy that there is no recognition here that "the right to work and eat" can readily be forfeited with the loss of the "empty bauble"—the right to vote.

In his monograph, "Dare the School Build a New Social Order?" which combined his Baltimore address with two other papers, Dr. Counts is even more explicit in his diagnosis and prescription:

If we accept industrialism, as we must, we are then compelled to face without equivocation the most profound issue which this new order of society has raised and settle that issue in terms of the genius of our people—the issue of the control of the machine.

* * * If the machine is to serve all, and serve all equally, it cannot be the property of the few * * *.

If democracy is to survive, it must seek a new economic foundation. * * * If property rights are to be diffused in industrial society, natural resources and all important forms of capital will have to be collectively owned. Obviously, every citizen cannot hold title to a mine, a factory, a railroad, a department store, or even a thoroughly mechanized farm. This means that, if democracy is to survive in the United States, it must abandon its individualistic affiliations in the sphere of economics (pp. 43–45).

Dr. Counts acknowledges that he does not have all of the details worked out: "What precise form a democratic society will take in the age of science and the machine, we cannot know with any assurance today." On the other hand—

We must * * * insist on two things: First, that technology be released from the fetters and the domination of every type of special privilege; and, second, that the resulting system of production and distribution must be made to serve directly the masses of the people. Within these limits, as I see it, our democratic tradition must of necessity evolve and gradually assume an essentially collectivistic pattern. The only conceivable alternative is the abandonment of the last vestige of democracy and the frank adoption of some modern form of feudalism (ibid. pp. 45–46).

We must decide in whose interests our mighty mechanism for the production and distribution of goods is to be managed. It might be made to serve either the few or the many; it cannot be made to serve both. * * *

Clearly, if democracy is to survive, it must be divorced from its union with the simple agrarian life of the past and be adjusted to the complex industrial society of the present. In the sphere of economic relationships, it must be dissociated from its individualistic connections and be rephrased in terms of the collectivist reality. The old foundations are gone. In the highly integrated social order of the twentieth century individual men cannot own and operate the means of production as they did at the time of the founding of the Nation. As a consequence, the fulfillment of the old ideal requires a reversal of loyalties at certain points. Today the individual can be guaranteed freedom for cultural and spiritual growth only by the abandonment of economic individualism. Liberty of persons is no longer to be attained through freeing business enterprise from restraints but rather through deliberate organization in the name of material security for all. Thus the democratic tradition has come to the end of an era. If its spirit is to live on, its forms must suffer radical change (pp. 16, 17, ibid.).

It is all as simple and neat as that.

This same premise that capitalism is dead, or dying, and that its replacement by some form of collectivism, by some form or degree of Government-planned economy, governmental control or socialization essentially new and different in character, is both inevitable and desirable, underlies the Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commission on Social Studies sponsored by the American Historical Association.

This report, constituting the seventh and last volume of a series of publications by the commission, marked the consummation of commission studies and activities extending from January 1929 to December 1933. As previously mentioned, Dr. Counts served as research director for the commission from August 1, 1931, until the termination of its operations.

The premise of the inevitable replacement of capitalism by collectivism, constituted the "general point of view or frame of reference" of the Conclusions and Recommendations of the commission—page 3. This premise is elaborated as follows:

Under the molding influence of socialized processes of living, drives of technology and science, pressures of changing thought and policy, and disrupting impacts of economic disaster, there is a notable waning of the once widespread popular faith in economic individualism; and leaders in public affairs, supported by a growing mass of the population, are demanding the introduction into economy of ever wider measures of planning and control (p. 16).

The report continues:

Cumulative evidence supports the conclusion that, in the United States as in other countries, the age of individualism and laissez faire in economy and government is closing and that a new age of collectivism is emerging.

The report acknowledges that "as to the specific form which this 'collectivism,' this integration and interdependence, is taking and will take in the future, the evidence at hand is by no means clear or unequivocal. It may involve the limiting or supplanting of private property by public property or it may entail the preservation of private property, extended and distributed among the masses."

The report speculates that—

Most likely, it will issue from a process of experimentation and will represent a composite of historic doctrines and social conceptions yet to appear.

However, the Conclusions and Recommendations are emphatic as to the "inevitability" of expanding government

and expanding exercise of governmental compulsion:

Almost certainly it will involve a larger measure of compulsory as well as voluntary cooperation of citizens in the conduct of the complex national economy, a corresponding enlargement of the functions of government, and an increasing state intervention in fundamental branches of economy previously left to individual discretion and initiative—a state intervention that in some instances may be direct and mandatory and in others indirect and facilitative. In any event the Commission is convinced by its interpretation of available empirical data that the actually integrating economy of the present day is the forerunner of a consciously integrated society in which individual property rights will be altered and abridged (pp. 16–17).

The Commission emphasizes the viewpoint that "the emerging age is particularly an age of transition." Elaborating this point, it adds:

It is marked by numerous and severe tensions arising out of the conflict between the actual trend toward integrated economy and society, on the one side, and the traditional practices, dispositions, ideas, and institutional arrangements inherited from the passing age of individualism, on the other. In all the recommendations that follow the transitional character of the present epoch is recognized (pp. 17–18).

The Commission succinctly capsules its fundamental premise in the proposition that collectivism is "the future already coming into reality"—page 37.

Essentially this same premise found significant expression in the report of the Committee on Education for the New America of the Department of Superintendence of the NEA—now the American Association of School Administrators. This report was presented at the seventy-second annual meeting of the NEA, June 30–July 6, 1934, in Washington, D. C., by Dr. Willard E. Givens, then superintendent of schools of Oakland, Calif., and for many years since executive secretary of the NEA.

The pertinent statement was as follows:

A dying laissez-faire must be completely destroyed and all of us, including the "owners," must be subjected to a large degree of social control. (NEA Proceedings, 1934, pp. 647–655.)

Even more significant, in reflecting the definite Socialist trend of thinking in the group which drafted the report, is the following excerpt:

A large section of our discussion group, accepting the conclusions of distinguished students, maintain that in our fragile, interdependent society the credit agencies, the basic industries and utilities cannot be centrally planned and operated under private ownership. Hence, they will join in creating a swift Nation-wide campaign of adult education which will support President Roosevelt in taking these over and operating them at full capacity as a unified national system in the interest of the people (ibid p. 647).

This statement on the thinking of the group raises a question as to the consistency—if not the sincerity—of a subsequent declaration in the report that education will give the individual "a new appreciation of ownership of property" and that under the envisioned new order "the employer will be permitted to make a fair profit on his investment"—pages 647–9.

Further interesting evidence of this preoccupation of a representative segment of NEA membership, or leadership, with the possibility and desirability of achieving socialism is provided by the unusual action of the NEA at its 1933 meeting in Chicago. I refer to the following resolution, adopted by the delegates:

The officers of the NEA are requested to provide, through its journal and otherwise, reliable, authentic information for the use of its members concerning publicly owned, publicly controlled, and publicly operated gas, electric light, and power plants, especially as to the following items: (1) Name of municipality; (2) population; (3) rates of service; (4) net earnings to the municipality; (5) a similar showing concerning comparable privately owned and privately operated utility companies. (NEA Proceedings, 1933, p. 222.)

Incidentally, this resolution was published in the November 1933 NEA Journal—page 213—below an article on "How Public Ownership Reduces Rates," by Carl D. Thompson, secretary of the Public Ownership League. This article, advancing arguments for municipal and public ownership of utilities, was accompanied by suggestions for classroom activities in connection with this broad subject.

A major vehicle for expression and elaboration of the basic premise that capitalism must bow out in favor of collectivism was provided in the decade from 1934 to 1944 by the educational journal, the Social Frontier and its successor, Frontiers of Democracy. These publications were launched specifically to promote the movement under discussion here. The former publication, edited by Dr. Counts, with Dr. William H. Kilpatrick as board chairman, numbered among its directors more than 60 leading American educators. I cite a number of typical expressions of this basic premise from the editorial columns of these publications, as well as from articles which appeared in these and other educational journals and books.

The lead editorial in the initial issue—October 1934—of the Social Frontier, which bore the title "Orientation," stated the basic premise which the journal was designed to promote:

For the American people the age of individualism in economy is closing and an age of collectivism is opening. Here is the central and dominating reality in the present epoch. * * *

* * * (The Social Frontier) represents a point of view, it has a frame of reference, it stands on a particular interpretation of American history. It accepts the analysis of the current epoch presented above and outlined in greater detail in Conclusions and Recommendations, Report on the Social Studies of the Commission of the American Historical Association.

The Social Frontier assumes that the age of individualism in economy is closing and that an age marked by a close integration of social life and by collective planning and control is opening. For weal or woe it accepts as irrevocable this deliverance of the historical process (pp. 3–4).

In the next issue—November 1934—the Social Frontier editorially elaborated its acceptance of collectivism as an inevitability:

The Social Frontier is not engaged in any battle for collectivism as such. That issue has been decided by the forces of history. As Prof. Walton Hamilton says in the last paragraph of a brilliant article in the Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, the "Commitment to collectivism is beyond recall." * * *

* * * Accepting the rise of a collectivist order as irrevocable, it (the Social Frontier) refuses to adopt a fatalistic attitude toward the question of the form which collectivism is to take in the United States. * * *

The most crucial and fundamental of the choices which the American people will be called upon to make, which they are being called upon to make, has to do with controlling purposes and interests. * * * The Social Frontier will throw all the strength it possesses on the side of those forces which are striving to fashion a form of collectivism that will make paramount the interests of the overwhelming majority of the population (pp. 3–4).

Despite this professed dismissal of concern over "the question of the form which collectivism is to take in the United States," the publication indicated the alternative to capitalism in fairly definite terms in an editorial in the April 1935 issue:

Loudest in the chorus of praise for freedom and imprecation for collectivism are the grateful beneficiaries of our inherited economic institutions. To them freedom is God and collectivism is Satan.

That the propagandas of profit-motivated reactionaries and the notions of honest but deluded liberals have gained a hold on the popular mind is due in no small measure to the failure of those committed to a collectivist social order to set up effective counter propaganda and to disseminate true notions of liberalism. * * * The mistaken notion that democracy and freedom are identical with the institutions of property and profit should not be allowed to go unchallenged. On the contrary, teachers and laymen should make clear by all means at their disposal that a collectivist social order is not only necessary in a world of large scale production, corporate control, and human interdependence, but also that under these circumstances only social ownership and democratic control of the means of production can secure a free and democratic life (p. 9.)

In still another editorial in this same issue—April 1935—the Social Frontier pronounced this judgment of absolute doom upon capitalism:

The end of free business enterprise as a principle of economic and social organization adequate to this country is at hand (p. 8).

Nor did this publication, in the editorial development of its premise of the inevitability of collectivism, blink at the prospect that it must involve increasing regimentation. Quite the contrary. In an attack on a view expressed by former President Hoover, a June 1935 editorial insisted that there is "good" as well as "bad" regimentation:

With respect to Mr. Hoover's assumption that regimentation must inevitably lead to the conversion of this fair land into a zoo, it is legitimate to ask: What alternative have we? * * * The only other choice is the wilderness where the lions prey upon the lambs.

And finally, is economic regimentation really evil? Must it necessarily result in the dehumanization of man? No general answer to these questions is possible. It all depends on who does the regimenting and the purpose the process is intended to serve. If regimentation is imposed by the few people at present in power, for the purpose of maintaining that power, it is evil because dehumanizing. The end products then are material, cultural, and spiritual poverty for the vast masses of people. But if regimentation is the consequence of the human urges of the millions who seek a life of work, dignity, security, and material and cultural plenty, it is humanizing and consequently good. Such regimentation is no regimentation at all; it is rather humanization, liberalization, and socialization (pp. 5–6).

The same basic premise of the necessary and inevitable replacement of capitalism with collectivism provided a major theme for many of the contributors to the magazine, Progressive Education, in the early 1930's, and for contributors to the Social Frontier and Frontiers of Democracy in the decade during which those journals were successively published. A few typical citations will suffice to illustrate the point.

Writing under the title, "Teachers Must Be Leaders," in Progressive Education, October 1932—pages 410–413—Jesse H. Newlon, director of the Lincoln school, said:

To effect a more equitable distribution of the national income, a curb must be put upon the operation of the profit motive. The making of profits can no longer be regarded as the chief aim of production. Production must be primarily for use. Integration and planned control of the agencies of production and distribution are inescapable in production primarily for use. They can be achieved only through organs of economic planning that can exercise wise control over credit and over many basic industrial and agricultural operations. To accomplish these ends will necessitate fundamental modifications of our forms and processes of government, both national and local, in order to adapt them to contemporary needs.

In an address before the Sixth World Fellowship of the New Education Fellowship—the international organization of the Progressive Education movement—at Nice, France, in 1932, Dr. Harold Rugg, professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University, declared:

The world is on fire, and the youth of the world must be equipped to combat the conflagration. Nothing less than thoroughgoing social reconstruction is demanded. (Progressive Education, December 1932–January 1933, pp. 11–18.)

About a year later, Dr. Rugg wrote:

We know now beyond cavil that sufficient physical and human resources exist on the North American Continent to give every man, woman, and child a standard of life several times higher than the minimum of 1929. But we know also that to do so a vast degree of socialization in the central control and operation of the entire continental system of production and distribution must be instituted now. * * *

* * * Advocates of the democratic method who are troubled by the image of a destroyed Bill of Rights evoked by the Fascist specter * * * are desperately striving for a program of socialization of the production-distribution system which will be carried out with the "consent" of the people. (Progressive Education, January–February 1933, pp. 3–5; the Educator and the Scientific Study of Society.)

Granville Hicks, at the time assistant professor of English at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and later a member of the editorial board of The Masses, writing in the January-February 1934, Progressive Education—pages 49–54—on "The Social Interpretation of Literature," tersely stated the premise we are documenting here:

Today the majority of those authors who make any attempt to portray contemporary life frankly admit that the capitalist system is doomed.

Hicks was an exponent of the view that "Marxism must be the basis for the analysis of literature as a social phenomenon," as opposed to "the conventional methods of teaching English, which give the student a cultural polish without challenging any of his convictions, without raising any serious questions about the existing order."

The Roosevelt New Deal provided exponents of the collectivist premise with the opportunity—which they fully capitalized on—to emphasize the fact that they were talking about something more sweeping than palliative reforms of capitalism. Their praise of Roosevelt's program was always qualified by a reminder of that fact.

Thus, a statement drafted by Willard W. Beatty, president of the Progressive Education Association, and published in the October 1933, Progressive Education, page 304, said:

Despite the tremendous efforts which the [Roosevelt] administration has put forth in the short period since it took over the reins of Government, we have made no more than the most preliminary steps along a new pathway.

Norman Woelfel, subsequently managing editor of the Social Frontier and even later professor of education at Ohio State University, wrote an article, "The Educator, the New Deal, and Revolution," in the January–February 1934, Progressive Education, in which he insisted that the then current phrase, "the Roosevelt revolution" was a misnomer. The Roosevelt program, he wrote, deserved the educators' support only because it left open "the path to a more revolutionary future." He urged educators to provide "stimulus to further leftward responses on the part of the administration," but made clear that "what really has happened is, of course, far from being a revolution" since "the traditional pattern of administering the industrial resources of the Nation by private business in the interest of money profit remains the same."

Dr. Woelfel then defined his conception and goal of revolution by asserting that it:

Implies that there be no unnecessary delay in making completely public the ownership and control of the natural resources and the industrial structure of the Nation (pp. 107–112).

And he added bluntly that in the achievement of this purpose "we must not blindly shrink from the fact that it may require some use of force against those at present privileged."

The same reminder that the Roosevelt program fell far short of the premise and goal of collectivist reconstruction was given by Dr. Henry Pratt Fairchild writing in the October 1934, Social Frontier:

The old economic structure is a house built upon the sands, and the President, instead of doing anything to install a firm foundation or to move the house over to bedrock, contents himself with putting in a new beam here, shoring up a wall there, and spreading whitewash liberally wherever he can find an exposed surface.

This is the tragedy of the New Deal. * * *

There are many, even in capital-minded America * * * who will not be satisfied with a New Deal—they want a new deck (pp. 15–18, A Sociologist Views the New Deal).

Broadus Mitchell, associate professor of economics at Johns Hopkins University, writing in the April 1936 Social Frontier criticized the "apologists of capitalism" who talk of correcting the shortcomings of the economic order "within the framework of the present system." And he pointed to a small group of American economists "but rapidly growing, which finds the only practicable exit in the common ownership of the social means of production and in their operation for use rather than for profit"—pages 215–217.

One of the popular, euphemistic phrases used by many of these educators to define the desired collectivism was "social design"—a polite term for governmental control or ownership. Thus, Dr. Theodore Brameld, professor of education at New York University, wrote in Frontiers of Democracy—January 15, 1940, pages 111–112, 126–127:

We need today a design for tomorrow. We need an American design which encompasses and unifies the partial, contradictory, often destructive plans of our traditional economy. We need a design where nature's goods at last are consciously, collectively controlled by the majority of our people.

And a few months earlier, Dr. Harold Rugg, professor of education at Columbia Teachers' College wrote—Frontiers of Democracy, October 15, 1939, pages 9–11:

A large-scale, sustained-yield economy can be operated here if a practicable social design and an efficient and socially acceptable scheme of control can be provided. Both seem to me to be called for; the design must be comprehensive enough to cross any boundaries, either of States or personally owned properties that interfere with the efficient and humane operation of the social system. The central control to administer it must be created by the people themselves.

And Dr. Rugg adds, "that, it seems to me, is what we must teach." Regarding that latter assertion, I will have more to say later.

Again, permit me to point out, the advocates of collectivism did not dodge the fact that a planned economy means a controlled economy and a controlled economy means governmental regimentation. Thus Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes wrote in Frontiers of Democracy, January 15, 1940, under the title "Should Social Change Be Consciously Directed?"—pages 106–110:

The only way to plan is to plan. It is impossible to graft a planned economy on

to a competitive economic order and still hope to preserve the latter. Planning is compatible only with a considerable amount of collectivism and economic regimentation.

Friends of planned social change might as well recognize this fact and either withdraw from the movement or be prepared for the regimentation of economic life and the restriction of complete intellectual freedom which effective planning must entail. On the other hand, there is no reason for believing that effective planning must involve so ruthless a type of mental and social regimentation as the Soviet Union and the Fascist states have instituted. But it is equally certain that Stalin and Coolidge will not mix. We cannot have social planning without paying a price therefor in terms of some curtailment of pioneer individualism and freedom. Let those who count the price too high reflect that the alternative is chaos and misery which would make the bank holiday of early March 1933, seem a beatific idyll by comparison.

These views also found expression outside of the journals I have been quoting.

Dr. John Dewey, patron saint of progressive education, wrote in his "Liberalism and Social Action," page 90:

Earlier liberalism regarded the separate and competing economic action of individuals as the means to social well-being as the end. We must reverse the perspective and see that socialized economy is the means of free and individual development as the end.

Stuart Chase, in his address before the Department of Superintendence of the NEA at its Atlantic City meeting, February 25, 1935—NEA Journal, April 1935, pages 107–110—said:

If we have even a trace of realism in our natures, we must be prepared to see an increasing amount of collectivism, Government interference, centralization of economic control, social planning. Here again, the relevant question is not how to get rid of Government interference, but how to apply it for the greatest good of the greatest number.

Writing in the thirteenth yearbook of the Department of Superintendence of the NEA—1935—Dr. John L. Childs, professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia, said:

Democracy is supposed to denote a society in which control is by and for the people. Under present industrial conditions democratic control can be made a reality only by the collective ownership of those industries whose coordinated administration is essential to the success of a planned economy (p. 133).

* * * Enough data are now available * * * to show the general direction in which we must go. Industrialism points to national social planning. Our national ideal of social democracy requires that this planning be under collective control. Collective control cannot be made a reality in a regime of private ownership of the basic industries. Undoubtedly we can learn much from the experience of other countries, particularly Russia, but we also have our own unique conditions, resources, and ideals, and it would be disastrous for us to import wholesale the social methods of Communist Russia. Until we have seriously undertaken the task of inventing economic and political institutions which will make effectual social planning possible in our country and which will also seek to promote a career for individual initiative, we need not prematurely assume that collective planning and dictatorial bureaucratic regimentation of social life are necessary correlatives (pp. 137–133).

The citations could be endless. But nothing could more graphically sum up this commitment to the premise that capitalism must inevitably be replaced by collectivism than these concluding lines from a report on an educators' tour of Russia, written by Dr. Goodwin Watson, professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia, and a member of the Social Frontier board of directors—the Social Frontier, February 1937, page 143:

For each of us there were sights we approved and others we disapproved, but how about the balance of judgment on the new civilization as a whole? One became skeptical and remained rather unfavorable toward Soviet life. A half dozen who came prepared to find a bad situation had been transferred into warm admirers of the Communist scene. None who came with high expectations has been disappointed. The sum total would be more than 95 percent favorably influenced by this brief study. We had not always been comfortable, but we had been aware of a society directed toward the sustenance of major human values.

One question lingered in our minds. Anna Louise Strong had stated it for us. "I wish I knew," she said, "whether it will take longer for the Russians to develop efficiency or for America to develop socialism. Then I'd know where I want to live."

VI. UTOPIA VIA THE SCHOOLHOUSE

The educational movement here being described involves not only a summons to a belief but a summons to action—action on the part of teachers and school administrators, in and through the public schools, in behalf of that belief.

Therein lies the enormous and ominous significance of that movement. And therein lies the importance and relevancy of the premise documented in the preceding section.

There can be no question as to the right of a public school teacher to accept and, as an American citizen, to promote outside the classroom the premise that capitalism will or should be replaced by collectivism. That, incidentally, is not saying that a member of the Communist party should be permitted to teach in the public schools. The National Education Association and I are in perfect agreement on the proposition that Communist party membership disqualifies a person from teaching in the public schools of the United States.

The teacher's right of personal belief and advocacy, stated above, is one thing. It is something else, however, to propose that the teachers become the active agents for the promotion of collectivism as a part of their activities in the classroom, before the involuntary audience of pupils. It is something else, too, to propose that public education become the agency and medium for accomplishing that purpose.

Yet this is precisely the program of action advocated by the movement and activities here being documented. It is a proposal that, in the phrase I have already quoted from Dr. Kilpatrick, "the school take an active part in helping to build the new social order."

We will, in documenting this proposed course of action, encounter a variety of terms to describe the classroom process involved in this program. The blunt word, "propagandize" is sometimes used—though rarely. "Indoctrination" is another of the more forthright terms used—and the question of just what constitutes indoctrination becomes a subject of hair-splitting controversy among the educators. There are more euphemistic terms. Those who are hesitant to advocate outright classroom indoctrination in behalf of the collectivist goal, still accept collectivism as the "frame of reference" and basic "orientation" of the new education. The "democratic vision" of the possibilities of the new order are to be presented to the pupil, and his loyalties enlisted in its behalf. The objective is defined as that of attaining "uncoerced persuasion."

By whatever name it is called, the basic premise remains the same—the schools are actively to participate in building "the new social order" or in preparing and conditioning the child for participation in that order.

And that means, of course, that the educational system, its procedures and curriculum, are themselves to be reconstructed and revised to the extent necessary to carry out this program of action. But let the advocates and spokesmen of utopia-via-the-schoolhouse say it in their own words.

The whole point and purpose of Dr. Counts' original address at the Baltimore meeting, of his subsequent monograph, and of the "Call to the Teachers" which he inspired was, of course, that the teachers and the schools were to do something about it. The premise is implicit in the challenging title of the monograph, "Dare the School Build a New Social Order?" The Call to the Teachers was not alone a call to belief, but to action as well.

In the Baltimore speech, Dr. Counts elaborated the achievement of the progressive education movement since its inception in 1921. Impressive though these achievements were, he held that there was something still lacking. "There is no good individual apart from some conception of the nature of the good society," he argued. Likewise, "there is no good education apart from some conception of the nature of the good society." What progressive education lacks is a "theory of social welfare." The corrective?

If progressive education is to be genuinely progressive, it must emancipate itself from the influence (of the upper middle class), face squarely and courageously every social issue, come to grips with life in all of its stark reality, establish a theory of social welfare, fashion a compelling and challenging vision of human destiny, and become somewhat less frightened than it is today at the bogeys of imposition and indoctrination. (Progressive Education, April 1932, p. 257.)

The "challenging vision of human destiny," as we have already abundantly documented of course is collectivism.

Changes in our economic system will—

Dr. Counts declared—

of course, require changes in our ideals.

And the role of the school must be an active one in promoting these changes:

When I say that progressive education should face all of these questions I do not mean merely that provision should be made in our progressive schools for children to

study the problems of economics, government, and so on. This much, of course, should be done. But unless the progressive education movement wishes to change its name to the contemplative education movement, the goodwill education movement, or the hopeful education movement, it should go much further. To my mind, a movement honestly styling itself progressive should engage in the positive task of creating a new tradition in American life, a tradition possessing power, appeal, and direction.

But, you will say, is this not leading us out upon very dangerous ground? Is it not taking us rather far from the familiar landmarks bounding the fields that teachers are wont to cultivate? My answer is, of course, in the affirmative. * * * If we are content to remain where all is safe and quiet and serene, we shall dedicate ourselves, as teachers have commonly done in the past, to a role of relatively complete futility, if not of positive social reaction. Neutrality with respect to the great issues that agitate society, while perhaps theoretically possible, is practically tantamount to giving support to the most powerful forces engaged in the contest (ibid. pp. 262–3).

That the role which Dr. Counts envisioned for the school involved active promotion in the schoolroom in behalf of "a coordinated, planned, and socialized economy" is clearly indicated in his further statement:

You will also say, no doubt, that I am flirting with the idea of indoctrination. And my answer is again in the affirmative, or, at least, I should say that the word does not frighten me. We may all rest assured that the younger generation in any society will be thoroughly imposed upon by its elders and by the culture into which it is born. For the school to work in a somewhat different direction with all the power at its disposal could do no great harm. At the most, unless the superiority of its outlook is unquestioned, it can but serve as a counterpoise to check and challenge the power of less enlightened or more selfish purposes (pp. 262–263).

In his monograph, "Dare the School Build a New Social Order?" after describing the potential benefits of collectivism, Dr. Counts wrote:

Such a vision of what America might become in the industrial age, I would introduce into our schools as the supreme imposition, but one to which our children are entitled—a priceless legacy which it should be the first concern of our profession to fashion and bequeath. The objection will, of course, be raised that this is asking teachers to assume unprecedented social responsibilities. But we live in difficult and dangerous times—times when precedents lose their significance (pp. 53–54).

And he repeats the view expressed in his earlier paper:

If the schools are to be really effective, they must become centers for the building, and not merely the contemplation of our civilization. This does not mean that we should endeavor to promote particular reforms through the educational system. We should, however, give to our children a vision of the possibilities which lie ahead and endeavor to enlist their loyalties and enthusiasms in the realization of the vision. Also, our social institutions and practices, all of them, should be critically examined in the light of such a vision (pp. 36–37).

Then comes this bold counsel, regarding which we will have more to say later:

That the teachers should deliberately reach for power and then make the most of their conquest is my firm conviction. To the extent that they are permitted to fashion the curriculum and procedures of the school they will definitely and positively influence the social attitudes, ideals, and behavior of the coming generation. * * * It is my observation that the men and women who have affected the course of human events are those who have not hesitated to use the power that has come to them (pp. 27–30).

The "Call to the Teachers" is a call to participate "actively in the task of reconstituting the democratic tradition and of thus working positively toward a new society"—page 19. They "must work boldly and without ceasing for a better social order."

That what is demanded is a complete revision of the teacher's role both in society and in the schools is made crystal clear by the following injunction, one which should do more to provoke curiosity as to what's going on in the schools than all of the criticisms of lay groups or individuals:

If the teachers are to play a positive and creative role in building a better social order, indeed if they are not to march in the ranks of economic, political, and cultural reaction, they will have to emancipate themselves completely from the domination of the business interests of the Nation, cease cultivating the manners and associations of bankers and promotion agents, repudiate utterly the ideal of material success as the goal of education, abandon the smug middle-class tradition on which they have been nourished in the past, acquire a realistic understanding of the forces that actually rule the world, and formulate a fundamental program of thought and action that will deal honestly and intelligently with the problems of industrial civilization. They will have to restate their philosophy of education, reorganize the procedures of the school, and redefine their own position in society. Such measures will of course require fundamental changes in the methods of teacher training and the assumption on the part of the profession of an increasing burden of cultural leadership (pp. 20–22).

The reference to changes in methods of teacher training should particularly be noted. It is a reminder of the basic importance of the teacher training institutions to the entire educational program. And, by the same token, it reinforces a basic premise of this documentation, namely, that the extent of the permeation of collectivist philosophy into teacher colleges in an important index—the most important index—to the extent of the permeation of that philosophy into the public-school classroom.

That what Dr. Counts envisioned is also a complete revision of the philosophy and role of the school in society is made equally clear by the following:

In the collectivist society now emerging the school should be regarded, not as an agency for lifting gifted individuals out of the class into which they were born and of elevating them into favored positions where they may exploit their less-favored fellows, but rather as an agency for the abolition of all artificial social distinctions and of organizing the energies of the Nation for the promotion of the general welfare. This, of course, does not mean that the individual should not be encouraged to succeed. It means instead that he should be given a new measure of success.

Throughout the school program the development of the social rather than the egotistic impulses should be stressed; and the motive of personal aggrandizement should be subordinated to social ends. In promotion practices, in school activities, in the relations of pupils and teachers and administrators, the ideal of a cooperative commonwealth should prevail, due allowance being made for the requirements of special knowledge and the discharge of social responsibility. * * * All of this applies quite as strictly to the nursery, the kindergarten, and the elementary school as to the secondary school, the college, and the university (pp. 20–22).

Plainly this is a blueprint for converting the schools—from nursery through high school, and upward to college and university—into agencies for promoting the collectivist social order and developing a generation acquiescent to that social order.

The opening wedge for such a program was provided in the Conclusions and Recommendations of the American Historical Association's Commission on Social Studies.

The point of entry is clearly defined and adroitly chosen. The commission proposed consolidation of the traditional high-school subjects of geography, economics, cultural sociology, political science or civics, and history, in a single educational category to be designated the "social sciences."

It is obvious that this is the most strategic of all teaching areas so far as advancement of collectivist philosophy is concerned. Success in enlisting the teachers in this field in the cause of the "new social order" would have an effect and influence out of all proportion to the relative number of teachers involved.

The commission's Conclusions and Recommendations were addressed particularly to this area of education, and evidence of the purpose to exploit this newly designated educational field is found in the following recommendation:

The commission * * * deems desirable * * * the incorporation into the materials of social science instruction in the schools of the best plans and ideals of the future of society and of the individual (p. 27).

This particular paragraph brought a tart rejoinder from one "unreconstructed rebel" on the commission. Isaiah Bowman, who appended a minority report to the commission's recommendations, asked simply, "Who is to know the best?" No answer was forthcoming. But the answer is clearly implied in the document—the educators, of course, are the ones who will "know the best."

Bearing in mind the commission's conclusion that collectivism "is the future already coming into reality," the following recommendations clearly indicate the sweeping reconstruction of the schools and the education program proposed to serve this "future":

Organized public education in the United States, much more than ever before, is now compelled, if it is to fulfill its social obligation, to adjust its objectives, its curriculum, its methods of instruction, and its administrative procedure to the requirements of the emerging integrated order. * * * It must recognize the new order and proceed to equip the rising generation to cooperate effectively in the increasingly interdependent society and to live rationally and well within its limitations and possibilites (pp. 35–36).

By way of conditioning the child for this new order, "in the organization of the life of the school and the conduct of instruction, emphasis will be placed on the development of the social and creative rather than the acquisitive impulses"—page 40.

Furthermore, "the competent teacher, sensitive to the implications of the democratic ideal and conscious of the growing interdependence of social life, will appeal as little as possible to those motives which tend to exacerbate the struggle between individuals and will encourage the fullest development of the social and creative impulses"—page 81.

The import of these recommendations was accurately summed up by the late Professor Harold J. Laski, philosopher of British socialism, in an article in The New Republic, July 29, 1936:

At bottom, and stripped of its carefully neutral phrases, the report is an educational program for a Socialist America (pp. 342–345).

Mr. Laski further commented that the report calls for "education for a life socially controlled," and for "a teaching that definitely emphasizes the implications of a new social orientation." More later about Mr. Laski's estimate of this report.

The educational literature produced by the disciples and sponsors of this program is filled with plans for reshaping education for this new task of social reconstruction.

Dr. Harold Rugg, in his address before the New Education Fellowship in Nice, France, in 1932, said:

Before the school can be used as an agent for social regeneration, it must undergo thorough reconstruction.

How is the problem to be attacked? The first step is the building of a new program of work, a new content for the curriculum, directly out of the problems, issues and characteristics of our changing society. (Progressive Education, December 1932–January 1933, pp. 11–18.)

Among "the basic concepts that should constitute the guiding skeleton of our new educational program," according to Dr. Rugg, is the alleged "need for change in political, economic, and social government" and "the utter lack of economic government in the modern world."

Therefore:

Our new materials of instruction shall illustrate fearlessly and dramatically the inevitable consequence of the lack of planning and of central control over the production and distribution of physical things.

The large-scale undertaking assigned to the schools in promoting the new social order is made clear in this further comment by Dr. Rugg:

Thus through the schools of the world, we shall disseminate a new conception of Government—one that will embrace all of the collective activities of men; that will postulate the need for scientific control and operation of economic activities in the interests of all of the people. Political government in a new connotation, then, including economic government and social government.

Dr. Willard W. Beatty, president of the Progressive Education Association, writing in 1933, asserted that the educator "who would contribute materially to social planning" must "be prepared to undertake the instruction of children for their share in the new order"—Progressive Education, October 1933, page 304.

Dr. Norman Woelfel, in the January-February 1934 Progressive Education, argues that "educators are inevitably propagandists for one kind of social order or another."

Woelfel holds that with "our thin crust of culture breaking before our eyes" the educators' "ancient tactics of care and tact and impartiality are, of course, basically futile today." Neutrality is out:

If we wish to mutter longer the old rhetoric about democracy, as we pursue under capitalism our almost secret routine in the schools, that is a possible choice also, but there can be no assurance that it will long remain a possible alternative. If we will, as teachers, individually and then collectively, make this fundamental choice between clearly distinct social ideals, further procedures will be envisioned more clearly (pp. 107–112).

But the real danger before educators, as Dr. Woelfel sees it, is "this mental attitude which makes a supreme virtue out of listening to both sides forever and forever without ever making a decision." Obviously mere teaching about socialism is not enough for him.

This same premise that the purpose of teaching is not merely to present alternatives but actively to propagandize in behalf of a definite course of action is stated in a Social Frontier editorial on "The Ives Law"—October 1934, page 9:

They (the teachers) should proceed to a consideration of the changes in its (the Constitution's) provisions which the rise of industrial civilization is making desirable or necessary. And in doing all this, they should endeavor to carry their pupils with them.

Dr. John Dewey, while exceedingly dextrous in the manipulation of words, makes it equally clear that the premise of a collectivist social order calls for action in its behalf in the classroom. Because of his immense influence in modern education, I quote Dr. Dewey's statement at some length—"Can Education Share in Social Reconstruction?"—Social Frontier, October 1934, pages 11–12:

I do not think * * * that the schools can in any literal sense be the builders of a new social order. But the schools will surely as a matter of fact and not of ideal, share in the building of the social order of the future according as they ally themselves with this or that movement of existing social forces. This fact is inevitable. The schools of America have furthered the present social drift and chaos by their emphasis upon an economic form of success which is intrinsically pecuniary and egoistic. They will of necessity, and again not as a matter of theory, take an active part in determining the social order—or disorder—of the future, according as teachers and administrators align themselves with the older so-called "individualistic" ideals—which in fact are fatal to individuality for the many—or with the newer forces making for social control of economic forces. The plea that teachers must passively accommodate themselves to existing conditions is but one way—and a cowardly way—of making a choice in favor of the old and chaotic.

If the teacher's choice is to throw himself in with the forces and conditions that are making for change in the direction of social control of capitalism—economic and political—there will hardly be a moment of the day when he will not have the opportunity to make his choice good in action. If the choice is conscious and intelligent, he will find that it affects the details of school administration and discipline, of methods of teaching, of selection and emphasis of subject-matter. * * * The task is to translate the desired ideal over into the conduct of the detail of the school in administration, instruction and subject matter. Here, it seems to me, is the great present need and responsibility of those who think the schools should consciously be partners in the construction of a changed society. The challenge to teachers must be issued and in clear tones. But the challenge is merely a beginning. What does it mean in the particulars of work in the school and on the playground? An answer to this question and not more general commitment to social theory and slogans is the pressing demand.

An editorial in the April 1935 Social Frontier rebukes the magazine, the Nation, for criticizing a statement attributed to Dr. Jesse H. Newlon to the effect that "teachers are today justified in assuming a partisan position upon basic social and economic issues and in preaching the apparent truth of an impending collectivism." The critical view taken by the Nation, the editorial asserts, amounts to saying that "educational leaders are stepping over the proper bounds when they advise that teachers should build in youth attitudes more vital than that expressed in the platitudinous affirmation, 'there is much to be said on both sides' "—page 7. In the same issue, the Social Frontier calls upon teachers "to make clear by all means at their disposal that only social ownership and democratic control of the means of production can secure a free and democratic life." And it urges "effective counter propaganda" against the "propagandas of profit-motivated reactionaries"—page 9.

The same view that "education cannot be neutral" was expressed by Dr. Newlon during a panel discussion before the Department of Superintendence—NEA—meeting February 26, 1935. Dr. Newlon, professor of education and director of Lincoln School, Teachers College, Columbia, insisted that "the school will be employed either to support the existing order or to build a better social order"—NEA Proceedings, 1935, pages 540–541.

Dr. Harold Rugg, writing in the Social Frontier of October 1936, emphasizes that "a necessary first step in educational reconstruction lies in the remaking of the curriculum"—pages 12–15. Teachers should be brought into contact with new ideas in order to change their "understanding, outlook and method." The importance of such a change is made clear: "To change the outlook and procedure of teachers is to change the very lives of the children in their care."

An extreme example of the proposed changes in curriculum and instructional material is provided by the comment of James M. Shields, former supervising principal of elementary schools at Winston-Salem, N. C.—Social Frontier, June 1936, pages 281–284:

It fairly staggers one to consider the tremendous task ahead in revision of our existing instructional literature if it is to be of any use at all in a collectivist society.

Hardly a public school textbook now in use but is saturated with the profit psychology. Arithmetics are permeated with profit and loss, gain, "making" money. One would hunt in vain through their pages for any incentive to economic cooperation. Even geographies are replete with production for gain. And as for histories. No wonder the Russians started from scratch in creating an entire new educational literature under the Soviet system. Almost we may have to discover America anew.

The question of whether, and to what extent, "indoctrination" in behalf of the new collectivist social order is permissible, become a much debated issue in educational circles. It is not necessary to go into the technical details of this controversy. In many instances the views expressed by the same educators are self-contradictory. Dr. Rugg, for example, wrote—October 1936, Social Frontier, pages 12–15—that he did not advocate "the construction of any theoretical social order and its 'teaching' in the schools." Yet in the October 1939, Frontiers of Democracy, he insisted upon the necessity of a "scheme of central control" and added, "that is what we must teach"—pages 9–11.

Dr. Dewey similarly expressed disapproval of "undemocratic inculcation of ready-made conclusions" in the classroom, but added:

If teachers who hold that there is an intrinsic relationship between actualization of democracy and social planning of economic institutions and relations, hope to bring others to the same conclusions by use of the method of investigation and free cooperative discussion, I see nothing undemocratic in the procedure. It looks to me like an educational procedure and (one) * * * that teachers who have been led to accept the conclusion might then use with their own students. (Social Frontier, December 1938, pp. 71–72.)

Whatever the euphemisms employed to soothe suspicions, the basic fact remains that the program here being described contemplates activity in the classroom designed to propagandize for collectivism and designed to condition the child for a collectivist social order.

Dr. Boyd H. Bode, professor of education at Ohio State University, a sharp critic of this program, accurately described its propagandist character in a debate with Dr. John L. Childs in the columns of the Social Frontier:

Under the impetus of indignation * * * he (Dr. Childs) shows a disposition to identify democracy with a campaign for a specific scheme of ownership and distribution. Hand in hand with this goes a bold demand for "inculcation" and for a crusade to win adherents (November 1938, pp. 38–40).

Dr. Harry D. Gideonse—Social Frontier, January 1935, pages 15–18—rebuked the proposed program even more sharply with this prophetic warning:

The peril of it all might well be that history (or social studies) under such a definition is likely to become a controversial subject comparable to religion and unsuitable for instruction in the schools for the same reason. Whatever propagandists may call such new "education," it smells like propaganda—and a viciously untruthful sort—under any other name. We might leave these things to the American equivalents of Moscow and of Dr. Goebbels. A free school should have no truck with it.

The length to which this action program in support of the collectivist society is carried is indicated by the assertion of Dr. Jesse H. Newlon—Frontiers of Democracy, April 15, 1941, pages 208–11—that "the so-called child-centered school goes into the ashcan." The school, Dr. Newlon held, must become "society centered." It was statements of this type which prompted John L. Tildsley, associate superintendent of the New York City schools, to question indignantly whether a person holding such educational views "has a moral right to enroll himself as a teacher of children or as a teacher of teachers-of-children"—Social Frontier, IV, pages 319–322. And Dr. Tildsley angrily charged that the leaders of this movement "lose sight of the child as the center of the educative process and are not concerned with his growth, save in one direction, namely, his growth into an accelerator of a democratic collectivist social order. They view the child as collectivist-futter—fodder—to be utilized without regard to the effect on him of the collectivist-society-making process."

VII. CLASS WAR IN THE CLASSROOM

Should the public school classroom become a battleground of the class war?

Should American teachers join in that war?

It is a shocking thing that such questions should even be asked in the United States.

It is vastly more shocking to find supposedly responsible American educators answering these questions in the affirmative.

Extremist advocates of the collectivist premise of course believe that the transition from capitalism to collectivism will probably, if not inevitably, involve stern resistance on the part of the owner class and therefore lead to open conflict—political or worse—between the owner and worker classes of society. These extremists likewise hold that the schools cannot escape this conflict, and that teachers who would contribute to the realization of the collectivist society must cast their lot, in classroom and out, with the worker class.

Class war, of course, is a tenet of Marxism, and whether or not they accepted the Marxist label, the more extreme advocates of the achievement of collectivism-through-the-classroom embraced this class-war tenet.

Even Dr. Counts, who later vigorously repudiated communism, showed strong leanings toward this Marxist tenet in his earlier writings:

If democracy is to be achieved in the industrial age, powerful classes must be persuaded to surrender their privileges, and institutions deeply rooted in popular prejudice will have to be radically modified or abolished. And according to the historical record, this process has commonly been attended by bitter struggle and even bloodshed. Ruling classes never surrender their privileges voluntarily.

* * * There is little evidence from the pages of American history to support us in the hope that we may adjust our differences through the method of sweetness and light. (Dare the School Build a New Social Order? pp. 50–52.)

The implications of this view are developed in the "Call to the Teachers of the Nation":

Even the taxpayers have no special claim on the schools; they are but the tax collectors of society; ultimately school revenue comes from all who labor by hand or brain. This the teachers should never forget. Their loyalty therefore goes to the great body of the laboring population—to the farmers the industrial workers, and the other members of the producing classes of the Nation. They owe nothing to the present economic system, except to improve it; they owe nothing to any privileged caste, except to strip it of its privileges (pp. 19–20).

One of the most vigorous advocates of collectivism-through-the-schools during the past 20 years has been Dr. Theodore Brameld, professor of education at New York University. Dr. Brameld held that "realistically minded teachers might profit by greater acquaintance with Marx." While disclaiming advocacy of Marxism, Brameld pointed out that "several of his"—Marx's—"basic postulates are likewise those of a considerable group of progressive educators," especially his belief "that the profit system is the root of our social troubles" and his insistence "that collectivism has to replace it"—"Karl Marx and the American Teacher," Social Frontier, November 1935, pages 53–56.

Brameld called attention to Marx's statement in a letter to his friend Kugelmann that "the solution cannot proceed along pleasant lines." He emphasized the Marxian principle that "the opposition of the class in control of capitalist society is so tremendous that nothing short of counter-opposition frequently bordering upon, indeed crystallizing into, illegality will suffice to defeat it." Brameld declared that in Marx's view violence was to be avoided if possible; "but it should not be characterized categorically as immoral under all circumstances."

Dr. Brameld believed that Marxism "would applaud" the statement of Professor Newlon that "teachers must prepare to join in an organized way with the liberal forces seeking to build a better society, with labor, farmers, professionals and all others who do the actual productive work of the country, in the struggle of the people against special privilege"—Science and Society—A Marxian quarterly, fall, 1936, pages 1–17.

And Brameld held that, consistent with the Marxian strategy, teachers who wish to conduct their activity "within the school and without in behalf of the collectivist ideal must influence their students, subtly if necessary, frankly if possible, toward acceptance of the same position"—Social Frontier, November 1935, pages 53–55.

Dr. William H. Kilpatrick, chairman of the board of the Social Frontier, followed up publication of the Brameld article with an emphatic rejection of Marxism. But in the discussion which ensued the class approach to the fight for collectivism found vigorous espousal, even in one editorial in the Social Frontier. This editorial, in the February 1936 issue, pages 134–135, asserted:

To us the class approach to society appeals as the most promising to an understanding

of the processes of history and the complexities, conflicts, difficulties, and problems of life today. It appeals to us, also, as an extremely useful point of departure for a method of bringing about those changes which are necessary for an equitable distribution of the goods of life.

There then follows this brutally frank line of argument:

If we wanted a society dominated by either men or women, by Negroes or Nordics, by Jews, Catholics, Protestants, or atheists, we would approach society with a sex, race, or religious orientation. But we want a society dominated by and managed in the interest of those who create national and cultural wealth. We want a society in which goods will be produced for use, and not for the profit of owners of means of production. We want a society in which the wealth-creating resources and instruments will be owned collectively, controlled democratically, and managed efficiently. We want a society in which the fruits of economic effort will be distributed in such a way as to liberate the masses of the people for creative and appreciative experiences in the realms of culture.

In the process of creating such a society the needed classification—and we have indicated that classification of one kind or another is necessary for social engineering—is the classification of "worker" and "owner."

This classification, the editorial contends, meets the need for "an appeal that cuts across the maze of interests of the various groups" in society. "That appeal is the workers versus owners appeal."

The editorial further holds that "America now consists of one self-conscious class and one class that is not yet self-conscious." The "self-conscious class" is represented by the American Liberty League and the National Association of Manufacturers. The workers, of course, are the class "not yet self-conscious."

On the basis of this premise, the editorial states its conception of the task of education:

In view of the absence of a class mentality among the workers, it would be reasonable to assume that it is the problem of education to induce such a mentality, rather than to take an existing mentality and base a course of action upon it. In the interests of a genuinely classless society the crucial class distinctions which now exist ought to be emphasized.

Despite the extremely radical departure from the traditional American conception of our society and of the role of education, advocates of this view are emphatic in their insistence upon it as a necessary feature of the reconstruction of both society and the school. This view is given forceful expression by Dr. John L. Childs, professor of education at Teachers' College, Columbia University:

No matter how unaccustomed we Americans may be to thinking and operating in class terms, if we are empirical, we cannot shut out this possibility on a priori grounds. Here, also, the appeal must be to conditions, and not simply to what old habits of mind make congenial.

The institutions and practices of our historic American economic individualism are in irreconcilable conflict with the patterns of life implicit in the present interdependent industrial economy. * * * The collective, scientific planning and utilization of resources, material and human, in the interest of the whole community * * * is incompatible with the continuance of the historic profit system. * * *

If affairs are studied in relation to vital national trends the "class" concept seems to many to be less doctrinaire than the "classless" doctrine. So also from an empirical point of view does the notion of a deepening conflict of interests between owners and workers correspond more closely to the actual situation than does the view that all will collaborate in the transformation of our economic system. (Can Teachers Stay Out of the Class Struggle? Social Frontier, April 1936, pp. 219–222.)

Dr. Childs further contends that "the educator who now seeks to compromise or reconcile" this difference between the owner-worker classes "is not using his energies to good advantage." Childs is convinced that "we shall not make the transition to an effectual, planning society by the collaboration of all groups" and that "educators can play an important role" in the reconstruction of society only as they accept this premise.

Therefore, he concludes:

Educators, aware of what is now involved, and content to be guided by probabilities, in the absence of demonstrated certainty, should not find it difficult to decide where they belong in this deepening struggle of classes.

This view provoked violent dissent even among so-called liberal educators. In response to this criticism, Dr. Childs agreed that "the experimentalist educator will not encourage the preaching of violence and class hatred," because "his experience teaches him that when passions of this sort are aroused, it is generally chance operating as brute force and not intelligence which decides the issue." Such tactics, he warned, "might also lead to a sweeping reaction which could easily result in some form of Fascist control."

But Dr. Childs still insisted that "the only adequate social point of view for education is one which includes as an essential part the conception of the class struggle." And he warned that the experimentalist educator "will recognize that democracy involves the right of a majority to make its will prevail even if the power of government and law must be utilized to coerce reluctant minorities entrenched in outmoded institutional arrangements. Political democracy is not to be opposed to engaging in group and class struggles"—The Social Frontier, June 1936, pages 274–278.

It remained for Dr. Boyd H. Bode to reduce to man-in-the-street terms the import of what the advocates of class war in the classroom were proposing. He warned that however cleverly or carefully the proposals might be worded, the fine phraseology "must not be permitted to obscure the fact that this proposed scheme of education is deliberately aimed at fostering a disposition which will make the pupil intolerant and 'sore' with respect to the contrast between employers and workers"—the Social Frontier, November 1938, pages 38–40.

VIII. "FOLKS AREN'T GOING TO LIKE THIS"

From the very outset advocates of the promotion of a collectivist society through the public schools recognized the inevitability of powerful opposition to their program and its objectives. The leaders of the movement were too intelligent, too realistic, and too discerning not to do so.

The emphasis which they placed upon this anticipated opposition, and the pains to which they went to devise and recommend a strategy for overcoming that opposition, is itself a significant indication of the revolutionary character of their basic program.

Realization of the inevitability of this opposition explains Dr. Counts' statement, in his monograph, Dare the School Build a New Social Order?

We know full well that, if the school should endeavor vigorously and consistently to win its pupils to the support of a given social program, unless it were supported by other agencies, it could act only as a mild counterpoise to restrain and challenge the might of less enlightened and more selfish purposes (p. 24).

It was the same realization of this inevitable opposition which prompted Dr. Counts' startling injunction to teachers "deliberately"—to—"reach for power and then make the most of their conquest"—page 30. In this same vein, Dr. Counts warned that—

The power that teachers exercise in the schools can be no greater than the power they wield in society.

For this reason teachers "must be prepared to stand on their own feet and win for their ideas the support of the masses of the people"—pages 30–31.

The problem posed by the certainty of powerful opposition is stated even more clearly in the "Call to the Teachers of the Nation":

Thus we are brought face to face with the paradox: The school must participate in the task of social reconstruction, yet until society is already transformed the school can scarcely hope to function effectively (p. 23).

The reason for this paradox is obvious. As the "Call" warned, efforts at social reconstruction through the schools are certain to be confronted by "the ignorance of the masses and the malevolence of the privileged."

No one saw more clearly the certainty of this opposition and the threat which it involved than Prof. Harold Laski. In describing the Conclusions and Recommendations of the American Historical Association commission as "an educational program for a Socialist America," Laski offered a powerful warning against the practical obstacles in the pathway of such a program—a program which, of course, he heartily endorsed. He said, with respect to this educational program:

It is a direct criticism of the ideals that have shaped capitalist America; the ideals, also, that American capitalists still stoutly hold. To them it says in effect: We want you to agree to the trial of educational practices built upon the assumption that you and all that you are stand in contradiction to the needs of America. Our spirit is a denial of your spirit. Where you deny, we affirm; where you affirm, we deny. What you think are the safeguards of America are the things we believe will work disaster for it. We ask you to allow the schools to be used for the destruction of those safeguards.

Continuing this interpretation of what the proposed program involves, Mr. Laski pointed out that it says, in effect, to the leaders and exponents of the present American way:

We want to fill them (the schools) with teachers who will analyze critically all the things for which you stand. We want to create in the schools a new generation which will realize that your ideals, your purposes, your methods, are both dangerous and obsolete. We believe that it is to the interest of America—even, on a long view, to your interest—to help us to realize our program. Cannot we rely, in this crisis of America's destiny, upon your willing support for this adventure?

And, Laski concludes:

Virtually * * * the report (of the commission) asks the present owning class in America to cooperate in facilitating its own erosion. I know of no historic experience that makes that demand likely of fulfillment. * * * The report, I believe, underestimates the passion with which men cling to the religion of ownership; and its impact upon the votaries of that faith would, if they read it, lead less to conviction that conversion was desirable than to the angry perception that the liberal teacher is an even more dangerous heretic than they have hitherto been accustomed to affirm. (New Republic, July 29, 1936, pp. 342–345.)

John L. Tildsley, associate superintendent of the New York City schools, and a sharp critic of the Counts' program, envisioned opposition on an even broader scale:

Does Dr. Counts really believe that when he has won over the teachers to his revolutionary program, the parents, most of whom are opposed to the program, will continue to support teachers who (against the wishes of the parents) are making converts of their children for an industrial system that never has been operated successfully anywhere? (Social Frontier IV: 319–322.)

The same objections were anticipated by President Willard W. Beatty of the Progressive Education Association, writing in 1933:

We must recognize the fact that schools cannot offer their children instruction in political or economic doctrines which differ materially from those understood or accepted by the adult community. (Progressive Education, October 1933, p. 304.)

We will have occasion, presently, to note Beatty's formula for overcoming this obstacle.

In its final paragraph, the "Call to the Teachers of the Nation" stated the problem with breath-taking candor:

In conclusion, an obvious truth must be emphasized. The individual teacher cannot fight the battles of the profession alone. To advise him to do so, would be the counsel of madness. Working in isolation he cannot convert the school into an effective instrument of social reconstruction. If, unsupported by his colleagues, he should attempt any considerable part of the program outlined in these pages, almost inevitably his days as a teacher would be speedily numbered. He would fall before the onslaught of some body of witch hunters or some selfish interest (p. 26).

The problem is clearly enough defined. Its recognition by the advocates of social reconstruction through the schools is sufficiently established by these citations. I proceed to the various proposals for meeting this acknowledged hazard.

IX. STEPS TO POWER

However vague the leaders of the campaign for collectivism through the schools may be about some of the details of the new social order they are promoting, there is no corresponding vagueness about the measures they regard as necessary to equip and prepare the profession, and particularly its progressive element, for the coming struggle. There is no lack of imaginative and ambitious boldness in planning preparations for both offensive and defensive warfare.

The preparations envisioned include such mundane matters as professional tenure for teachers—job security, in other words—accumulation of necessary financial resources for the war chest, and even anticipation of need for legal aids. They include insistence by the teaching profession upon academic freedom, professional status, public deference to "trained judgment" of the educators, and, as a corollary, a minimum of "interference" by the lay public. There is recognition, too, of the need for "more liberal school boards"—since these agencies remain an unavoidable evil.

The proposed preparations also include strengthening of professional organizations and "solidarity," unionization of teachers, enlistment of the support of other social groups and organizations of kindred "liberal" spirit and aims, and even utilization of the "class approach" as a "resource" in the campaign. In a few instances the promoters of this campaign do not scruple to justify resort to deception and slyness.

Finally, and most ambitious of all, is the call for an all-out effort of adult education in behalf of the social reconstruction program—held to be necessary to provide a favorable climate of public opinion, at least among the "thinking minority," and to assure the ultimate success of the immense undertaking of building a collectivist society.

It is hard to spot a detail in the preparations that these educational-reform strategists overlooked.

The "Call to the Teachers of the Nation" lists many of the essential steps which teachers must take to fortify themselves for the struggle: It warns that "any program of education designed for the coming generation, if it is to be successful, must march hand in hand and be closely coordinated with a program of adult and parent education."

Furthermore, it asserts the profession's "members must prepare to struggle cooperatively and valiantly for their rights and ideals. They must fight for tenure, for adequate compensation, for a voice in the formulation of educational policies; they must uphold the ancient doctrine of academic freedom and maintain all of their rights as human beings and American citizens"—pages 24–25.

Let me interject, at this point, that no right-thinking person would deny the public-school teacher any of his rights either as a human being or as an American citizen. The "Call" continues:

Also they must insist on the public recognition of their professional competence in the field of education; they must oppose every effort on the part of publishing houses, business interests, privileged classes, and patriotic societies to prescribe the content of the curriculum. * * *

* * * The progressive-minded teachers of the country must unite in a powerful organization, militantly devoted to the building of a better social order and to the fulfillment, under the conditions of industrial civilization, of the democratic aspirations of the American people. In the defense of its members against the ignorance of the masses and the malevolence of the privileged, such an organization would have to be equipped with the material resources, the legal talent, and the trained intelligence necessary to wage successful warfare in the press, the courts, and the legislative chambers of the Nation (p. 26).

The Conclusions and Recommendations of the American Historical Association commission stressed the need for the public to defer to the profession:

If the school is to discharge the highly conservative function of relieving tensions in American society and of bringing thought and reason to bear on social adjustment, then reliance must be placed on the trained judgment of those to whom the actual conduct of public education is entrusted (p. 125).

This commission also emphasized that:

If the teacher is * * * to free the school from domination of special interests * * * there must be a redistribution of power in the conduct of education. * * * The boards of education will have to be made more representative (p. 128).

This same preoccupation with the make-up of boards of education is revealed, with a note of pessimism, in a review of Dr. Counts' book, "The Schools Can Teach Democracy," by Dr. Harold C. Hand, associate professor of education at Stanford University:

Given the present class-composition of virtually all of our boards of education, and the administrator-dominated type of teachers' organization to which the vast majority of the affiliated teachers now belong, what hope that such a splendid program of democratic education could be translated into actual practice in the classroom? (Frontiers of Democracy, October 1939, p. 24.)

In a similarly pessimistic vein, John Lloyd Snell, writing on "Social Attitudes of California School Board Members"—February 1940, Frontiers of Democracy, pages 141–142—offered this conclusion:

In general, the preponderance of evidence afforded by the investigation shows that high-school board members in the State of California, judged by their affiliations with organizations, are allied with the more conservative elements in our society and, in general, share their attitudes. It seems logical to assume that this conservative attitude is now operating and will continue to operate to modify and limit the possible directions that education may take in the State. Few of the many needed departures from the traditional secondary school curriculum may be expected to emanate from high-school boards as set up at present in California.

One of the most recent restatements of the necessity of stronger teacher organization to protect members of the profession in their self-appointed task of social reconstruction was made by Kenneth D. Benne, in his presidential address

before the American Education Fellowship—Progressive Education Association—in 1951:

Both preservice education of teachers and in-service education, through conferences, institutes, study groups, and school experimentation, must help teachers * * * to become actors as well as students in the struggle to determine the shape of the future * * * whether progressive or static, reactionary and dead.

One other lesson teachers must learn. This is the lesson of organized professional responsibility and solidarity to protect schools and teachers in the responsible, daring and open study, discussion and experimentation which the teaching task requires; to enlist the aid and support of other forces and groups who, like progressive teachers, are devoted to a democratic future for America and the world in protecting the transformation of the schools, to oppose forces and groups which would make of schools the passive and impotent hawkers of harmless, irrelevant, and outworn knowledge and values, the agents of social reaction. (Progressive Education, April 1951, p. 196.)

A similar emphasis on "professional solidarity" is provided by the counsel of Superintendent Virgil M. Rogers of Battle Creek, Mich., in an address at the July 1951 NEA meeting in San Francisco. Dr. Rogers urged:

Teachers must close ranks professionally, remove the schisms, and solidly unite professionally in every community and throughout the Nation.

A statement prepared by the NEA Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom rightfully asserts that "pupils need protection from the possible bias of teachers on certain issues" and that "community groups have the right to assume that they may justly protest, if convinced that both sides of an issue are not being fairly presented." At the same time, however, it cites as an example of "whims of unduly sensitive individuals or groups" criticism of a textbook which charged that "The typical newspaper is far from being impartial. Editorials that might offend big advertisers are not approved." And the statement insists that there is "need for professional solidarity in protesting all forms of censorship, suppression, and attacks on education" and "need for organized action from state and national arms of the profession for the preservation of our fundamental freedoms"—NEA Journal, May 1951, pages 321–322.

The call for professional solidarity takes many forms. Thus, Dr. Theodore Brameld, in his discussion of possible contributions of Marxism to the profession, said:

Particularly would he (Karl Marx) be pleased to see that at least a few teachers have already gone so far as to unionize themselves as a class, conscious of interests fundamentally separate from most school boards or from others sympathetic with the status quo. (Social Frontier, November 1935, pp. 53–56.)

Again, in Science and Society—A Marxian Quarterly—fall 1936, pages 1–17—Brameld wrote:

Marxism would applaud * * * the statement of Professor Newlon in the Social Frontier, "Teachers, if they are really opposed to suppression that is fascism, must prepare to join in an organized way with the liberal forces seeking to build a better society, with labor, farmers, professionals, and all others who do the actual productive work of the country, in the struggle of the people against special privilege."

That the purpose of such organization is not merely that of collective bargaining with respect to tenure, salaries, etc., is made clear by Dr. John Dewey—Social Frontier, April 1935, pages 11–12:

An open alliance of teachers with workers would greatly strengthen the educational as well as the economic position of the teaching body.

Organization among teachers is imperatively needed to stem the rising tide of brutal reaction and intimidation. But so many teachers are timid because of "hostages to fortune" that it is foolish to suppose that this organization will be adequate unless it is supported by wider and deeper organization with others who have a common interest in the reconstruction of the present regime of production for personal gain and personal power. * * *

What can be done? The direct answer is: join locals of the American Federation of Teachers where they exist; help form them where they do not exist. * * * I would heartily second the motion of Heywood Broun for an alliance of teachers with the Newspaper Guild. Actors and writers are organized or beginning to organize. Ministers in the churches, while not yet widely organized for other than purely professional purposes, have spoken, through their various organizations, more and more openly about the injustices of the present order.

What is needed is an aggressive alliance of these various groups. Divided, we may fall. United, we shall stand, and in standing shall do our special work.

It is significant that some educators flatly rejected this counsel. Thus, Dr. H. Gordon Hullfish, professor of education at Ohio State University, writing under the title, "Why I Am Resigning From the Teachers' Union," said:

I see no justification for throwing the allegiance of the school at either extreme (left or right), thus placing greater pressure upon the school than already exists, and this at a time when so many factions in our society are giving evidence of a measure of social motivation. (The Social Frontier, January 1937, pp. 110–112.)

In a similar vein, Pearl A. Wanamaker, State superintendent of public instruction of the State of Washington, said in an address before the NEA representative assembly, July 7, 1947:

The best interests of public education are not served by affiliation of the teaching profession with labor. * * *

Teachers, like physicians and lawyers, work in a specialized field with no more relation to one than another area outside that field. * * * Why, then, should members of our profession single out for a special kind of cooperation a part of our population devoted to a special economic viewpoint?

All professions must cooperate with each other and with nonprofessional organizations in joint projects devoted to the Nation's welfare. That is the democratic way. * * *

The NEA stands firm in its objection to organized affiliation of the profession, as a body, with any part of the national life that entertains an exclusive economic, religious, or political point of view. (NEA Journal, Sept. 1947, p. 434.)

In line with the call for professional organization and solidarity here being documented, Dr. Norman Woelfel urged "a united front of radically inclined educators"—Progressive Education, January–February 1934, pages 107–112. He urged that educators "form their defensive lines under the banner of basic convictions, ally themselves with all other social groups of similar orientation among the people, and fight heroically against whatever forces elect to lay down the gage of battle."

Dr. John L. Childs, exponent of the class approach in the effort to achieve a collectivist society, insisted that "the present conflict of classes presents not only a problem, it also presents a resource"—Social Frontier, June 1936, pages 274–278.

The educators' "struggle for academic freedom and adequate support for the public school" is, in Dr. Childs' judgment, "related to the deepening conflict of class interests in American society." This is obviously so, he believes, because the educators' "experience indicates that not all classes in the economic life of the United States are so situated objectively that they will be inclined to favor this fundamental social reconstruction." Indeed, Dr. Childs adds, "a small, but economically and politically powerful, class of owners is already taking active measures to forestall it."

Conversely, "honest appraisal of conditions convinces him"—the experimentalist educator—"that certain elements of the population are much more likely to respond to this program of socialization than are others. If, as this movement of workers—farm, factory, office, and professional—gathers momentum, he finds that class cleavages in American life grow sharper, he will not thereby be deterred from continuing his work of political and economic organization."

In Dr. Childs' view, far from being deterred, the teachers should welcome allies in the conflict:

To entertain this end of drastic social reconstruction but to be unwilling to cooperate in developing the means necessary to achieve it is to be guilty of a most nonexperimental mode of behavior.

* * * In my opinion, the chance for a peaceful, orderly transformation of our economy will be increased, not lessened, by an open alliance of professional groups, including educators, with the working class (ibid, pp. 274–8).

In an earlier article, Dr. Childs expressed the belief that—

If the schools are to be kept free to perform their important intellectual function during this period (of transition to an effectual planning society, they will need the support of those groups whose interests will be advanced by the change from capitalism. (The Social Frontier, April 1936, pp. 219–222.)

One of the most remarkable statements with respect to the potential power of the teaching profession and the strategic employment of that power is contained in an editorial bearing the statistical title—"1,105,921"—published in the January 1935 Social Frontier, pages 5–6. The title represents the number of persons teaching in the schools and colleges of the Nation in 1930 as disclosed by the Fiftieth Federal Census. The fact that one out of every 45 persons gainfully employed was engaged in teaching was described in the editorial as "a fact of far-reaching social significance—a fact whose meaning has been

fully grasped neither by society at large nor by the teaching profession."

Elaborating on this significance, the editorial emphasizes the role of teachers as professional specialists:

The responsibility of educational workers for shaping the program of the school has become perpetual and inescapable. They could not be mere instruments if they tried. This is due chiefly to the fact that in the course of the past several generations organized education has developed to a point where it requires in its conduct an enormous and ever-growing body of professional knowledge and experience. In large part, therefore, the actual administration of the school must be left to those who are technically competent—the teachers of the country. The only alternative is chaos and cultural regression.

The next sentence is extremely significant, and it raises the question as to the extent to which the wish is father to the thought:

In the very nature of the case no clear mandate covering the details or even the major outlines of an educational program can be given by society to educational workers.

Elaborating this view, the editorial continues:

Differentiation of function and delegation of responsibility are of the essence of industrial civilization. Increasingly, it would seem, if this civilization is to perdure and develop, the discharge of a particular function will have to be entrusted to the appropriate special group. The inherited conception of Government as a police or regulative agent, external to the economic and social process, is already breaking down under the impact of new forces. In the state now emerging organized education must take its place alongside the other great coordinate functions of industrial society and become an integral part of government.

The conception of organized education as "an integral part of government" when combined with the proposition that "no clear mandate covering even the major outlines of an educational program can be given by society to educational workers," seems to me to add up to an amazing totalitarian, free-from-accountability - to - anyone - but - themselves role for members of the teaching profession. It is a demand for carte blanche for the profession—the ultimate in a "hands-off" notice to the "educationally incompetent" lay public including, presumably, elected members of boards of education. Successful establishment of such a role for the teaching profession obviously would solve most of the practical difficulties of achieving the envisioned collectivist society through the classroom, provided the advocates of that goal could, in turn, capture control of the teaching profession.

The editorial goes on to deplore the "tragedy that the teachers of the Nation, as a body, are unprepared, in either knowledge, disposition, or organization, to discharge intelligently and effectually the responsibilities which events have placed on their shoulders." And it adds that "to those who say that the profession dare not show independence in the formulation of either educational or social policies, it should be pointed out that the potential power of teachers in terms of today and tomorrow has never been put to the test."

By way of elaborating on this "potential power," the editorial points out that on the basis "of simple numerical strength alone" the members of the teaching profession, "if organized and conscious of their strength, could wield enormous power." The editorial continues:

With the enfranchisement of women the teachers of the country have become a potential political force to be reckoned with. They have the power to throw the fear of God and of unemployment into the hearts of many a machine politician. The Social Frontier is of the opinion that the judicious and courageous use of this power in advancing the interests of education and protecting the civic and professional rights of teachers is a responsibility which they can no longer escape.

A further factor of "potential power"—one of utmost importance—is cited by the editorial:

The strength of the teachers * * * is by no means to be gauged by statistics. Their strength is strategic and functional as well as numerical. They spread over the country in a fine network which embraces every hamlet and rural community. And the function which they perform brings them into close and sympathetic relations with the rank and file of the people of the Nation. No occupational group in society is equally favorably situated.

As still another "source of strength" of the profession, the editorial cites the fact that membership of the profession as a whole "compasses all fields of knowledge and thought and is thus peculiarly armed to do battle in the contemporary world."

The editorial concludes:

Clearly, if they but utilized the resources within their grasp, teachers could become one of the major forces in American life. Particularly might they aspire to such a position, if they should choose to identify themselves with the masses of the people and refuse longer to make obeisance to the badges of wealth and rank. All they lack is organization, vision, and courage. Perhaps these things will come.

In conjunction with this emphasis on the "potential power" of the teaching profession, I call attention to a proposal to give the public schools a total monopoly on the primary and secondary education of American youth. I sincerely trust that there is no extensive disposition in the circles of professional education to revive and promote this particular, iniquitous proposal. But it cannot pass unmentioned.

In the April 1943 Frontiers of Democracy, pages 215–216, an anonymous article was published in the magazine's "What Do You Believe?" section, entitled "Shall We Revive the Oregon School Law?"

The article recalls that some 20 years earlier Oregon had enacted, by referendum, a law establishing the public school as the only available school for all its children between the ages of 8 and 16. The article points out that this law was ruled invalid by the courts, but ventures the belief that "with the new attitude on the United States Supreme Bench there is no certainty that the decision would now be against the law."

The article proposes a Nation-wide Oregon law, which would, of course, ban private or parochial schools for this age group. As arguments for creation of such an educational monopoly, the article charges that the private—secular—school "exists primarily to shelter the privileged from the common-run" and that "such segregation in the degree present tends to hinder the mutual give-and-take of conference and opinion necessary to the successful operation of a democracy."

So far as the parochial school is concerned, the article contends that it "exists primarily to segregate its school population from assimilative interaction with the rest of the people. Insofar as the parochial school succeeds, it builds a mind different from the common American mind." The article adds:

A democracy depends for its success on discussion, on honest shared search to find out what to think and do. The method of certain parochial schools is dogmatic authority, not shared inquiry; their students, therefore, do not learn how to discuss and inquire and even worse, they acquire such closed minds, such fixed and absolute ideas, that in too large measure they are unable to participate profitably in discussion. The democratic process is closed to them.

This amounts to a claim by one educational group of the right to define the democratic process and to impose its concept of that process upon other groups by law, regardless of contrary educational, political, or religious views. Triumph of such a proposal as a Nation-wide Oregon law would, of course, create an educational monopoly. Presumably it would remove important obstacles to the program of social reconstruction through the classroom. Fortunately there are no grounds for anticipating any extensive public support for such a move.

One other device proposed for offsetting or circumventing public opposition to collectivism via the classroom must be mentioned. I am certain that advocacy of this technique is the rare exception. I refer to the method of slyness or outright deception.

This, of course, is what Dr. Brameld was talking about in his discussion of "Karl Marx and the American Teacher" when he said that teachers favorable to the collectivist philosophy and program "must then influence their students, subtly if necessary, frankly if possible, toward acceptance of the same position"—Social Frontier, November 1935, pages 53–55.

This is also the same method referred to in the instructions to teachers published in the May 1937 issue of "The Communist"—cited, with vigorous condemnation, by V. T. Thayer, education director of the Ethical Culture Schools, in his book, American Education Under Fire, 1944:

"The party must take careful steps to see that all teacher comrades are given thorough education in the teaching of Marxism-Leninism. Only when teachers have really mastered Marxism-Leninism will they be able skillfully to inject it into their teaching at the least risk of exposure.

In view of the fundamental integrity of the overwhelming majority of American educators, it is shocking to find the

Progressive Education magazine as recently as February 1951 carrying an article advocating outright deceit—apparently without any editorial repudiation of the suggestion. I quote from an article, "Guarding the Freedom To Teach," by A. Max Carmichael, professor of education at Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Ind.:

I suppose there are cases where teachers live under a constant threat. * * * Our teacher will have to choose whether * * * to try to live up to the principles which he morally can accept, and risk being discharged, or whether * * * to temporize with the situation, abiding actually or ostensibly by the decision of those in control, but here and there, perhaps, secretively failing to abide by the injunction and not stating his position too openly in the wrong places. Some teachers can find moral justification for that latter procedure under these circumstances. It seems to me that the individual teacher will have to make up his mind in terms of the alternatives before him, to wit, how well he can make an adjustment if discharged, how likely he is to get caught, etc. It seems a shame to have to talk in these terms, but one must meet opposition that is without moral principle in ways that implement one's long-time goals rather than the more immediate ones. Ultimately, force may often best be met with force and with its accompanying deceit. Let me here add that so long as no threat of discharge exists, I see no reason for any other behavior than that of candid discussion. Even in the case of threat, there is little need for innuendoes, name calling, sarcasm, even though there may be occasion for deceit (p. 110).

This is appalling counsel, especially from a professed teacher of teachers. Even more appalling is the apparent failure of the progressive education leadership to repudiate such counsel and its author.

By comparison with this vicious counsel, the final proposal for overcoming public opposition to collectivism-through-the-classroom which I shall document at least has the virtue of forthrightness and integrity.

Many advocates of the reconstruction of the social order via the schoolhouse also call for a corollary campaign for collectivism through adult education.

The practicalities which dictate this proposal are obvious, and were well stated by President Willard W. Beatty, of the Progressive Education Association. After pointing out that "schools cannot offer their children instruction in political and economic doctrines which differ materially from those understood and accepted by the adult community," he wrote:

A double burden therefore rests upon the educator who would contribute materially to social planning. He must be prepared to undertake not only the instruction of children for their share in a new order, but also leadership and guidance of the adult community in its groping for individual and social security in this rapidly changing world. (Progressive Education, October 1933, p. 304.)

Prof. Harold Rugg, who for 20 years has been the most zealous advocate of such a program of adult education, expressed the "need" in terms of the creation of "an informed climate of opinion by a dramatic Nation-wide campaign for social reconstruction." He insisted that "this step is a necessary preliminary to the rebuilding of the social-science program of the elementary and secondary schools," since "these, too, are molded by the dominant climate of opinion in the community"—Progressive Education, January–February 1934, pages 3–5.

Earlier, in The Great Technology, 1933, Dr. Rugg insisted that "the remaking of minority opinion in American life is fundamental to the reconstruction of public opinion," page 203. It is curious that this exponent of democracy constantly talked in terms of a "thinking minority," which he usually estimated in terms of some 25,000,000 people.

Dr. Rugg's advocacy of such a program of adult education reached a climax unequalled before or since, when, in 1942, he addressed open letters to President Roosevelt, United States Commissioner of Education John Studebaker, and to public-school superintendents of the Nation, under the resounding title, "The Battle for Consent: Gentlemen, This Is Our Moment—If."

It called for an all-out, high pressure, Government-sponsored, financed, and directed campaign of adult and youth education designed to "redirect social trend," to wage a "war-at-home over a free, abundant, and creative world," to promote world rehabilitation and "full-employment at abundance level." The social program thus to be promoted included economic planning by Government, "interjection of social capital into the system" by Government "if private initiative does not act promptly to maintain full employment," and the proposition that "with our giant resources we need not fear the national debt."

In his letter to the President, Dr. Rugg said that educators who have reached "much the same conclusions and affirmations, more than all else crave a chance to teach these great ideas to their high school youths and to the prospective teachers in the colleges of education. They want to write them into the new textbooks that will be made to herald the new day"—Frontiers of Democracy, December 1942, pages 75–81.

He said that "to do that would be a thrilling experience" and added:

I know, for I tried to do it during the great depression in my Man and His Changing Society—a series of books which was studied by some 5,000,000 young Americans until the patrioteers and the native Fascist press well-nigh destroyed it between 1939 and 1941.

Dr. Rugg called for creation of an office of education for peace, with "unlimited resources," with "a budget running into billions if necessary, to reach ten, twenty, thirty million Americans day after day, week after week, without let-up."

In his letter to Dr. Studebaker he called for "an all-out campaign over every trunk line of communication in this country, a Nation-wide barrage of ideas and attitudes that will reach every city, town, and hamlet—a barrage day after day, month after month, not letting up for years to come."

To carry out this program, "the Government must get access to national radio and movie newsreel chains, to the movie houses, to syndicate space in the newspapers, to 200,000 secondary and college teachers and their classrooms and their curricula."

More than that, "the Government must be ready to print and sell at a nickel or a dime hundreds of pamphlets and bulletins in 10,000,000 lots." Further outlining his program, he wrote:

This campaign requires a pamphlet-bulletin-article-book-writing program that would dwarf anything that has ever been dreamed of in this or any other country. The Nation's finest novelists, poets, essayists, columnists, and other publicists, drafted to write. Drafted, I say. The Nation's scholars in the social sciences—economics, politics, government, history and sociology, social psychology and public opinion—drafted to organize topics, to outline material, to collaborate with the professional writers in preparing books, pamphlets, bulletins, articles printed by Government printing presses and syndicated at cost throughout the country.

He insisted that "the time is short" because with the end of the war "the incipient fascism that is latent in most of our communities today could quickly and virulently infect the social blood stream of our country; it could utterly strangle our treasured democratic process and turn your teachers and youth into fearsome parrots of an authoritarian regime." In a later article—Frontiers of Democracy, January 1943, pages 101–109—he again warned:

There may not be time enough * * * to silence the isolationist, exploitive, back-to-normalcy, die-hard right and their vicious press.

This fantastic, grandiose proposal was snubbed by President Roosevelt. Commissioner Studebaker aptly pointed out that "political democracy in the United States requires that orderly means of ascertaining the collective judgment and will of the people be secured through the mechanism of political parties, political campaigns, and free elections."—Frontiers of Democracy, March 1943, pages 172–175. Reluctantly, Dr. Rugg thereafter wrote:

I am unhappy to report that the hoped-for attack from Washington has not been forthcoming. * * * I very much fear that as in the past we shall be driven back upon private initiative to take the lead. (Frontiers of Democracy, May 1943, pp. 246–254).

And he issued a significant summons to colleges of education:

Let them become powerful national centers for the graduate study of ideas and they will thereby become forces of creative imagination standing at the very vortex of the ideational revolution. Let us make our teacher education institutions into great direction-finders for our new society * * * pointers of the way * * * dynamic trail blazers of new frontiers (ibidem).

The hope dies hard—the hope of achieving the longed-for social reconstruction through the schools, through adult education, through teacher-training colleges. Indeed, the hope does not die. Despite temporary set-backs and disappointments, it stubbornly persists.

X. CHANGING OUR FORM OF GOVERNMENT

Fundamental changes in the philosophy and procedures of American Gov-

ernment are, of course, implicit in the very concept of collectvism and socialization being documented herein.

In addition, the movement here being described has produced numerous byproducts and offshoots in the way of subsidiary and auxiliary proposals for changes in the philosophy and procedures of American Government. These proposals and ideas are all grist for the mill for the educators who seek to achieve a new social order through the schools.

Space forbids more than a brief cataloging of a few of these proposals and ideas. They represent a part of the indoctrination of teachers, and, presumably through the teachers, of children designed to prepare them for the new day.

One premise, stated early in the history of this movement, is that "Democracy should not be identified with political forms and functions—with the Federal Constitution, the popular election of officials, or the practice of universal suffrage"—Counts', "Dare the Schools Create a New Social Order?" page 40 ff. And Dr. Counts adds, "the most genuine expression of democracy in the United States has little to do with our political institutions: It is a sentiment with respect to the moral equality of man; it is an aspiration toward a society in which this sentiment will find complete fulfillment."

Dr. Counts later came to attach much greater importance to the political forms and functions of the American Government—"Education and the Promise of America," 1945. But in this earlier view he was opening the way for reckless advocacy of changes in forms of Government, supposed to serve the ends of social reconstruction.

This premise leads, logically, to the view expressed by Dr. Rugg in The Great Technology, that we must "build systematically the attitude among the young people of the world that the trend toward representative democracy has produced nothing more than important experiments in Government." Likewise, they must be taught that "every form of Government on earth today must be regarded frankly as an experiment, tentative, and to be changed as new social and economic conditions develop"—page 270.

This encouragement, through the schools, of a flippant, lighthearted, and casual attitude toward government and the basic principles of government, yields some fantastic byproducts.

One, of course, is the glib acceptance of big government, especially at the Federal level.

For example, "fear of centralized governmental administration and control" is dismissed as a "bogeyman," not because a trend in that direction does not exist, but because the trend is inevitable and even desirable. Thus Arnold E. Joyal, professor of educational administration at the University of Maryland—Frontiers of Democracy, February 1941—argues that there is nothing to fear in this "inevitable trend" if people only "realize that the Federal Government is as much our Government as is the State or the city or the school district. It is capable of functioning only with our sanction."

With this glibly experimentalist attitude, it is no surprise to find Stuart Chase, writing in the May 1934, NEA Journal, page 147, that one of the changes required by an abundance economy is "the scrapping of outworn political boundaries and of constitutional checks and balances where the issues involved are technical."

Similarly we find the John Dewey Society yearbook, "Teacher and Society," sympathetically proposing regular 10-year conventions for revision of State and Federal constitutions; removal of the power of the Supreme Court to declare acts of Congress unconstitutional, and "a change in our constitutional pattern which would eliminate State boundaries and set up a system of representation based primarily on economic and geographic regions"—page 174 ff.

Again we have the proposal that the United States Supreme Court have a "substantial minority" membership of laymen—that is, nonlawyers—with the suggestion of the name of Henry Wallace as one lay Justice—telegram to President Roosevelt from the directors of the Social Frontier and the fellows of the John Dewey Society, February 21, 1937, the Social Frontier, April 1937, pages 197–8.

There is also the denunciation by the late Dr. William H. Kilpatrick of the "threefold governmental arrangement of President, Senate, and House" as "a misconceived system," because it "embodies inherent conflict where there should be inherent cooperation"—Frontiers of Democracy, March 1943, pages 164, 165. One wonders as to the qualifications for grounding the younger generation in the basic principles of our Government system possessed by a teacher or by a teacher-of-teachers with such views.

Then as a further example, there is the theory advanced in the book, New Schools for a New Culture—Charles M. MacConnel, Ernest O. Melby, and Christian O. Arndt. In a chapter, appropriately titled "Sailing for Utopia," it argues that "democracy has little to do with majority rule." True democracy operates, according to the authors' theory, through the process of "consensus"—agreement reached through discussion in small groups. This theory holds that the "action bodies" of government "must be reduced to a size that they may act with efficiency and dispatch in times of emergency or crisis," and adds that "Congress and many State legislatures have long outgrown such specifications."

Under the utopian scheme envisioned, "war and other national emergencies may still have to be handled by a small national deliberative body," but the great bulk of less urgent problems would be handled by the consensus method through a "hierarchy of deliberative bodies," extending from the grass roots to the national level (p. 196 ff.).

Still another device proposed under this experimentalist approach to the business of government is the development of "do-democracy" through the medium of citizens' advisory committees, working with elected administrative officials, which, it is held, would open up "opportunities for a large number of citizens to participate directly in government." (Practical Applications of Democracy, George de Huszar, page 44, 1945.) The question of how responsible public officials could thus delegate authority and responsibility imposed by law, or how these committees could in turn lawfully accept the authority and responsibility, is not too clear. Possibility that the citizen committee-method of government might become a source of serious conflict and confusion when undertaken on this basis, should be obvious.

Much more serious are some of the proposed changes in the basic philosophy relating to the powers of Government, especially in the realm of freedom of speech and press.

Thus we have Kenneth D. Benne, professor of education at the University of Illinois—Progressive Education, May 1949—depicting teachers and school administrators as "social engineers" and "change agents."

And we have the amazing proposition that—

> The engineering of change must be anti-individualistic, yet provide for the establishment of appropriate areas of privacy and for the development of persons as creative units of influence in our society.

Dr. Benne regards as "unscientific" the concept of "natural rights" of man. Moreover, "human rights and duties are grounded in the institutions and ideologies of a culture, not in a nature independent of man's social relationship."

Accordingly:

> That a wise social policy will establish areas of privacy for persons and voluntary associations within the society is undoubtedly true. In such areas private judgment may rule. But the determination of the proper boundaries of these areas must, in an interdependent society, be based on a collective judgment.

It would take some doing to rewrite the Bill of Rights on the basis of such a political and social philosophy.

The extent to which the Bill of Rights is at issue in this whole movement is well illustrated by the series of articles by Dr. Norman Woelfel, professor of education at Ohio State University, on "Communications," in the October 1945 and January, February, and May 1946 issues of Progressive Education.

The philosophy underlying these articles is epitomized in his discussion of the newspaper, which he regards as merely a mirror of "the peculiar ideological idiosyncracies of an owning and ruling class."

Dr. Woelfel offers the startling conclusion that:

> It may be necessary, paradoxically enough, for us to control our press as the Russian press is controlled and as the Nazi press was controlled. However, even if this were truly the only way out it is not "control" that we should fear, for we already have a very vicious type of control. We need only to look carefully at the objective in whose name control is exercised. Democratic objectives are open, intelligent, creative; they are pointed at the

welfare of every individual and at the realization of a great common culture. Surely we could have nothing to fear from a press controlled to reflect, realize, and glorify such objectives. (Progressive Education, May 1946, p. 266 ff.)

The control proposed by Dr. Woelfel would take the form of "continuing national, regional, and local controlling boards on which the consumer, the journalist, and the educator are represented" (ibid.).

Not content with "capturing" the public schools, Dr. Woelfel and his fellow educators insist that control of the press, radio, and cinema cannot be left to "their owners and their hireling practitioners if we wish social salvation."

A great many Americans are likely to conclude that the price of salvation, as set by Dr. Woelfel, is impossibly high.

XI. QUIZ GAME FOR TEACHERS AND PUPILS

Since, under the educational movement here being documented, teachers are envisioned as "engineers of social change," it is only natural that the leaders of the movement should be interested in the political-economic-social views of members of the profession. Particularly there is an interest in the presence or absence of so-called liberal views among the teachers.

This interest is graphically illustrated by a survey of teachers' views on such subjects conducted in 1936 by the John Dewey Society for the Study of Education and Culture.

This survey and its findings are described in the society's first yearbook, issued in 1937, in the chapter, "The Social Attitudes and Information of American Teachers," written by Dr. George W. Hartmann, associate professor of education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

In opening the discussion of this survey, Dr. Hartmann offers this thesis:

Any system of public education that seeks to equip the Nation's youth for effective participation in the life of a complex society cannot be indifferent to the social, political, economic, and general philosophic attitudes of its teachers. * * * We cannot doubt that the teacher's personal acceptance or rejection of significant institutional practices and proposals has at least some influence upon the actions and opinions of his pupils and consequently upon the thoughts and behavior of future citizens of the country. * * * In a period of rapid social change the particular attitudes of the teacher lose whatever irrelevancy they may have appeared to possess in a stabler era and become instead crucial matters for urgent consideration (pp. 174 ff.).

One phase of this survey was the circulation among 9,300 junior and senior high school teachers of the country of a "testing instrument" listing 106 propositions to which the teacher was asked to express agreement or dissent. According to Dr. Hartmann, usable results were obtained from 3,700 persons, or about a 40-percent return. Returns, of course, were unsigned.

Most significant is the fact that in publishing the tabulated returns, Dr. Hartmann indicated the "liberal" and therefore the desired answer, for each proposition and rated the replies by this liberal criterion.

This quiz game for teachers is cited for obvious reasons. Efforts of lay citizens or organizations to determine the political views of teachers would rightfully be condemned. As long as the teacher keeps his political and economic prejudices out of the classroom, they must rightfully be regarded as his own private affair—exactly as are his religious views. I agree, of course, with the comparatively recent official NEA position that membership in the Communist Party is quite a different thing and properly disqualifies a person from being a public-school teacher.

Moreover, the first to condemn inquiries as to teachers' political or economic views would be the so-called liberal educators—if the inquiries came from outside "busybodies, patrioteers, American Fascists," and so forth. Yet in this 1936 survey the liberal educators not only canvassed the teachers' political and economic views but rated them as acceptable or unacceptable, on the basis of their conformity to the "liberal" line.

Nothing more clearly reveals the effort to capture and employ the schools for the collectivist ideology than this example of interest in the teachers' views.

Following are samples of the 106 propositions included in the testing instrument and the tabulations of the replies. Note particularly, the slanted character and obvious implications of many of these propositions, and also the listing of the preferred or "liberal" view as indicated in the column headed "Key":

Distribution of opinion among high-school teachers with respect to some of the major political, economic, and educational issues facing contemporary American society

[The column headed "Key" gives the "liberal" answer: P means plus, or agreement; M means minus, or disagreement]

	Percent marked plus	Percent marked minus	Percent omitted	Key
Education should develop among its beneficiaries a disposition to participate ethically and intelligently in the solution of social problems	100	0	0	P
Capitalism is immoral because it exploits the worker by failing to give him the full value of his productive labor	40	58	2	P
The regular calling of conventions for the revision of State and national constitutions at 10-year intervals would eliminate some of the evils of social lag	68	30	1	P
A classroom teacher should make every effort to prevent his pupils from discovering his position on controversial issues	38	62	0	M
A policy of maximum international cooperation is morally superior to national isolation from world affairs	90	10	0	P
The United States Supreme Court should be deprived of its power to declare acts of Congress unconstitutional	19	80	1	P
Our national health would suffer if physicians were made civil servants like the public-school teachers and placed on the Government payroll	30	69	1	M
Persons who wish to bring about a "New Social Order" make poorer teachers than those who adhere strictly to their own specialty	34	65	1	M
Indoctrination by conservatives plays a smaller part in American schools today than radical propaganda	30	69	1	M
It is pedagogically unprofitable to discuss serious social problems with adolescent youngsters	16	83	1	M
A satisfying life for the masses of people can be secured without introducing important economic changes	24	75	1	M
Income and social usefulness are closely correlated at the present time	47	51	2	M
The smooth functioning of a profit economy depends upon either natural or artificial scarcity	58	39	3	P
Most of the 10,000,000 or more unemployed will never again find steady work at good wages in a capitalist society	49	50	1	P
Production for use and present-day capitalism are incompatible systems	53	44	3	P
Adequate economic security for all is impossible under a laissez faire system	72	25	3	P
No person should be permitted to have an income of more than $25,000 a year until such time as the average wage earner receives at least $2,000 a year	51	48	1	P
Cheaper electric light and power could be had if the industry were owned and operated by governmental units	75	24	1	P
Transport service would deteriorate if all railroads were owned and managed by the Federal Government or one of its agencies	34	65	1	M
We need a Government marketing corporation empowered to buy and process farm products and to sell them here and abroad	47	51	2	P
The coal mines of the Nation should be taken over by a public agency and run for the benefit of all the people	50	49	1	P
All foreign trade should be a monopoly of the Federal Government	22	76	1	P
No government has a right to experiment with different social policies	16	83	1	M
All banks and insurance companies should be run on a nonprofit basis like the schools	35	64	1	P
The best way to secure decent homes for most of the people will be for the Government to build them for its citizens on a large scale basis	41	58	1	P
All farm mortgages should be assumed by the Federal Treasury at an interest rate not in excess of 1 percent	28	70	2	P
Most of the undesirable features of the newspapers, the movies, and the radio come from their being controlled by profit-making corporations	68	32	0	P
The largest possible amount of business competition is necessary to national wealth	40	60	0	M
The practice of birth control should be discouraged	11	88	1	M
The Federal Government should provide all classes of people opportunity for complete insurance against accident, sickness, unemployment, premature death, and old age	66	33	1	P
If we had to choose between German fascism and Russian communism, I should prefer the former	41	53	6	M
Genuine individual liberty will flourish under socialism as it never did before	18	81	1	P
Public business enterprises are always inefficient	12	88	0	M

Distribution of opinion among high-school teachers with respect to some of the major political, economic, and educational issues facing contemporary American society—Continued

[The column headed "Key" gives the "liberal" answer: P means plus, or agreement; M means minus, or disagreement]

	Percent marked plus	Percent marked minus	Percent omitted	Key
For most people the opportunity to exercise beneficial personal initiative would be increased by life in a socialist state	21	77	1	P
The greater the amount of governmental control over anything, the greater the increase in graft	43	57	0	M
The formation of a comprehensive anticapitalist Farmer-Labor political party in the United States would contribute greatly to our social progress	42	56	2	P
There is nothing fundamentally wrong with our society; all we need to do is to introduce a few reforms which will correct abuses and make some institutions more humane	65	34	1	M
If the best possibilities of the American tradition are to be realized, a new social order qualitatively different from private capitalism must be built	45	54	1	P
An improved American nation will result from step-by-step advances in the socialization of the means of production and distribution	74	24	1	P
There is no such thing as a "class struggle" in American life today	12	87	1	M
A classless society is possible	20	79	1	P
A classless society is desirable	39	60	1	P
Whenever great social needs require it, the ruling class will always be found willing to surrender some of its privileges in order to meet them	29	69	1	M
Capitalism can be abolished only through a violent seizure of power by anticapitalists	18	81	1	M
If we put capable men into office, most of our social problems would be solved	78	21	1	M
The less government the better	24	75	1	M
No economic system can function efficiently without appealing to the desire for private profits	64	35	1	M
Teachers have a moral obligation to remain rigorously neutral on all debatable issues both in class and out	13	86	1	M
The best form of society is one in which an intelligent and forceful elite rules over the stabilized masses	35	64	1	M
Although some persons take advantage of it for unworthy ends, at bottom our industry is organized on a fundamentally ethical basis	71	28	1	M
I believe that the United States is just as selfish as any other nation	61	38	1	P
All social planning leads to human regimentation	32	67	1	M
As the economic crisis lengthens and deepens, society tends to divide into 2 mutually opposed sections	81	18	1	P
It is as difficult for a man of property to support basic social change as for a camel to go through the eye of a needle	40	59	1	P
The behavior of the capitalists is doing more to discredit and undermine capitalism than all of the activities of anticapitalistic groups	71	27	2	P
The exceptional wealth of the United States is the result of our continued loyalty to the capitalist system	33	64	3	M
A system that has worked as well as capitalism has in this country for the last 150 years should not be changed now	32	66	2	M
Teachers should affiliate with some genuine labor organization of their own choosing	37	62	1	P
Contemporary school practice generally develops a fixity of outlook which hampers social readjustment	44	55	1	P
Economic individualism is more appropriate to contemporary America than any proposed form of collectivism	63	34	3	M
Whenever social ownership is substituted for private ownership, at least partial compensation for the value of the property transferred should be made	93	6	1	P

NOTE.—A "liberal" answer, as defined by the key, was given by a majority of the teachers replying on 78 of the 106 questions.

A similar type of opinion test was developed and used as part of an educational experiment conducted in the Floodwood, Minn., high school, under the auspices of the University of Minnesota. This experiment is described by its director, Dr. Theodore Brameld, in his book, "Design for America" (1945). It was part of the collectivist educational movement and was termed by Dr. Brameld "an educational exploration of the future of democracy for senior high schools and junior colleges."

This test was used with pupils participating in the Floodwood experiment. It likewise involved a series of propositions to be affirmed or denied. And here again the returns were rated on the basis of the liberal or preferred answers.

Following are typical statements with the preferred answers indicated in parentheses after each proposition:

There should be Government ownership and control of radio stations. (Affirm.)

Liberal interpretation of the Constitution has permitted too great expansion of the powers of the Federal Government. (Deny.)

If European countries want to establish left-wing governments after the war, we should support them. (Affirm.)

A program to legalize and educate for birth control should be instituted in the Nation. (Affirm.)

The power of unions should be curtailed. (Deny.)

America has never been interested in imperialistic gains. (Deny.)

Should any plan of socialized medicine be established, the caliber and the ability of the medical profession would fall. (Deny.)

Family life is in need of no change in its traditional form. (Deny.)

What this country needs is more TVA's. (Affirm.)

If the creed of the postwar world be the betterment of the common man, then it follows that public medicine should become a main part of that program. (Affirm.)

If medical care is to be made available to all families at costs they can afford, these costs must be shared by all. (Affirm.)

The Federal Government should finance Government projects for the advancement of the arts. (Affirm.)

The Constitution needs some radical modifications. (Affirm.)

There is need of a change in our constitutional pattern which would eliminate State boundaries and set up a system of representation based primarily on economic and geographical regions. (Affirm.)

There is too much bureaucracy in Government already. (Deny.)

Our economic base must be shifted from rugged individualism to economic planning. (Affirm.)

The chain of middlemen that connects the producer with the consumer is unnecessary. (Affirm.)

The more State authority and the less Federal authority, the better. (Deny.)

Unless business makes a profit, the worker will be unemployed. (Deny.)

Economic planning and control of production by Government could never eliminate depressions and unemployment. (Deny.)

Without individual competition for profits, our economy would slow up and soften. (Deny.)

Income taxes on the rich should be greatly increased. (Affirm.)

Wealth should be much more equally distributed. (Affirm.)

The Government should take over much larger areas of northern Minnesota iron mines now entirely in private hands. (Affirm.)

XII. A NEW "CALL" AND A NEW STRATEGY

To a large extent the Second World War, and the tasks and problems which it posed for public education, diverted the attention of educators from the program of social reconstruction through the schools. This was true even of the most outspoken advocates of that program.

Testimony to this fact is provided in a postwar statement of policy adopted by the American Education Fellowship—the new, euphemistic title of the Progressive Education Association—at its Chicago convention, November 29, 1947. This policy statement reviewed the reform movement of the thirties, cited its eclipse during the war period, and issued what was, in effect, a new "call" to the teachers of the Nation. I quote from this document—Progressive Education, February 1948, pages 33, 40–41, 46, 58:

Memories are not so short as to forget the economic events following World War I—the years of reckless prosperity and high living, of growing corporate power and disparities of wealth, followed by years of devastating depression, hunger, fear, and waste of human resources. During the thirties some American educators became sufficiently concerned to voice their anger at this tragedy through the pages of one journal, the Social Frontier, and through the volumes of the Commission on the Social Studies—American Historical Association. They courageously analyzed the failures of a system which could cause such havoc, and they demanded fundamental changes to eliminate those failures. Yet, as the depression waned and the Nation became preoccupied with winning of World War II, even their voices softened to a whisper. It was almost as if those theorists were right who have said that education is always chiefly a reflector of the social order—rather than its critic, leader, and recreator.

This declaration of policy of the American Education Fellowship is significant on many counts. Perhaps its greatest significance lies in the fact that it was officially adopted, first by the board of directors of the AEF and then by the delegates at the Chicago convention, and subsequently was submitted to a vote of the AEF membership. The policy statement was approved by a majority of the mail ballots returned. It will be recalled that the original "Call to the Teachers of the Nation," while drafted and approved by a committee of the Progressive Education Association, was never formally adopted by either the PEA board or its membership—a fact which the association's president emphasized at the time the original "Call" was published. Thus the postwar policy statement has an official status lacking in the earlier pronouncement. To that extent it is a bolder action and a more significant pronouncement than the original "Call."

The "new call" also reflects a new strategy in the social-reconstruction-through-the-schools movement, a strategy of euphemism, double-talk, more guarded phraseology, and more cautious commitments. That undoubtedly was due, in part, to the necessity of modifications in order to find a broad basis of consensus and agreement within the larger group. We know, from a sympathetic report on the session at which the policy statement was adopted, that there were those in the group who were concerned lest the statement "commit the AEF to an advocacy of a socialistic economy"—Progressive Education, January 1948, Report on the National Conference, Archibald W. Anderson, assistant professor of education, University of Illinois.

Whether the final document avoided such a commitment is a matter of opinion. But it obviously provided a common ground, or a common roof, for those who, at one extreme, do advocate socialism and those who either do not advocate socialism or do not want to appear to the public or their colleagues in the teaching profession as advocates of socialism.

By fortunate circumstance, we are given an insight into the evolution of this particular document which is most enlightening. The AEF policy committee, of which Dean Ernest O. Melby, of the New York University School of Education, was chairman, designated Dr. Theodore Brameld, perhaps the most radical of the present-day leaders of the social-reconstruction-through-the-schools movement, to prepare the draft of the statement of policy for submission to the Chicago convention. Dr. Brameld's first draft was carried in full in the November 1946 issue of Progressive Education.

According to Professor Anderson's report on the Chicago convention, Dr. Brameld's original draft was discussed at length by the AEF board of directors and by delegates in the opening days of the Chicago meeting. Anderson adds:

They—

The directors—

appointed a committee to attempt certain modifications which seemed desirable. It was this modified form which was finally presented to the conference as a whole.

The official statement of policy, as adopted by the Chicago convention, was published in full in the February 1948 Progressive Education.

A sentence-by-sentence analysis and comparison of the original and final drafts is most enlightening. It discloses the attempt to modify the more extreme and forthright Brameld statement of policy to satisfy the apprehensions of more conservative, or at least more cautious, members. It also discloses, as I shall point out, that the camouflage operation was something less than perfect. There are numerous obvious give-away bare spots in the final product.

Following is an analysis of the most important portions of the policy statement:

First. The statement cites approvingly the trends, outside the United States, toward increasing public controls over "economic processes" and deplores the failure of this country to match these trends.

The following paragraph was adopted in the final draft unchanged from the original Brameld draft:

In only one great respect—though a most crucial one—the present decade differs from the twenties. While America seems to have learned little from its recent economic experience, other parts of the world have learned much. All over the earth powerful movements of the common people are demanding that these absurd and destructive fluctuations of the industrial system should end—that public controls be exerted over economic processes of sufficient strength and rationality to guarantee stability, much greater equalization of wealth, and the securities of a rising standard of living which the proven potentialities of abundance make entirely feasible.

The next paragraph shows the following interesting change:

Brameld draft: "America is out of step with the world."

Final statement: "Since the end of the war, America has shown a singular reluctance either to take cognizance of the democratic nature of these movements or to deal with the serious social problems which have called them forth."

Second. The original and final drafts also show some significant changes in the wording of the two major policy declarations of the American Education Fellowship.

Brameld draft: "The two great constructive purposes which should now govern the AEF follow directly from this brief analysis. They are:

"I. To channel the energies of education toward the reconstruction of the economic system—a system which should be geared with the increasing socializations and public controls now developing in England, Sweden, New Zealand, and other countries; a system in which national and international planning of production and distribution replaces the chaotic planlessness of traditional 'free enterprise'; a system in which the interests, wants and needs of the consumer dominate those of the producer; a system in which natural resources, such as coal and iron ore, are owned and controlled by the people; a system in which public corporations replace monopolistic enterprises and privately owned public utilities; a system in which Federal authority is synchronized with decentralized regional and community administration."

Final statement: "As a result of the analysis made above, two great constructive purposes have first claim for active support.

"1. The reconstruction of the economic system in the direction of far greater justice and stability; a system to be secured by whatever democratic planning and social controls experience shows to be necessary."

(Unchanged in two drafts.)

A system in which social security and a guaranteed annual wage sufficient to meet scientific standards of nourishment, shelter, clothing, health, recreation, and education are universalized; a system in which—

Brameld draft: "The majority of the people" is the sovereign determinant of every basic economic policy.

Final statement: "The will of the majority with due regard for the interests of all the people" is the sovereign determinant of every basic economic policy.

(Unchanged in two drafts.)

Brameld draft: "II. To channel the energies of education toward the establishment of genuine international authority in all crucial issues affecting peace and security; an order therefore in which all weapons of war (including atomic energy, first of all) and police forces are finally under that authority; an order in which international economic planning of trade, resources, labor distribution and standards is practiced parallel with the best standards of individual nations; an order in which all nationalities, races, and religions receive equal rights in its democratic control; an order in which 'world citizenship' thus assumes at least equal status with national citizenship."

Final statement: "2. The establishment of a genuine world order, an order in which national sovereignty is subordinate to world authority in all crucial interests affecting peace and security; an order therefore in which all weapons of war and police forces are finally under that authority; an order in which international economic coordination of trade, resources, labor and standards parallels the best practices of individual nations; an order geared with the increasing socializations and public controls now developing in England, Sweden, New Zealand and certain other countries; an order in which all nationals, races, and religions receive equal rights; an order in which 'world citizenship' thus assumes at least equal status with national citizenship."

It will be noted that the Brameld draft, as cited above, calls explicity for advocacy of Socialism, which he defines in detail. This detailed proposal of Socialism is omitted from the final draft. But note this: whereas the Brameld proposal to gear the economic system "with the increasing socializations and public controls now developing in England, Sweden, New Zealand, and other countries" appears in the section calling for "reconstruction of the economic system" in the United States, the final draft shifts this endorsement of "the increasing socializations and public controls now developing in England, and so forth" to the section of the policy statement dealing with "international economic coordination." Just how this relocation of this phrase makes the document any less an endorsement of Socialistic principles and methods is a puzzling question, to say the least. The Socialistic slip still plainly shows beneath the verbal outer-garments of the revised document.

Third. The sections of the two drafts dealing with the question of "classroom

indoctrination" are interesting. I cite these sections:

Brameld version: "In 'taking sides' against the unworkable economic system and unworkable nationalism, and with a workable system and workable internationalism, there is need to develop consciousness of a distinction between the convictions already held by those who take such sides and those who do not yet do so. This is necessary in order thereby to permit development of new educational techniques of learning through social agreement, not by superimposing prejudgments. Only thus can majority rule eventually become rule by an informed majority who understand what they want and how democratically to get what they want. The school should become a center of experimentation in attaining communities of uncoerced persuasion."

Final statement: "In implementing the above outlook there should be no attempt to indoctrinate for any political party or for any given economic system. It is vital to maintain democratic intelligent discussion and decision but also to make sure that the process will lead to conclusions. This can only be done by informed teachers who have convictions of their own—convictions which they do not foist upon their students but which at appropriate age levels they share with students. The task is to experiment with techniques of learning which look toward intelligent social consensus, not to superimpose prejudgments or dogmatic doctrines. Only thus can majority rule eventually become rule by an informed majority who understand what they want and how, democratically, to get what they want. The school should become a center of experimentation in attaining communities of uncoerced persuasion."

The original Brameld draft includes a concluding paragraph which was deleted from the final policy statement. It said:

To prove that education is not a mere mirror of dominant ideologies, not a device for bolstering outmoded economic systems and diseased nationalisms, but rather that education is a penetrating critic, dynamic leader, and imaginative recreator which anticipates dangers before they crystallize into calamities, which helps simultaneously to reshape the culture of America and the world in accordance with the imperatives of our revolutionary age—this is the supreme obligation of the American Education Fellowship in our time. This is its new policy.

Regardless of the professed repudiation of indoctrination, the policy declaration makes clear that certain "conclusions" by the pupils are desired as the result of the educational process.

Fourth. One other deletion from the Brameld draft is particularly noteworthy. Citing the alleged contradictions in public-school teaching regarding foreign affairs, the original and final drafts contain this identical wording:

They (schools) may study and endorse the United Nations, to be sure; and that is helpful. But they seldom face the contradiction between high-minded objectives for all nations and the still dominant power of sovereignty of each nation. Students are taught that internationalism is desirable; they are also taught that the United States is supreme in its own right. They are taught that all countries must cooperate; they are also taught that we should keep the secret of atomic energy. They are taught that we should support the efforts of common peoples in other parts of the world to rise in power; they are also taught to be uncritical of a foreign policy (which) when it serves to thwart those efforts.

In the original Brameld draft, the last sentence of the foregoing included seven additional words, so that it concluded:

They are also taught to be uncritical of a foreign policy which serves to thwart those efforts in countries like Greece, China, and Spain.

Obviously, the counsels of caution in the Chicago convention dictated that the AEF policy statement should not include this specific mention of Greece, China, and Spain which paralleled the ther prevalent Communist line.

Fifth. That the new AEF policy statement—regardless of its cautious double-talk—constitutes a new "call" to teacher activity and effort, in and out of the classroom, in support of increasing social controls and subordination of the United States to world government, is made clear by other sections of the draft finally adopted. Thus the final draft adds this paragraph to the original version:

Inasmuch as the forces that shape society are those that determine education as well, educators should understand what is taking place in the community, and should take stands as adult citizens on controversial issues of the day. It is their right and duty to participate actively in political and economic life.

Both the original and final drafts also declared that the "two great guiding principles"—those mentioned above—"involve a multitude of specific educational tasks to which the AEF should now devote itself." That these tasks relate to the curriculum and the classroom is made clear in the final draft, which varies only in minor details from the Brameld version:

Their precise delineation should involve every member and the closest cooperation with all groups and forces which share generally in its purposes. In this statement of policy, it is possible only to suggest what some of these tasks may be.

1. A subject of first importance in the reconstructed curriculum is the careful study of evolving economic and political systems characterized by developments both in our own country and in other countries.

2. Of great importance also is the study of both the successes and failures of attempts to move toward genuine world order.

3. As indicated above there is desperate need to prepare realistic materials regarding the economic system, and for skill in penetrating propaganda.

4. There is need to develop consciousness in students, teachers, administrators, and other citizens of the meaning and content of the values which should govern new social arrangements and purposes.

5. There should be extensive educational practice in building detailed social designs which come to grips with problems arising in, for example, social planning. Intensive study is needed of experiments and institutions already under way, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, the postal system, the consumer cooperative movement, the social-security programs of America and Europe. Psychological problems such as motivations and incentives; political problems such as bureaucracy and reorganization of State and Federal Governments; social problems such as neighborhood life and the role of women; economic problems such as the place of private property in an evolving democracy—

Incidentally, in the Brameld draft, the phrase "increasingly socialized order" was used instead of "an evolving democracy"—

problems of civil rights such as those raised by the President's committee on civil rights—these are equally pressing.

The finally approved draft also revived the appeal for adult education along the lines of the social reconstruction program:

Vital education of the adult population at the "grass roots" should occupy a place of importance comparable to education of youth, and should include all the issues exemplified above.

Sixth, the document as finally adopted proposes close cooperation and affiliation with other educational organizations. It urges that the AEF "seek to influence" these organizations "to experiment with its new materials and methods." It cites particularly UNESCO, and urges AEF to "push for recognition by the U. N. of the need to lift UNESCO above its present purely advisory status."

With respect to other educational organizations in the United States, the policy statement says:

Cooperation with the United States Office of Education is also important, looking toward crystallization of its own objectives and toward the provision of more authority to assist in improving the public schools. The National Education Association, American Federation of Teachers, Association for Childhood Education, and American Association for Adult Education should learn of the new AEF program, and should consider its reformulated ends and means just as they have done during the earlier period of AEF history.

The policy statement as adopted calls on the AEF to "support the democratic potentialities of the labor movement, the consumer cooperative movement, and quasi-political groups of sufficiently similar intent." Significantly, an additional phrase, "such as the Political Action Committee and Union for Democratic Action," which appeared in the Brameld draft, was deleted from the final statement. The Union for Democratic Action, incidentally, is the subject of extensive discussion in the Special Report on Subversive Activities Aimed at Destroying Our Representative Form of Government, of the House Un-American Activities Committee—Report No. 2277, June 25, 1942—which lists affiliations of 50 leaders of the UDA with the agencies and fronts of the Communist Party.

Seventh, the policy statement, as finally adopted, calls for the editorial content of the AEF's magazine, Progressive Education, to be "explicitly geared to these purposes." Furthermore, it states that the magazine "should give much more consideration to fundamental analysis of social, economic, political, scientific, esthetic, and philosophical issues arising from them, and it should assist teachers in putting AEF purposes and methods to work by providing actual materials and examples of where and how it is being done."

Eighth. This AEF policy statement, setting forth the postwar program and objectives of this movement, emphasizes that even the traditional educational objectives of the progressive education movement must be subordinated to the

task of social reconstruction. The statement as finally adopted, concludes as follows:

In making these important recommendations, the AEF will continue to support the kind of experimentation for which it is most famous. It will continue to emphasize "learning by doing," "community schools," "the integrating curriculum," "teacher-pupil planning," "child development," and other objectives of progressive education as these now become more widely accepted. These types of experimentation should emphasize the social-emotional development of children and adolescents, and parent education.

In terms of organizational imperatives, however, such objectives are now subordinate, even while indispensable, to the larger, more audacious and magnetic objectives impelled by a world in crisis. Faced by the alternatives of economic chaos and atomic war, on the one hand, of world-wide plenty and enforceable international order, on the other hand, the AEF should become the clearest, most purposeful educational spokesman for the second of these alternatives. Thus, and only thus, can it become even more the great vanguard influence which it has been for nearly three decades—an influence which, as before, is certain to extend far beyond its own membership and even its own country.

Social reconstruction and "world-saving" obviously still are to have top priority rating in the program of progressive education—a rating even above that of the less audacious and magnetic objectives of routine education.

And it is equally obvious that the progressive education leadership still claims, and expects to exercise, immense influence in more conservative educational ranks, despite the embarrassed efforts of some present-day leaders of educational officialdom to disprove the existence of the educational Peck's Bad Boy by denying or ignoring that existence.

The new strategy of the progressive education movement is that of guarded caution and carefully phrased euphemism, which, especially for the "outsider," obscures meanings and befuddles issues.

Of course, this is not characteristic only of the spokesmen of progressive education. Consider these statements from Schools for a New World, the twenty-fifth yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators, issued in February 1947:

The supreme problem of our society in our day, then, is the retention of the essence of our liberties—freedom of education, opportunity, choice of career, suffrage, speech, press, and assembly—while creating and establishing the controls of a democratic social order in which individual lives merge in a supreme entity of purpose and being that in itself is the ultimate goal. That means, inevitably, a vast stepping-up of the functions of government on all levels; it means a vastly increased emphasis in our schools upon education for civic and economic understanding and competence; it means a fundamental shift in emphasis throughout our whole educational program, from helping to educate the individual in his own right to become a valuable member of society to the preparation of the individual for the realization of his best self in the higher loyalty of serving the basic ideals and aims of our society.

* * * The realities of the world in which we now live endows "community" with a new meaning. It can no longer be merely "a body of people living under the same general conditions" (dictionary definition). If our civilization endures, it will be because community becomes both a primary and an ultimate functional entity—an end in itself (pp. 43–44).

Dr. Counts and others said all that 20 years ago—said it much more clearly and forthrightly.

Even more recent comments of advocates of social reconstruction through the schools disclose the persistence of the basic premises first set forth 20 years ago.

Thus we find Kennth D. Benne, professor of education at the University of Illinois, interpreting the role of the public school educator as that of social reconstruction in terms unmatched by Dr. Counts for complete frankness:

The central counsel of this number of Progressive Education to teachers and school administrators is that they come to see themselves as social engineers * * * They must equip themselves as "change agents."

The engineering of change must be anti-individualistic, yet provide for the establishment of appropriate areas of privacy and for the development of persons as creative units of influence in our society * * *

Individualism today tends to threaten rather than to promote the values of individuality. We are brought back to the processes of planned social change and to the formulation of an adequate methodology of social engineering as a necessary condition for the conservation and extension of democratic values. (May 1949 Progressive Education.)

This view holds that teachers are not only to be "social engineers," and "change agents," but that they must take a lead in the "development of skills necessary for creating common public judgments" which will have a priority over "unchecked private judgment." Educators are to help "groups and organizations to define and redefine those areas of life in which common values and standards are necessary." Educators are to take a lead in "inducing, directing, and stabilizing changes in persons, groups and organizations." Certainly that is acceptance with a vengeance of Dr. Counts' advice to teachers to "deliberately reach for power."

That the program of social reconstruction is still viewed in terms of collectivism is reaffirmed by Dr. John L. Childs as recently as February 1950. Writing in the Progressive Education magazine of that date, Dr. Childs asserts:

The fundamental interests of teachers as teachers are not restricted to the effort to get an adequate material and spiritual support for the public school. Teachers are also concerned with the effort to organize and maintain a society that can make a productive use of the human product of the schools. * * *

* * * We must develop a more sensitive regard for the cultural aspects of human existence, and be prepared to support a vastly extended program of community services. This, in turn, means frank commitment to the "welfare state," and to the planned organization of the productive enterprises of our country. The real issue is no longer one of social and economic planning versus an individualistic system of laissez-faire; it is rather one of what forces are to do the planning, by what means are controls to be exercised, and for what purposes. In sum, a functional education must now be associated with the task of the achievement of a more functional society, and teachers interested in democracy have a basic stake in the development of this functional society (p. 118).

Doctor Childs sums up the current attitudes of American educators in three categories: First, those who believe in the Communist solution of the problems, which group, he believes, "fortunately are very few," second, "a numerically large group" who feel that "resolution of social, economic and political problems" is not properly the responsibility of educators as educators but who believe they are justified in pressure tactics to secure greater support for the schools; third, a third group, with which he identifies progressive educators. He continues:

This third group * * * believes that in the long run both the material and the spiritual interests of public education depend upon the achievement of a reorganization of our economy. They therefore do not have faith in a policy that insists on teachers working separately as a mere educational pressure group, and which discourages from uniting with other functional groups in a common effort to develop an economy in which production will be cooperatively planned for the welfare of all * * * a more socialized economy (p. 120).

Dr. Childs believes that educators, by identifying themselves with groups "which are uniting to support the social, economic, and political developments which Americans have chosen to describe as the 'welfare state,' will be taking the step most needed to preclude a Fascist development in our country"—page 120.

Finally, Dr. Brameld in his recent book, "Ends and Means in Education," 1950, defines this concept of education with the apt term, "Reconstructionism."

This educational philosophy—

He asserts—

would attempt to build the widest possible consensus about the supreme aims which should govern mankind in the reconstruction of world culture. The world of the future should be a world which the common man rules not merely in theory, but in fact. It should be a world in which the technological potentialities already clearly discernible are released for the creation of health, abundance, security for the great masses of every color, every creed, every nationality. It should be a world in which national sovereignty is utterly subordinated to international authority. * * *

Education sufficiently dedicated to this purpose no longer remains, to be sure, on the fence of intellectual "impartiality" (pp. 17–18).

Further, Dr. Brameld declares:

The kind of education here being discussed encourages students, teachers, and all members of the community not merely to study knowledge and problems considered crucial to our period of culture, but to make up their minds about promising solutions, and then to act concertedly (p. 86).

The new terminology actually emphasizes and reaffirms the basic premises of the original social-reconstruction-through-the-schools movement, rather than altering or abandoning these premises.

XIII. "I PLEDGE ALLEGIANCE TO" WORLD GOVERNMENT

As the policy statement of the AEF discloses, a major addition has been

made to the program of social reconstruction through the schools. One of the "two great constructive purposes" which have "first claim for active support" in the public schools, according to this pronouncement, is "the establishment of a genuine world order, an order in which national sovereignty is subordinate to world authority in all crucial interests affecting peace and security; an order therefore in which all weapons of war and police forces are finally under that authority."

Dr. Brameld, in his "Ends and Means in Education," 1950, states it even more bluntly, though with a word of reproach that dedication to this ideal is not more complete:

There is widespread, if still superficial, acceptance among teachers of the belief that national sovereignty must go (p. 125).

This advocacy of a supernational sovereignty particularly welcomes an opportunity to promote supergovernment in the field of education, through UNESCO. Thus, Dr. Brameld writes:

The majority machinery of the United Nations, UNESCO, or any similar organizations created on behalf of world order should be so greatly strengthened that no member country, including the Soviet Union and its satellites, can conceivably refuse to abide by its own power-backed decision (ibid, p. 117).

The potentialities of UNESCO are similarly emphasized by I. L. Kandel, of Teachers College, Columbia University, writing in the April 1946 NEA Journal:

Nations that become members of UNESCO accordingly assume an obligation to revise textbooks used in their schools. The International Organization for Intellectual Cooperation sought to promote the revision of textbooks. * * *

For the present there is no provision for the scrutiny of textbooks in the UNESCO constitution on the assumption that they are matters within the domestic jurisdiction of the member nations in which the organization is prohibited from intervening. Under these conditions, each member nation, if it is to carry out the obligations of its membership, has a duty to see to it that nothing in its curriculum, courses of study, and textbooks, is contrary to UNESCO's aims. This task has already been undertaken through voluntary activities in the United States in the study of textbooks dealing with Latin American countries and Canada.

Recent history has shown, however, that unilateral efforts to revise the materials of instruction are futile. The poison of aggressive nationalism injected into children's minds is as dangerous for world stability as the manufacture of armaments. In one, as in the other, supervision of some kind by an international agency is urgent (pp. 175 ff.).

Implications of this proposal become even more ominous when read in conjunction with the following extracts from volume V of the UNESCO pamphlet series "Toward World Understanding." This volume, "In the Classroom with Children Under 13 Years of Age," 1949, says:

School textbooks have, as a rule, been written with so little objectivity and integrity that history, as generally taught up to now, has been an obstacle to international understanding. The child has been led to conclude that perfidy and oppression are always and solely the characteristics of the enemy. The need is urgent for a general revision of textbooks, both national and general (p. 16).

The pamphlet continues:

This revision, another task worthy of UNESCO, should carry much further the elimination of events which, from the world-education point of view, have no value, such as the endless catalogs of wars. It is not to these accidents which have periodically jeopardized and distracted civilization that the child's attention should be drawn, but to the constructive activities which help to advance civilization, materially and spiritually * * *. History must cease to be a military history and must become the history of civilization.

There is need above all for universal history. Just as the child must grow used to considering the earth as his habitat, so he must learn to consider the whole of humanity as the fatherland in whose service the particular fatherlands, his own and all others, are enrolled (p. 16).

The pamphlet deplores the fact that "before the child enters school his mind has already been profoundly marked, and often injuriously, by earlier influences"—page 7. Among these "injurious influences" are "errors of home training"—page 9—and the fact that "it is most frequently in the family that the children are infected with nationalism"—page 54. In the same vein, it points out:

As long as the child breathes the poisoned air of nationalism, education in world-mindedness can produce only rather precarious results. As we have pointed out, it is frequently the family that infects the child with extreme nationalism. The school should therefore use the means described earlier to combat family attitudes that favor jingoism (p. 58).

The pamphlet, which is a group report on a UNESCO seminar conducted in Lausanne, Switzerland, concludes:

Education for world-mindedness * * * is a political problem even more than an educational one, and the present position of the teachers does not, in general, permit them to intervene in the field of politics with requisite authority. * * *

We expressed the wish that UNESCO would persuade not only governments, but also public opinion, that the most urgent problem in the political field is the educational one, and, more particularly, that an intellectual and moral attitude favorable to international understanding and cooperation (which is civilization's only hope) can be promoted only by a school reorganized to this end and equipped with everything that is indispensable to its effort; that, consequently, the cost of such an enlightened education is a wise investment of the national income; and that activity of the school cannot bring about the desired result unless, repudiating every form of nationalism, the policy of the nation itself is one of international understanding and cooperation (p. 60).

Practical implications for American education of this new internationalism are revealed with disconcerting frankness in the Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education, vol. III, page 48:

The role which education will play officially must be conditioned essentially by policies established by the State Department in this country, and by ministries of foreign affairs in other countries. Higher education must play a very important part in carrying out in this country the program developed by the UNESCO and in influencing that program by studies and reports bearing upon international relations. * * * The United States Office of Education must be prepared to work effectively with the State Department and with the UNESCO.

It is interesting, in this connection, to read the view advocated by Lewis Mumford, for a number of years on the Committee on Teacher Education of the American Council on Education. In an address at a Conference on World Order in Rochester, N. Y., November 13, 1951, Dr. Mumford urged adoption by this country of a "universal policy" which "would offer" to the rest of the world "practical cooperation and tangible wealth and welfare."

Such an offer, Dr. Mumford holds, "would be hard to resist, all the more because we ourselves, as the wealthiest nation in the world, would by the very principles we uphold, have to pay the largest tax and receive the smallest amount of tangible benefits." That, of course, would be a super-Marshall plan.

The program of social reconstruction through the schools becomes something indeed to contemplate if and when American teachers become the handmaidens of the welfare state in America and, in addition, of a world welfare state with America picking up the check.

XIV. A SUMMING UP

Responsible public criticism of the schools is an American right and duty. It is the only way of progress and improvement. It is the only safeguard against unhealthy, harmful, and subversive developments.

Responsible criticism will inevitably include, from time to time, criticism of the type which some educators and some members of educational officialdom dislike and resent and, therefore, brand as "destructive."

Notable recognition has recently been given these elementary principles in the State of Michigan. The State superintendent of public instruction, Dr. Lee Thurston, has created a commission on educational policies which includes in its membership both professional educators and representatives of the lay public. This commission has undertaken to appraise public criticism of the schools, to encourage responsiveness on the part of educators to legitimate criticism, and to establish greater mutual understanding between school leaders and the public they serve.

In a communication to the school administrators of Michigan, the Commission has said:

In our American way, the supreme judge of the merits of the public school is the people. In the last analysis they pronounce the verdict.

I cannot commend too strongly this undertaking, or the spirit reflected in this statement. It has a direct relevancy to the movement here documented.

Insofar as there is a movement within public education circles to convert the schools into an agency of social reconstruction, into promoters of collectivism, socialism, or the welfare state, the American people have a right to be aware of that fact and to have full information regarding that movement.

They have a right, furthermore, to criticize the movement, to oppose it, to brand it as "subversive," and to hold educational leadership and members of the teaching profession strictly to account for it.

To deny these propositions is to deny the people the right and duty to "pronounce the verdict" on their own schools. To hold that the American citizen lacks the right to criticize, on the grounds that he does not possess sufficient "educational competence," is to say he lacks the competence of citizenship and the competence to pass judgment on what he desires either his society or his schools to be. I cannot think of any more undemocratic premise than that.

One of the current alibis for this social-reconstruction-through-the-schools movement deserves passing note. In his book, "This Happened in Pasadena" (1951), David Hulburd comments on the criticism offered during the Pasadena controversy that Dr. Kilpatrick and other Dewey disciples "advanced, especially in their written works, many radical, political, and economic theories." Of this Mr. Hulburd says:

> It might be remembered, however, that these radical theories had been advanced in the thirties, when it was not uncommon for genuine liberals to espouse points of view which they no longer hold (p. 53).

The record documented herein has clearly established that the basic points of view espoused in the thirties are still espoused by the leaders and disciples of this movement. These points of view are reaffirmed in the AEF Statement of Policy, in the writings of numerous progressive educators, and in modified form in the publications of the American Association of School Administrators.

As recently as early 1951, Kenneth D. Benne, in his presidential address at the National Conference of the American Education Fellowship in Philadelphia, was urging a new "Call to the Teachers of the Nation." Such a call, he said, "must have many elements in common with its forerunner of 1933"—Progressive Education, April 1951, page 195. And Dr. Benne pointed out that "the way of thinking which the—original—call represented was never absent after 1933 from the thinking and activities of organized progressive education." He even credited this "way of thinking" with influencing the National Education Association "to somewhat similar though more cautious conclusions."

The record does not bear out the effort of Hulburd to dismiss thus casually the "radical theories" of educators—and of this movement—in the thirties as "points of view which they no longer hold." The movement, as we have seen, persists, regardless of any changes of views on the part of some individuals.

Even if there are individual advocates of these theories who have subsequently abandoned these views, that fact would provide the strongest possible indictment of the proposal to promote social reconstruction through the classroom. A procedure can scarcely be dignified with the name "education" if it involves promoting certain theories among students which the advocates of those theories later casually discard. On such a basis, the schools would become merely the mirrors of the prevailing fads of so-called "liberals."

Educational officialdom and its spokesmen do the public schools a grave disservice by attempting to deny the record of the movement which is documented here. They perform an even graver disservice by attempting to suppress or "punish" discussion or criticism of this movement. A blanket denial is as unwarranted, and is as certain to create suspicion of the schools, as a blanket indictment of the schools.

I have endeavored throughout this documentation to avoid not only a blanket indictment of the schools but any resort to emotionalized denunciation. I have endeavored to describe and define a movement which, I believe, is subversive both of American principles and of sound education.

I believe that such a documentation will be welcomed not only by thoughtful American laymen, but by countless teachers and educators, who are concerned about certain trends in American life and education.

Out of the experience of assembling this documentation has come the conviction that the American educational system, like America itself, despite its shortcomings and vagaries, carries within itself the seeds of self-correction and improvement. It is my firm conviction and deep faith that responsible criticism within and outside the professional educational circles constitutes a logical and effective partnership in the continuing task of achieving better schools and better education.

I should like to emphasize one fact, which by the very nature of this documentation, has received scant recognition—the fact that the movement which I have here described has today, and from the very outset has had, outspoken and vigorous opponents within the educational profession. Present-day lay critics of this movement may take heart from this fact, for it is proof that their hostility to the movement does not arise solely from their "incompetence in educational matters" and it is assurance that they have powerful allies within the educational profession itself.

Immediately following Dr. Counts' historic address at the Baltimore convention, a Short Hills, N. J., teacher, Ellen Windom Warren Geer, raised these penetrating questions to which no effective answers have been supplied in the 20 years since:

> Shall we indoctrinate (young people) with social theories which seem sound to us today, but which, by the time our children are able to accomplish anything for their furtherance, may be hopelessly outdated, and the adherence to which will have incapacitated them for open-minded recognition of that fact? Or is there a higher courage in remaining faithful to the hitherto untried experiment of developing a courageous open-mindedness in the belief that so equipped, the new generation may be able, after they leave us, to cope with a changing civilization, only dimly foreseen by us, with far more wisdom than we can hope to attain ourselves? What course is truly "progressive?" (Progressive Education, April 1932, pp. 265 ff.)

Then there is the judgment offered by the distinguished American historian, James Truslow Adams, commenting on the "Call to the Teachers of the Nation":

> I do not see that the teachers of America have any right to set up as a "powerful organization," free from all influence outside—except for being guaranteed tenure and adequate compensation by the economic order which otherwise they are free to flout—to say precisely what the future society must be and to train the youth of the Nation to believe solely in the teachers' utopia.
>
> My experience with graduates of the public schools is that they have never been taught to use their minds or to learn the use of intellectual tools. It seems to me that there is a task calling for all the abilities of such teachers as we yet have, rather than shattering this world to bits to mold it nearer to the Teachers' Union's desire—even if the union could agree on a desire. (Progressive Education, October 1933, pp. 303-314.)

There is also the warning of John L. Tildsley, associate superintendent of the New York City public schools, offered in 1938, against the "seeming indifference" of the frontier thinkers "to the steady deterioration in an ever-accelerated degree in the quality of public elementary and secondary education in this country."

And Dr. Tildsley offered the further counsel that—

> The supreme need of America today is neither an immediate democratic collectivist society nor more complete academic freedom. It is the creation of a highly intelligent, social minded, self-disciplined, efficient body of citizens and a supply of thoroughly trained, courageous, strong-willed, potential leaders and administrators. (Social Frontier, IV: 319-322.)

There is the sober counsel offered by President Orville C. Pratt of the National Education Association in the NEA Journal of November 1936—page 238:

> Should we * * * not emphasize both sides of academic freedom? The issue of loyalty oaths would have made less headway if, in connection with the statement of our right of academic freedom, we had at the same time clearly and emphatically stated our duty to be absolutely loyal and to inculcate American ideals.
>
> As a result of neglecting to state the duty side of academic freedom, we find ourselves now in the position of being regarded in some quarters with suspicion. We know that the suspicion has no foundation in fact and we resent it. Under these circumstances what we ought to do is to assure the public that the teachers of America are overwhelmingly and intensely patriotic. By all means, let us insist on our rights, but let us be no less zealous in acknowledging and performing our duties.

There is the penetrating criticism of the AEF policy presented by two directors of that organization in 1948, Lester B. Hall, superintendent of schools of Highland Park, Ill., and Harold G. Shane, AEF vice president, and superintendent of schools of Winnetka, Ill.

In their criticism of this policy declaration, they wrote:

> It appears from study that a particular doctrine or body of dogma has been established, which presumably is to be accepted for implementation by members of the association. It does not seem that this acceptance of a "line" or "position" is compatible with the progressive tradition. (Progressive Education, April 1948, p. 110.)

Continuing, the educators point out:

In the policy * * * sharp criticism is directed at the present American economic organization, without any comparable attempt to analyze the strengths of the system. Nowhere in the document is a scholarly effort made to evaluate the strengths of a capitalistic organization, or to point to ways in which it might be improved. Instead, emphasis is placed by implication upon the strengths of a more socialized economy, which presumably has no weaknesses worthy of mention. Such a bias seems a marked and undesirable departure from the association's belief in free inquiry, full discussion, and intelligent decision in view of all pertinent facts.

This discerning criticism likewise points out that the policy statement constitutes "the tacit assumption of general approval of the direction being taken by most of the socialized states in the world today," and that "criticism of America's economic order and foreign policy in the document is not balanced by analysis of the policies of other nations, including those within the Russian orbit, whose policies are at least as much, if not more, open to question"—page 110, ibidem.

Finally, this criticism offers the stern warning that progressive educators "must avoid being duped by those who would use the liberal movement in American education for ends other than the orderly advancement and achievement of the ideals of free peoples"—ibidem, page 111.

There is the view expressed at the Barnard Forum in New York City in February of this year by Dean Francis M. Crowley, of the Fordham University College of Education:

The progressive social philosophy of education generates confusion and fosters disintegration. The school should not be used as an instrument to agitate for overthrow of existing society.

Finally, there is the discerning analysis of current "attacks" on the schools offered by Dr. Willard B. Spalding, dean of the College of Education of the University of Illinois, writing in the November 1951 Progressive Education. Dr. Spalding frankly acknowledges the existence of a "cluster of stereotypes" which have developed in the minds of a growing number of Americans with respect to progresive education.

One of these clusters—

He adds—

centers around the belief that progressive education is attempting to indoctrinate boys and girls with an idea about the form and nature of our society and the government which it should have, which will erode away or destroy the type of government which we now have. * * * In this cluster, we find that progressive education is directed toward indoctrinating belief in the welfare state; that the social-studies teaching is done by teachers who are opposed to the capitalistic system of free enterprise and favor socialism or some other brand of collectivism; and that progressive education is opposed to patriotism and to a belief in the fundamental principles which underlie our country.

Dr. Spalding refuses to attribute the persistence of such beliefs solely to the sponsorship of "self-seeking groups and individuals." He refuses to accept the explanation that they are "kept alive by subversive right-wing groups in order that they might strengthen their own treasuries or have some theme which they could use in their literature."

On the contrary, Dr. Spalding believes that whereas progressive education originally was concerned with "the development of the science of education," it has "somehow got off the track." He believes that dogma was substituted for scientific inquiry and adds that he "is proud to be one of many" persons who left the Progressive Education Association and the American Education Fellowship because of this trend.

With a frankness and fairness not always paralleled today by educational leaders, Dr. Spalding concludes:

Why do they (these stereotypes) persist and why are they so widespread? I submit that perhaps the major reason for this is the abandonment by the progressive-education movement of its early search for a science of education. * * *

The * * * cluster of stereotypes * * * about indoctrinating a political theory, is a direct result of publications of organizations like the AEF. Few teachers do what is charged against all, but people do not read the list of members, and attribute those ideas to all teachers.

Some of us feel that the progressive-education movement has been captured by a group who are more concerned with changing society than with improving the quality of instruction in the classrooms of America. I think that change in the direction of the movement, because of this change in leadership, has been unfortunate for American education as a whole. * * *

In the long run, we can only eliminate the sterotypes about education from the American mind by eliminating the conditions which cause them.

It is inexpressibly heartening to read these words.

I believe the elimination of the conditions in the American public school described by Dr. Spalding and documented herein is a joint concern and a joint enterprise of professional educators, elected public school officials and lay citizens and organizations.

I do not look to repressive legislation, to indiscriminate denunciation, to reckless witch hunting, or to the high-voltage emotional tactics of name calling, to accomplish this result.

Rather, I believe that the key to the elimination of these conditions lies primarily in full exposure of these conditions to public knowledge, in fearless criticism of the movement which has created the conditions, and in increasing public cooperation between educational leadership and all interested citizens through agencies and procedures exemplified by the Michigan Commission on Educational Policies.

MAJOR SOURCE MATERIALS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dare Progressive Education Be Progressive? Paper by Dr. George S. Counts, delivered at Baltimore meeting of Progressive Education Association, February 1932. Progressive Education, April 1932, pages 257–263.

Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order? Monograph by Dr. George S. Counts, April 15, 1932, incorporating material presented in three addresses, Dare Progressive Education Be Progressive? Education Through Indoctrination, and Culture, Social Planning, and Leadership.

A Call to the Teachers of the Nation, 1933; Committee on Social and Economic Problems of the Progressive Education Association.

Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commission on Social Studies, American Historical Association, 1934.

The Report of the Committee on Education for the New America of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association 1934 Proceedings, NEA.

The Social Frontier, a monthly journal published from 1934 to 1939.

Frontiers of Democracy, successor to the Social Frontier, published from 1939 to 1944.

Progressive Education, official journal of the Progressive Education Association, now the American Education Fellowship, 1932–51, inclusive.

Yearbook of the John Dewey Society, especially the First Yearbook, 1937, The Teacher and Society.

Proceedings of the National Education Association, 1932–51, inclusive.

Yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators, especially 1947 and 1952 editions.

A New Policy for the American Education Fellowship, November 1947, and February 1948, Progressive Education.

The Soviet Challenge to America, Dr. George S. Counts, 1931.

National Education Association Journal, 1933–51.

This Happened in Pasadena, David Hulburd, 1951.

Bulletin No. 35, National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education, NEA, Harold Benjamin, chairman, 1951.

American Education Under Fire, Ernest O. Melby, 1951.

A New Education for a New America, Prof. Harold J. Laski, the New Republic, July 29, 1936.

American Education and the Social Struggle, Theodore Brameld, Science and Society—a Marxian Quarterly, fall, 1936.

The Great Technology, Harold Rugg, 1933.

New Schools for a New Culture, Charles M. MacConnel, Ernest O. Melby, and Christian O. Arndt.

Design for America, Theodore Brameld.

Ends and Means in Education, Theodore Brameld, 1950.

Toward World Understanding, volumes I to VII, UNESCO.

Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education, volume III.

Who Owns Your Child's Mind? John T. Flynn, Reader's Digest, October 1951.

Who's Trying To Ruin Our Schools? Arthur D. Morse, McCall's magazine, September 1951.

The Civil Rights of Conservative Men in Education, the Case of Alpheus W. Ray, superintendent of elementary schools, Roseville, Calif., brief issued by California Sons of the American Revolution, 1951.

Eighth Report, Senate Investigating Committee on Education, State of California, 1951.

Statement to Michigan School Administrators, the Michigan Commission on Educational Policies, 1951.

The Pasadena Story, National Commission for the Defense of Democracy

Through Education of the NEA, June 1951.

School and Society, particularly October 29, 1949, Communism and Fascism in the Schools, John J. DeBoer; March 25, 1950, review of Communism and American Education, W. W. Brickman; April 22, 1950, the Politics of Scholastic Criticism, Col. George C. Reinhardt; July 22, 1950, Fear Is the Enemy, John J. DeBoer; October 14, 1950, What Is the Enemy? Col. George C. Reinhardt; January 20, 1951, the Danger of Authoritarian Attitudes in Teaching Today, Sidney Hook; February 10, 1951, Policy and Leadership of the American Education Fellowship, Frederick S. Breed; July 14, 1951, Mr. Breed and the AEF, Kenneth D. Benne, and the Scapegoat Value of American Public Education, Douglas Rush; July 21, 1951, Why Raise an Oath Umbrella? Thomas Woody; and October 27, 1951, In Defense of the Critics of Education, Hugh R. Fraser, education editor, Pathfinder magazine, and Attack and Counterattack in Education, W. W. Brickman.

Fortune, January 1952, the Social Engineers, and March 1952, Groupthink, William H. Whyte, Jr.

Investigation of Teachers Union, Local No. 555, UPWA-CIO, special subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 1948.

Atlantic Monthly, Quackery in the Public Schools, Lynd and Case, March and May 1950.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is recognized for 3 minutes.

GREAT FALLS AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a telegram from the Great Falls Chamber of Commerce, which reads as follows:

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *March 20, 1952.*
Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Wednesday morning's Tribune has Washington AP dispatch in which congressional House committee charged triplication and waste of manpower at Great Falls Air Force Base. Particularly commenting upon the burdensome function of keeping hundreds of certain roads in Montana open during winter. These, as you well know, are in conjunction with off-base secret installations which are classified as pertaining to national defense. Newspaper item also criticizes duplication of mess halls, where in fact new buildings are taking the place of old obsolete ones, the life of which was 5 years, but they have been built 10 years and that these buildings were constructed on authority of Army Air Force officials and properly passed through Congress.

It seems that everything mentioned in this dispatch is distorted and without foundation. Would appreciate it if you could inform the committee and Congress of the true conditions. Would appreciate your cooperation.

GREAT FALLS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
LLOYD M. CROXFORD, *President,*
A. J. BREITEINSTEIN, *Secretary.*

Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to me how a House subcommittee can make such charges on the basis of a 1-hour stopover at Great Falls Air Base. I understand the reason they stopped at Great Falls was not to investigate the base, but was due to engine trouble on their flight to Alaska.

There is, as near as I can find out, no basis for the charges made. The Air Force did not use personnel to clear and maintain roads, as this was done by the Montana State Highway Department. Insofar as housing is concerned, there is absolutely no duplication, but, as a matter of fact, there is a great need for more housing. Because of the lack of this needed housing, the Great Falls Air Base is in a sadly dilapidated state. This is deplorable when one considers that of all the air bases in the United States this is, in my opinion, the most important one in the entire Nation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WILSON of Texas and to include an editorial.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio and to include a radio speech.

Mr. O'TOOLE and to include an article from the Seafarers Journal.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia to revise and extend remarks made in Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter in two instances.

Mr. BRYSON and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. MCGUIRE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. MCGUIRE) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTEN.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania and to include an article.

Mr. ROBERTS (at the request of Mr. RAINS) and to include an editorial.

Mr. BROOKS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN.

Mr. DONOHUE and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. MILLER of New York in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee and to include an editorial.

Mr. LATHAM (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BAKEWELL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CHENOWETH.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter in remarks he made in Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. MULTER in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CANNON and to include a speech delivered in Chicago.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include an address recently made by Hon. James A. Farley.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. JENSEN and to include a statement.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MORANO (at the request of Mr. SEELY-BROWN) on account of illness.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. WALTER), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

Mr. HELLER on account of official business (SEC investigation).

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 20, 1952, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1012. An act to permit educational, religious, or charitable institutions to import textile machines and parts thereof for instructional purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 24, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1269. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the annual report of the Department of the Army relative to the disposal of Army excess personal property located in areas outside the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, for the calendar year 1951, pursuant to section 404 (d), title IV, of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1270. A letter from the chairman, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting the Thirteenth Semiannual Report of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, for the period July to December 1951, pursuant to section 9 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1271. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of the accounts and financial statements of certain banks and corporations supervised by Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 399); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 7176. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1628). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1184. An act to extend

the Youth Corrections Act to the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1629). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H. R. 7176. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 7177. A bill to authorize works for development and furnishing of water supplies for waterfowl management, lower San Joaquin Valley, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 7178. A bill to authorize works for development and furnishing of water supplies for waterfowl management, lower San Joaquin Valley, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 7179. A bill to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 7180. A bill to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 7181. A bill to appropriate $25,000,000 for the establishment of laboratories for research and study of foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases, as authorized by section 12 of the act of May 29, 1884, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. R. 7182. A bill to provide for the deduction by a divorced husband of certain payments for the support of minor children, for the reduction of the exemptions claimed by the divorced wife in such cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7183. A bill to amend section 112 (n) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to nonrecognition of gain from sale or exchange of residence) with respect to persons serving on active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 7184. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), to provide overtime compensation for employees of the postal transportation service for service in excess of 32 hours performed in any calendar week in which a holiday occurs; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McKINNON:

H. R. 7185. A bill to provide for research into and demonstration of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 7186. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to require Federal grand and petit jurors to take an oath of allegiance and subscribe to an affidavit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7187. A bill to provide reduced annuities at age 55 after 15 years of civilian service for persons involuntarily separated from the Federal service not by removal for cause; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 7188. A bill to provide that the additional tax imposed by section 2470 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code shall not apply in respect of coconut oil produced in, or produced from materials grown in, the Territory of the Pacific Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7189. A bill to amend the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which relate to machine guns and short-barreled firearms, so as to impose a tax on the making of sawed-off shotguns and to extend such provisions to Alaska and Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HESS:

H. J. Res. 407. Joint resolution designating the 7-day period beginning October 20, 1952, as Cleaner Air Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H. J. Res. 408. Joint resolution authorizing the Commissioner of Labor Statistics to prepare and publish a Consumers' Price Index and certain other indexes and budgets; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. Res. 585. Resolution authorizing the printing of the committee print entitled "Federal Educational Activities and Educational Issues Before Congress" as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Resolution of the Massachusetts Legislature, memorializing Congress to place a limitation upon the amount of money to be spent by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to place a limitation upon the amount of money to be spent by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusets: Resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to place a limitation upon the amount of money to be spent by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to place a limitation upon the amount of money to be spent by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 7190. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Como; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7191. A bill for the relief of Antonio Messina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7192. A bill for the relief of Luigi Rizzi, also known as Louis Rizzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 7193. A bill for the relief of Marina George Loizas Kellis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 7194. A bill for the relief of Adamantios Niamonitakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7195. A bill for the relief of Harilaos Filippos Ikonomou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 7196. A bill for the relief of Antonio Fopp; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 7197. A bill for the relief of William E. Ackerknecht; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 7198. A bill for the relief of Louis Joseph Rago; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 7199. A bill for the relief of Shung Yon Rhee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

643. By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Resolution of the Woman's Club of Irwin, Pa., demanding that immediate steps be taken to increase aircraft production so that, without delay, the air forces of the United States will be superior in type and number to any other in the world; to the Committee on Armed Services.

644. By Mr. PRESTON: Petition of the Uvalda (Ga.) Lions Club, relative to preservation of constitutional government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

645. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Walworth County Taxpayers Association, that Congress be urged to take note of the recommendations of its bipartisan fact-finding bodies such as the Hoover Commission, and adopt their recommendations as a move toward balancing the Federal budget, reducing Federal debt, and placing the Federal Government on an efficient and sound financial basis; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

646. Also, resolution of the Milwaukee County Highway Committee, requesting the Wisconsin Senators and Congressmen to assist in obtaining such radar equipment for General Mitchell Field; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 24, 1952

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

Almighty and most gracious God, whose mercy is from everlasting to everlasting and whose goodness is new every morning and fresh every evening: We bow before Thee in contrition and gratitude. In Thy light we would find wisdom for each perplexity, strength for each testing situation, safe guidance through every peril, and courage for every emergency.

We thank Thee for our ability to respond to good impulses. Incline our hearts to obey every beckoning finger which invites our souls to larger life. Make us eager to translate the glowing impulse into the worthy deed. Give us a divine discontent with low levels of life.

We bring our Nation to Thy throne. Protect, preserve, and unify our people. May we see Thee as the guardian of our Republic and the keeper of our destiny.