

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 4, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, March 1, 1954)

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

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

Eternal Father, whose glory is in all the world and whose grace is the breath of our very lives: We thank Thee for this day freighted with promise and wealthy with opportunity if we but seize it. Save us from missing its nobler calls by our prepossession with lesser and meaner concerns, so that when evening tints the sky "It might have been" will not be our sad lament. Give us the purpose and the patience to fill sunny hours with labor knowing that, after our brief and fitful day, the night cometh, when our work is done. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., March 4, 1954.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE, a Senator from the State of Nevada, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

STYLES BRIDGES,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MALONE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 3, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 153. An act for the relief of Wilhelm Engelbert;

S. 303. An act for the relief of Felix S. Schorr and his wife, Lilly Elizabeth Schorr;

S. 502. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Margareth Weigand; and

S. 827. An act for the relief of Matthew J. Berckman.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of

the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1883. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Franklin Jim, a minor; and
H. R. 2567. An act to amend the act of July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493), relating to the relief of certain disbursing officers.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1967. An act for the relief of the Stebbins Construction Co.; and
H. R. 3275. An act for the relief of the Bracey-Weish Co., Inc.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2984) to prohibit reduction of any rating of total disability or permanent total disability for compensation, pension, or insurance purposes which has been in effect for 20 or more years, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. POTTER, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Agriculture for salaries and expenses, Forest Service

(subappropriation fighting forest fires), for the fiscal year 1954 had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF BUREAU OF MINES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Bureau of Mines, Coal Mine Inspection Branch, and Health and Safety Division, Department of the Interior, for the period January 1 through December 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

A letter from the Secretary, Railroad Retirement Board, Chicago, Ill., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CENSUSES OF MANUFACTURERS, MINERAL INDUSTRIES, AND OTHER BUSINESSES

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 19, 1948, to provide for censuses of manufacturers, mineral industries, and other businesses, relating to the year 1954 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION OF STATISTICS OF COTTON

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cotton" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT, RELATING TO REQUIREMENT FOR FINAL PHYSICAL EXAMINATION IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to remove the requirement for a final physical examination for inductees who continue on active duty in another status in the Armed Forces (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate telegrams, cablegrams, and a letter in the nature of petitions from the Council of School Supervision and Administration of Ceiba; the Local Board Teachers Association of Ceiba; the Local Board Teachers Association of Aspiedras; local union No. 849, Sugar Industry of Camuy; the board of directors of the National Farm Loan Association of Puerto Rico of San Juan; the Rotary Club of Ponce; the Puerto Rico State Association of Letter Carriers of San Juan; the Secretary of Education, San Juan; the Puerto Rico Council of Boy Scouts of America, San Juan; the supervisory council, Puerto Rico Teachers Association, San Juan; and J. Acosta Henriquez, Rio Piedras, all in Puerto Rico, condemning the action of certain persons in attempting to assassinate Members of the House of Representatives, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MAINTENANCE OF BOSTON ARMY BASE FACILITIES—RESOLUTION OF DIRECTORS, NEW ENGLAND CHAPTER, NATIONAL DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION, BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the directors of the New England chapter, National Defense Transportation Association, with relation to the repair and maintenance of the waterfront terminal section of the Boston Army base. This subject is of great importance to those of us who reside in Massachusetts.

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

RESOLUTIONS OF NEW ENGLAND CHAPTER, NATIONAL DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION, ADOPTED, BOSTON, MASS., THE 9TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 1954

Whereas the National Defense Transportation Association has as its aims and objectives: To assist in effecting transportation preparedness for war. To make studies and reports upon special subjects and problems pertaining to all phases of transportation as they may affect requirements during an emergency. To bring to the attention of the people of our country the necessity for transportation preparedness and to stress the importance of transportation as a major factor in bringing an emergency to a successful conclusion; and

Whereas the National Defense Transportation Association, which membership consists of recognized experts in the field of transportation and allied industry, subscribes to said aims and objectives; and

Whereas the New England chapter, National Defense Transportation Association, has been advised of the proposal of the Department of the Army, that the section of the Boston Army Base known as the "waterfront terminal section" be leased, sold and/or declared excess to the Department of Army needs; and

Whereas Boston Army Base is the only terminal in New England with the necessary supporting facilities vital to the requirements of the military in times of national emergency; and

Whereas other pier facilities in Boston and/or New England are not sufficient in number or adequate in type; and

Whereas it is the further understanding of the New England chapter, National Defense Transportation Association, that the Department of the Army proposal is necessitated by the failure to allocate funds in the budget for needed repairs and rehabilitation; and

Whereas it is the opinion of the directors of the New England chapter, National Defense Transportation Association, that the waterfront terminal section of the Boston Army Base is a necessary facility in preparedness for periods of emergency; and

Whereas it is the considered opinion of the directors of the New England chapter, National Defense Transportation Association, as assembled, that the proposal to lease, sell, or declare excess is contrary to the best interest of national defense and preparedness; and

Whereas it is the considered opinion of the New England chapter, National Defense Transportation Association directors, as assembled, that it is the purpose of their organization to express themselves in such matters: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the directors of the New England chapter, National Defense Transportation Association, meeting at Boston, Mass., this 9th day of February 1954, advise the Defense Department, and the Armed Forces Committees of the Congress and the Senate of the United States, and all New England Members of the Congress and the Senate of the United States, that the proposed action of the Department of the Army to lease, sell, or declare excess the waterfront terminal section of the Boston Army Base is contrary to the interest of national defense and preparedness; therefore, be it further

Resolved, That the Department of the Army, the Armed Forces Committees, all Members of the New England delegation to the Congress and the Senate of the United States, be requested to recommend the allocation of funds for the maintenance and rehabilitation of the waterfront terminal facilities of the Boston Army Base.

PRICE SUPPORTS ON DAIRY PRODUCTS—RESOLUTION OF WASTEDO FARMERS UNION LOCAL 488, GOODHUE, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Wastedo Farmers Union Local, No. 488, Goodhue, Minn., concerning reduced price supports on dairy products, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY ABOUT 135 MEMBERS OF THE WASTEDO FARMERS UNION LOCAL, NO. 488, AT MEETING HELD FEBRUARY 15, 1954, IN THE LEON TOWNSHIP HALL, GOODHUE COUNTY, MINN.

Resolved, That we are alarmed at the drastic action taken by Secretary Ezra Benson in reducing price supports on dairy products to 75 percent of parity.

That this action will not only destroy farmers' buying power but will in turn injure the economic structure of all business in agricultural areas.

That our congressional representatives should at this session of Congress take legislative action to annul such unfair drastic administrative action taken by the United States Department of Agriculture.

That the lowering of price supports on soybeans, flax, and dairy products in addition to acreage cuts already provided for will mean that farmers are headed for a severe economic depression in 1954.

ARTHUR E. HAGSTROM,
Secretary, Wastedo Farmers Union
Local No. 488.

CONGRESSIONAL AND JUDICIAL SALARIES—RESOLUTION OF THE 11TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT BAR ASSOCIATION OF MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the 11th Judicial District Bar Association of Minnesota, on February 15, in favor of increasing congressional and judicial salaries, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE 11TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT BAR ASSOCIATION OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Resolved, That the 11th Judicial District Bar Association of the State of Minnesota

hereby approves United States Senate bill No. 1663 introduced by Senator McCARRAN, of Nevada, to increase the salaries of Members of Congress, judges of the United States Court, and United States attorneys, and urges the Honorable EDWARD J. THYE, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, and the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK to lend their support to the passage of said legislation.

Adopted and approved by the 11th Judicial District Bar Association of the State of Minnesota February 15, 1954.

DIRECT PRODUCTION PAYMENTS FOR DAIRY PRODUCTS—RESOLUTION OF ROCK CREEK BOOSTERS CLUB, ROCK CREEK, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Rock Creek Boosters Club, Rock Creek, Minn., at its meeting on February 9, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred. The resolution expresses approval of the principle of direct production payments for dairy products.

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

The following resolution was unanimously adopted at the February meeting of the Rock Creek Boosters Club held at the C. Edwin Peterson farm home on February 9, 1954:

"Whereas the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson has declared he will seek a reduction from 90 to 75 percent of parity on dairy products; and

"Whereas the dairy farmers of the northwest are greatly disturbed by the act of the Secretary of Agriculture in singling out the dairy farmer for such drastic cut in his income; and

"Whereas the farmer's cost of operating his farm is at its highest peak, as to tractors, farm machinery, repairs, gas labor, taxes, etc.; and

"Whereas the present method of handling by the Government the purchasing and storing of dairy products are not feasible nor economical: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we favor the principle of direct production payments for dairy products, thereby consuming all the dairy products at its market place; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to our Senators and Congressmen, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C."

JOHN E. JOHNSON,
President, Rock Creek, Minn.
Mrs. ERVIN NELSON,
Secretary, Pine City, Minn.

After the meeting adjourned the following members signed the resolution and are on file with the secretary:

John E. Johnson, Rock Creek, Minn.; Gunnard Shoberg, Rush City, Minn.; Clifford Shoberg, Rush City, Minn.; Ernest Olson, Rush City, Minn.; Gust Christenson, Rush City, Minn.; Elmer Johnson, Rush City, Minn.; C. Edwin Peterson, Pine City, Minn.; Harold E. Peterson, Pine City, Minn.; Ervin L. Nelson, Pine City, Minn.; Louis Baum, Pine City, Minn.; Mrs. Alice Nelson, Pine City, Minn.; Mrs. Harold Peterson, Pine City, Minn.; Mrs. C. E. Peterson, Pine City, Minn.; Mrs. Freda Johnson, Rock Creek, Minn.; Mrs. Hannah Johnson, Rush City, Minn.; Mrs. Edith Christenson, Rush City, Minn.; Mrs. Mabel Shoberg, Rush City, Minn.; Mrs. Margaret Olson, Rush City, Minn.; Mrs. Viola Baum, Pine City, Minn.

EMPLOYMENT OF AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION AGENTS — RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, DULUTH, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the Duluth, Minn., Chamber of Commerce, on February 23, proposing the employment of Agricultural Extension Agents in the Forestry Division of the Department of Agriculture.

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

Whereas the Duluth Chamber of Commerce, through its agricultural council and its forestry committee, is cognizant of the vast amount of privately owned land in northeastern Minnesota which is suitable for forestry purposes, such as production of pulp, fence posts, veneer, and saw logs, which would supplement other regular farm income; and

Whereas those owning such lands are in need of technical assistance to aid them in planning a well managed, long-range forestry program; and

Whereas such special assistance has been made available in Itasca County by the employment of an extension agent in forestry, demonstrating, beyond all doubt, the value of such technical assistance in forestry to private land owners.

Therefore the Duluth Chamber of Commerce, through its agricultural council and forestry committee, resolves that the Congress of the United States give very serious consideration to the matter of shifting existing funds within the Department of Agriculture which would permit employment of agricultural extension agents in forestry; that these agents in forestry be located in the agricultural extension offices of the several counties in northeastern Minnesota, working and cooperating with the agricultural extension agent and other cooperating agencies to develop a long-range forestry management program which would benefit not only the private land owner who has land suitable for growth of trees, but would benefit society in general by making greater and wiser use of our natural resources; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Congressmen and Senators in Washington, and that a copy be sent to the Director of Extension at University Farm, St. Paul, Minn.

RESOLUTIONS OF ROSEAU COUNTY (MINN.) FARMERS UNION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two resolutions adopted by the Roseau County Farmers Union, favoring a price support of 100 percent on farm commodities, and opposing the selling out of Government projects to private power companies, be printed in the RECORD.

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

ROSEAU COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
Roseau, Minn., February 18, 1954.
Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: At our last Farmers Union County Board meeting we passed these two resolutions:

"The Roseau County Farmers Union Board, representing 800 farm families, goes on rec-

ord favoring a price support of 100 percent or full parity on all farm commodities"

"The Roseau County Farmers Union Board goes on record opposing the selling of our Niagara Falls or any other Government project to any private power company for generating purposes."

Sincerely,

Mrs. TILFORD WICKLANDER,
Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS OF OKLEE FARMERS UNION, LOCAL 157, OKLEE, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two resolutions adopted by the Oklee Farmers Union Local, No. 157, Oklee, Minn., on February 12, favoring a price support of 100 percent of parity on farm products, and extending the REA program, be printed in the RECORD.

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

OKLEE, MINN., February 18, 1954.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: When we, the members of the Oklee Farmers Union Local, No. 157, Red Lake County, in a meeting assembled on Friday, February 12, 1954, the following resolutions were passed representing our 144 members:

"RESOLUTION 1

"A resolution was passed asking a support price of 100 percent of parity on all farm products including perishables with marketing quotas or production controls if necessary.

"Therefore we urge you to vote and strongly support this legislation when it comes up in Congress."

"RESOLUTION 2

"We favor extension of the REA program and further development of dam sites and hydroelectric power by the Federal Government. Cooperatives and municipalities to have first preference of such power. We are opposed to the proposed plan where cooperatives would be required to estimate their power needs for 20 years in advance. It would be impossible to estimate the needs for even a short time in advance due to the rapid increase of power needs."

Therefore we urge you to strongly support the extension of the REA and to strongly oppose and vote against the new power policy on the proposed plan requiring 20 years advancement estimates of power needs when it comes up in Congress.

OKLEE FARMERS UNION LOCAL,
Mrs. ALFRED SYRTVEIT,
Secretary-Treasurer.

RESOLUTION OF PINE ROCK GRANGE 775, PINE CITY, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by Pine Rock Grange, No. 775, Pine City, Minn., on February 17, demanding 90 percent of parity for dairy farmers, be printed in the RECORD.

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

PINE CITY, MINN., February 18, 1954.

Hon. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY:

The Pine Rock Grange, No. 775, at their meeting on February 17, passed a resolution demanding 90 percent parity for the dairy farmers and instructed me to send you a copy of same.

PINE ROCK GRANGE, No. 775.
JOE KARAS, Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS OF GOOD HOPE LOCAL, MINNESOTA FARMERS UNION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two resolutions adopted by the Minnesota Farmers Union, Good Hope local, on February 17, to extend the present price-support program, and concerning the imports of oats, barley, rye, and wheat, be printed in the RECORD.

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

We, the 95 family members of the Minnesota Farmers Union, Good Hope local, Pennington County, Minn., at local meeting held at B. F. Bieswenger home February 17, 1954, offer the following resolutions:

"RESOLUTION 1

"1. We urge that our Congressmen and Senators extend the present price-support program until its committees can develop a program that will give the farmers 100 percent of parity, which will be fair to producers and consumers alike.

"2. We urge that Congress take account of the Secretary of Agriculture setting the price of dairy products at 75 percent of parity and have them moved up to present levels which expire March 31, 1954.

"3. We are agreed that food occupies a position in the present international situation, where it is properly classified as a defense weapon.

"We urge, therefore, that congressional policies be written which will specify the upper and lower limits of the reserves of food and fibers and other agricultural products which are necessary to be maintained in the national interest, but that such reserves should be surrounded by safeguards which will effectively insulate them. Farmers should not be forced to assume the cost and other burdens of such reserves, when they are created in the national interest."

"RESOLUTION 2

"1. We urge our Congressmen and Senators deal promptly with the imports of oats, barley, rye, and wheat, when these imports of grains endanger the interests of the farmers and the Government.

"2. These imports are a direct abuse of price-support program.

"We urge once more that Congress take appropriate and prompt action to halt the imports of farm commodities that prevent attainment of the goal of parity prices."

JOE JOHNSON,

President.

Mrs. C. H. BEISWENGER,
Secretary.

EXCISE TAX ON TELEPHONE SERVICE—RESOLUTION OF BRAHAM FARMERS MUTUAL TELEPHONE ASSOCIATION, BRAHAM, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Braham Farmers Mutual Telephone Association, Braham, Minn., at their annual meeting, urging the elimination of the 15-percent Federal excise tax on telephone service, be printed in the RECORD.

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

STANCHFIELD, MINN., February 23, 1954.
Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the annual meeting of the Braham Farmers Mutual Telephone Association the resolution written below was decided on in committee. The chairman, Mr.

Charles A. Pearson, reported to the directors and delegates in regular session. This director organization represents 11 rural telephone companies around the Braham, Minn., area.

On motion seconded, and carried L. L. Schaeffer, secretary, was ordered to spread on records said motion; and to send a copy to each Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Hon. EDWARD THYE, and Hon. ROY WIER.

"Whereas there is now imposed a Federal excise tax of 15 percent of telephone service which imposes a severe and, we think, an unjust burden and additional cost on all telephone users, local as well as long distance. This tax steps up to 25 percent on calls over 24 cents charge. Since this tax as it is now applied has a crippling effect on small independent companies, it should receive the consideration of the tax-making bodies: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we the directors of the Braham Farmers Mutual Telephone Association, in annual meeting assembled, and representing 210 rural telephone stations, do hereby respectfully urge the elimination or reduction of these discriminatory taxes."

Respectfully submitted.

L. L. SCHAEFFER,
Secretary, Braham Farmers Mutual Telephone Association, Braham, Minn.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2911. A bill to provide for the development of a sound and profitable domestic wool industry under our national policy of expanding world trade, to encourage increased domestic production of wool for our national security, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1044).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 3068. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, relative to the process of selection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 3069. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 3070. A bill to govern the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of water; and

S. 3071. A bill to amend the act authorizing agricultural entries under the nonmineral land laws of certain mineral lands in order to increase the limitation with respect to desert entries made under such act to 320 acres; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 3072. A bill for the relief of Spirodon Karousatos; and

S. 3073. A bill for the relief of Julius Rutigliano (Giulio Rutigliano); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 3074. A bill to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 to authorize the disposal of certain Federal surplus property to State

and local units of the United States Civil Defense Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

DEVELOPMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAYS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which I believe will provide adequate funds from the Federal Government for the development of the Nation's highways. I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement in connection with the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Michigan may proceed.

The bill (S. 3069) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FERGUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, there is no substantial disagreement about the need for much swifter and broader action in the development and maintenance of our national highway system. The need is great, and bold action is required. This bill authorizes bold action.

The bill provides a total of \$2,208,000,000 for each of the 2 fiscal years, 1956 and 1957, for the Federal share of our highway program.

On the principal Federal-aid systems, where funds are matched by State and local agencies, this bill proposes \$2,175,000,000 against authorizations in the 1952 act of \$575 million for each year.

A large increase is proposed in funds available for the national system of interstate highways, from \$25 million to \$900 million. Large increases are also proposed for the Federal primary, secondary, and primary highways in urban area systems.

The bill I have introduced would also authorize the sum of \$100 million for defense highways, including circumferential highways around a city or intracity radial routes. I believe this is an important authorization in the bill because it will make funds available for development of necessary civil defense highways. These highways, necessary also in the everyday development of our cities, would also play a vital role in military and civil defense should such a need ever arise. They too, would be invaluable as evacuation routes, and, also, as means of bringing support and assistance to areas affected in case of a bombing attack. I believe this Nation will be much better off if we construct evacuation highways for civil defense which can also be used every day rather than build bomb shelters that we hope will never be used.

In addition to these features, which I believe mark a positive, constructive and adequate approach to our highway problem, this bill contains highly desirable new legislative features.

First. The funds authorized in the bill would be apportioned among the States on the basis of a modified formula. One-half of the funds would be apportioned on the basis of existing law and one-half on the basis of the proportionate number of motor vehicle registrations in each State. I believe this is a sounder approach because our highway problem exists where the cars and trucks are and this bill would attack the problem directly.

Second. The entire amount for the farm-to-market roads of the Federal secondary system would be made available for disbursement to the States on a certification that the plans meet the requirements of the individual State. This would give States the opportunity to use their own initiative and resourcefulness to get maximum mileage in the secondary system. It would answer the criticism of some that greater mileage would be possible except for the standard required by the Bureau of Public Roads.

Third. Authority would be provided for the President to advance allocations made under this bill by 1 year if he finds that such a speedup would be desirable as a means of increasing employment.

Fourth. In order to assure that adequate consideration is given to the civil-defense aspects of highways, the bill directs that Federal highway officials consult periodically with the Federal Civil Defense Administrator.

Fifth. The bill provides a new and broadened section authorizing research activities on the part of the Bureau of Public Roads. I have felt for some time that research in highway planning and construction has not kept pace with the development of modern motor vehicles and believe this new authority will be beneficial in that respect.

Sixth. Because existing Federal legislation in the field on highways is contained in numerous different acts running back for many years, this bill directs the Federal highway officials to transmit to Congress a draft of consolidated and codified Federal highway legislation which I hope will eliminate some of the difficulty and confusion which now exists.

The sums which would be authorized in this bill are based on two separate and unrelated sets of facts:

First. The deficiencies in the federally supported highway systems is estimated by the President in his economic report to be \$35 billion. This bill contemplates a 15-year program of restoration of our national highways, at the rate of about \$2.2 billion per year. This bill is adequate to eliminate the existing backlog of highway needs within a reasonable period.

Second. This bill will authorize a sum approximately equal to the amount of revenue collected by the Federal Government from various highway-use taxes, including gasoline, oil, and various excise taxes on vehicles, tires, and accessories.

I hope an early public hearing will be held on the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at the conclusion of my remarks a comparative table of the au-

thorizations under the current act and those proposed by my bill.

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

Comparison in authorizations in Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 and proposed authorization in Ferguson bill

Item or category	1952 act, Public Law 413, 82d Cong. for 1954-55 fiscal years	Ferguson bill, 1956-57 fiscal years
Federal-aid system:		
Primary system.....	\$247,500,000	\$425,000,000
Secondary system.....	165,000,000	350,000,000
Primary system in urban areas.....	137,500,000	350,000,000
Interstate system.....	25,000,000	900,000,000
Defense highways, including circumferential highways.....		100,000,000
Total, Federal-aid system.....	575,000,000	2,125,000,000
Federal roads:		
Forest highways.....	22,500,000	22,500,000
Forest-development roads and trails.....	22,500,000	22,500,000
Park roads and trails.....	10,000,000	10,000,000
Parkways.....	10,000,000	10,000,000
Indian roads and trails.....	10,000,000	10,000,000
Public lands roads.....	2,500,000	
Total, Federal roads.....	77,500,000	75,000,000
Total, each fiscal year.....	652,500,000	2,200,000,000
Total, for both years.....	1,305,000,000	4,400,000,000
Special authorizations:		
Inter-American Highway.....	16,000,000	16,000,000
Other.....	65,500,000	
Total, special authorizations.....	81,500,000	16,000,000
Grand total.....	1,386,500,000	4,416,000,000

SUBMISSION OF INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS TO THE SENATE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I did not want to take the time of the Senate last night in connection with Senate bill 3067 which I introduced at that time for myself and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], but I would like to briefly call it to the attention of the Senate at this time.

The bill would require the State Department to transmit to the Senate within 30 days the text of any executive agreement or other international agreement to which the United States is a party. The bill also provides that the President of the Senate shall refer the agreement to the appropriate committee of the Senate, or the appropriate joint committee.

At the present time, the State Department is required by section 102 of the United Nations Charter to send the text of these international agreements to the U. N., but there is no requirement that they advise the United States Senate.

I believe this is completely unreasonable, so the Senator from California and I have introduced corrective legislation.

We would be pleased to have other interested Senators join us in sponsoring this proposed legislation.

JOHN SAUDAS—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on the Consent Calendar, last Tuesday, the Senate passed and sent to the House Senate bill 1138, for the relief of John Saudas. I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which that bill was passed, and I have been advised by the Parliamentarian that it will be necessary that the House be requested to return the bill to the Senate. There are certain features of the bill which I should like to consider further. I have discussed the matter with the majority leader.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion to reconsider the vote will be entered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I move that the House be requested to return the bill to the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware requesting the House to return to the Senate, Senate bill 1138.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, as acting majority leader, I wish to commend the Senator from Delaware for the action which he has just taken. This is another example of the able manner in which the Senator from Delaware performs his senatorial duties. The motion involves a very serious matter, and as a result thereof the Senate will be required carefully to review proposed legislation passed this week on the Consent Calendar. I am very proud that the Senator from Delaware invites our attention to the seriousness of some of our actions, particularly when they appear to be ill considered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

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

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

By Mr. FERGUSON:

Statement prepared by him on the anniversary of Hungarian Independence Day.

Statement prepared by him on the anniversary of the Soviet nomination of Rumania.

DECLARATION OF UNITED STATES SOVEREIGNTY OVER AREAS OF THE ANTARCTIC CONTINENT

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, recently I have noted the interest being taken by the press and radio in my resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 127,

declaring United States sovereignty over certain areas of the huge Antarctic Continent. This resolution is a companion measure to House Joint Resolution 353, introduced in this Congress and in prior Congresses by Representative TOLLESON, of Washington. In section 1 of the joint resolution, specific meridians, 90° to 150° west longitude, are given as boundaries of an area which American citizens have explored and which has not yet been claimed by any other country. Under section 2 of the joint resolution, all other American explored lands are included, and the President is requested to take necessary steps leading toward negotiation for the recognition of our claims in the areas which have been explored by Americans, but which today lie within the formal paper claims of other nations. I mention these two main sections of the joint resolution because in some press accounts the distinction between them has not always been clearly understood.

In taking action on a measure of this kind, the Congress will not in any way encroach upon the conduct of foreign affairs, which is rightly in the hands of the executive branch of our Government; but especially in regard to the tract not claimed by any other nation, the Congress quite properly has an opportunity to pass upon the declaration of our sovereignty. I hope the Foreign Relations Committee will soon find an opportunity to consider the joint resolution.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a portion of a newscast by David Wills over the National Broadcasting Co. network on February 16, 1954, on the program Three Star Extra, originating in Washington, D. C. I believe the commentator is to be commended for his research work in connection with claims of the United States as to parts of the Antarctic Continent.

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

Bills have been introduced in Senate and House to declare American sovereignty over parts of the Antarctic Continent, specifically the area between the 90th and 150th meridians of longitude. This incidentally, is the worst stretch of coast on that whole frigid continent. No one has ever landed upon it from the sea, and no other country claims it.

Up to now the American official position has been that while we do not claim any land in Antarctica, we reserve the right to make any claims we wish and meanwhile we don't recognize the claims of any other country.

The Argentinians, the Chileans, and the English keep up a running quarrel over that part of Antarctica opposite South America, tear each others' huts down, sail a cruiser by to show strength, but never get too rough.

The Norwegians, English, Australians, New Zealanders, and the French have mutually recognized each others' claims, some of them rather tenuous; only one New Zealander has ever even seen the place.

The Russians thought they had a brave right since 1820 when an explorer named a cape Alexander the First Land, but it turned out to be only an island.

While no one lives in Antarctica, 10,000 men visit it yearly for whaling, and a land mass twice the size of the United States must have abundant minerals. The ice

caps make them unworkable right now, but who knows what technological progress and atomic power may make possible in the future. A couple of centuries ago when the beaten French had to choose between ceding a couple of Caribbean islands or Canada to the English, they kept the then rich islands and surrendered the unwanted colds of Canada—now a fabulously wealthy nation.

The wealth of Antarctica may some day be opened up, and America will want her share, earned by many brave and successful explorations.

SURPLUS FOODS FOR NEEDY AMERICANS

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, on February 3, I addressed identical letters to the Secretaries of Agriculture, Labor, and Health, Education and Welfare, urging swift action to establish a system whereby surplus foods in Government stocks can be more readily distributed to needy American citizens, particularly unemployed persons and elderly people receiving inadequate pensions and insurance, and requesting that the Departments assign staff experts to cooperate with me in drafting proposed legislation.

As of today, I have received replies from the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Agriculture. The Department of Labor has offered to detail a staff man to work with me in the preparation of proposed legislation, but the Department of Agriculture has reported that "its studies and discussions have not progressed to the point where specific legislation can be formulated." The Department of Welfare has not yet replied to my letter dated 1 month ago.

A great many individuals from all parts of the country have written me about this proposal. I have also received a large number of thoughtful comments and suggestions from leaders of organizations concerned with this problem.

As matters of interest to the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the following communications relating to this food disposal plan be printed in the RECORD at this point:

From the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Labor, the Iowa Food Distributors Association, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, the Cooperative League of the USA, the National Association of Retail Grocers, and the Iowa CIO Council.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., February 12, 1954.
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your letter of February 3, concerning the possibility of using surplus food stocks to improve the diets of groups within this country with limited amounts of money to spend for food.

We appreciate and share your concern over the size of Government-held inventories and the need to find constructive uses for such surpluses without dislocating normal trade channels. Moreover, we are in complete agreement with the principle expressed in your letter that maximum use of such foods

should be made in meeting the need of some of our citizens for improved diets before wide-scale dispositions are made for foreign relief purposes.

Many persons in this country are now benefiting from our donations of surplus foods. During this fiscal year, we now estimate that at least \$170 million worth of surplus foods will be distributed to over 9 million children in school-lunch programs and 1 million inmates of charitable institutions.

This use of surplus foods is being accomplished under our program of direct distribution, for which both the Federal Government and the States share responsibility. This Department arranges for and underwrites the costs incident to such donations up to the time such foods are delivered in carload lots to the States. The States are responsible for all subsequent costs of handling and delivery to eligible groups. Through the extensive use of existing storage and transportation facilities, States have developed quite effective delivery systems, with a minimum of out-of-pocket costs.

Needy families also are eligible to receive surplus foods under our present program of direct distribution. However, until recently, there has been but limited demand for such distribution; donations to needy families have been made only in certain areas in a few States and to Indian families on reservations. Recently, there has been a marked increase in interest in, and requests for, distribution on a family basis. In this connection, we want to point out that the Department has held that needy families are not necessarily limited to those receiving general assistance or welfare grants such as old-age assistance. Rather, as far as surplus commodities are concerned, needy families are those certified by State or local officials to be in need of additional food.

In response to these requests for family distribution, such donations are being accomplished as rapidly as States are able to arrange for the certification of applicant groups as needy and for the local handling and distribution of the commodities. We want to point out, in this connection, that the majority of States would be required to make considerable realignments in their delivery organizations (now based upon relatively infrequent deliveries to relatively large-volume users) in order to accomplish any wide-scale family distribution. Nonetheless, substantial progress is being made. Our latest report indicates that States are now providing surplus foods to 283,000 needy persons and that this number will shortly be increased by at least an additional 130,000 persons. Dairy products—butter, cheese, and dry milk—are making up a substantial portion of this distribution, since the Commodity Credit Corporation holds no stocks of dried eggs and canned beef, purchases were limited to the quantities that could be used by existing outlets at the time the purchase was made.

We recognize there are certain limitations of this method of using surplus foods to improve family dietary levels. Therefore, we are now studying the advantages and disadvantages of alternative or additional methods of accomplishing such an objective. We have been discussing various approaches with Senator AIKEN and other members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and with the House Committee on Agriculture. However, these studies and discussions have not progressed to the point where specific legislation can be formulated.

If you should wish more detailed information on the current status of our program of direct distribution, particularly in relation to donations to needy families, we will be happy to supply it.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. BENSON,
Secretary.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, February 16, 1954.
The Honorable GUY M. GILLETTE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 3 and your telegram of February 13. This reply was delayed pending my return this morning from California.

I have been advised by the Secretary of Agriculture that his Department has already devoted a great deal of time and effort to this vital problem in cooperation with the Senate Committee on Agriculture under the chairmanship of Senator AIKEN and that these deliberations have and will explore many possible solutions to the problem including the one you propose. I understand that the Labor Department will be called upon shortly to participate fully in these undertakings.

However, this Department is ready to cooperate with you in every possible way and I have asked Mr. George Tobias, program specialist attached to my office, to contact you and determine how best the Labor Department can be of service.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES P. MITCHELL,
Secretary of Labor.

IOWA FOOD DISTRIBUTORS ASSOCIATION,
Des Moines, Iowa, February 10, 1954.
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE,
United States Senator from Iowa,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: Thank you very much for your letter of February 5, and especially so for sending a copy of your letter to Secretary of Agriculture Benson, in which you suggest a procedure that will be helpful in proper utilization of the tremendous supply of foods purchased under the price-maintenance program.

Certainly the need for some action in this matter is imperative and your suggestions are both practical and timely.

You recall, of course, the so-called food-stamp program which was in operation, beginning in 1939, and continuing until the need for disposal of surpluses ended during the war period. The previous plan proved satisfactory in most respects and by adoption of a program substantially similar the plan could be made effective promptly. It is most desirable that the products now in storage or to be bought hereafter be furnished to those most in need of additional food, and certainly it is proper and praiseworthy to avoid the loss of these valuable foods.

You may not recall the circumstances but the record will show that this office was the first to suggest the adoption of the food-stamp plan, and our members and I personally worked very closely with Mr. Milo Perkins, director of the previous program, throughout the entire period that the plan was in operation. Des Moines was one of the first cities in which the plan was tried and this office was very active in assuring the proper and successful operation of the program in this trade area and in obtaining its expansion throughout our State.

This background of experience is mentioned only as a basis for our assurance that we are ready and anxious to cooperate with you and with the Federal Government in the establishment and operation of a program such as the one you suggest, or in providing any assistance that we can render in the operation of any other practical plan to meet the present situation.

Thanking you very much for your assistance and with best personal regards, I am,

Yours most sincerely,

RALPH E. KITTINGER,
Secretary.

GENERAL FEDERATION OF
WOMEN'S CLUBS,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1954.
Senator GUY M. GILLETTE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have read with great interest the copy of your letter to Secretary Benson of Agriculture, Secretary Hobby of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Secretary Mitchell of Labor.

I would say that your proposal seems to me to be in accordance with the American way of thinking. Your statement that you believe that charity should begin at home is, indeed, apropos to the situation today when we are giving millions to other nations when we have hundreds of thousands living on a very meager income, thus unable to have proper nourishment.

Have not had an opportunity to speak to Mrs. Ahlgren, President of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, regarding her personal attitude to this, since she is out of the city. But I find that the General Federation of Women's Clubs has resolutions which, I am sure, would cover the subject sufficiently to allow us to support you in your effort to have the surplus foods distributed among our own people who need it. We have one resolution under the caption "food surpluses" which states that the General Federation of Women's Clubs "expresses its strong support of continued efforts to reach an effective method for the constructive use of United States agricultural surpluses." While in this particular resolution the General Federation had in mind overseas underdeveloped countries, we also have a resolution for "protection of consumer interests" which says that "a permanent joint standing committee of the House and Senate be formed whose purpose shall be to inquire into all matters affecting the health, welfare, and protection of the consumer and to recommend appropriate legislation."

Therefore, it is my opinion as legislative research director for the General Federation of Women's Clubs that this organization can and will support the principle set out in any legislation which will use our surpluses for the needy people in our own country—as I believe the above quoted resolutions give us that much latitude.

I personally am extremely interested in your suggestion of food stamps and I have many, many times spoken from the platform urging that some feasible plan be worked out whereby surpluses, if need be, be given to the needy rather than have the taxpayers pay storage.

You can count on the General Federation of Women's Clubs working for any principle which is set up for this purpose.

Sincerely,

SALLY BUTLER,
Director, Legislative Research.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON
AGRICULTURAL LIFE AND LABOR,
Washington, D. C., February 8, 1954.
Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: Thank you for sending us a copy of your release about the proposed food-stamp bill.

There is a great deal of interest in this bill among our member organizations and I shall include some of your letter in the next issue of our bulletin.

I enclose a copy of our last issue.

Sincerely yours,

ELIZABETH B. HERRING,
Executive Secretary.

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN,
Cleveland, Ohio, February 9, 1954.
Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: Your letter of February 5, 1954, and copies of the press

release and your letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, requesting assignment of experts to assist in drafting a suitable plan to distribute dairy, meat, and other perishable food surpluses to persons dependent on old-age and other unemployment benefits, is appreciated.

The suggestion that Government-held food surpluses be distributed to needy Americans is, indeed, timely and a reasonable way such surpluses should be used as long as there is urgent need for them in this country.

There are many thousands of workers who have been unemployed for such an extended period that they have already exhausted benefits due them under the unemployment-compensation laws of the several States and under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. Such unemployed workers are in a worse condition than those receiving old-age, retirement, or unemployment benefits. The proposal to distribute Government-held surpluses to needy persons should include unemployed workers whose unemployment benefits have been exhausted.

I trust the Secretaries of Agriculture, Labor, and Welfare, will quickly respond to your request by making available the necessary experts to formulate the plans needed to draft the required legislation.

The food stamp, or any other feasible plan, should be developed without undue delay. There is immediate need for distribution of the surplus foods to those receiving inadequate old-age or retirement benefits and to the unemployed workers. Such distribution will release storage space for the oncoming crops.

I compliment you on your aggressive action in promoting this worthy cause.

Sincerely yours,

W. P. KENNEDY,
President.

UNITED STATES WHOLESALE
GROCERS' ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Washington, D. C., February 9, 1954.
Senator GUY M. GILLETTE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: Thanks very much for sending us documents relating to your suggestions and actions with respect to some form of food-stamp plan or other plan for the disposal to needy citizens of the Government's huge stock of certain surplus foods.

Proper disposal of these foods is most desirable but constitutes a very difficult problem. We are glad to note your activity in this connection.

In view of the fact our official board has taken no stand on any specific plans for accomplishing the desired objective, we are not in position to offer you any definite suggestions except by way of inquiry and comment as follows:

1. Is it intended that the retail store would carry a separate stock of Government surplus foods for which the proposed stamps would be exchanged?

(a) This, of course, would impose extra management and handling to keep such stocks separated from the normal supply.

(b) How would the purchase of these Government surplus foods affect the movement of similar foods held in the grocer's regular stock? For instance, a pound of butter purchased through the stamp plan might very well result in 1 pound less of butter purchased from regular stock which, of course, would not create the added movement desired. Such being the case, the dairy farmer would not benefit, the Government would have 1 more pound of butter moved into surplus for each pound moved out, and the merchants all along the normal line of distribution would have that much drop in volume.

2. Assuming that these Government-owned surpluses would be made available to grocery stores throughout the Nation, how

would these stores obtain possession of such foods?

(a) Would the Government set up commissaries throughout the country for distributing these foods to the retailers? Or—

(b) Would the established wholesalers be expected to stock and deliver these surplus foods?

3. What provision would be made for paying the cost of necessary distribution? Would the retailer and distributor be permitted to charge their normal overhead expense or would they be expected to handle these surplus foods at cost, adding the expense load onto their other sales?

We would like for you to keep our association on your mailing list for further information on this movement, and for further consideration as developments may warrant.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD O. SMITH, JR.,
Executive Vice President.

THE COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., February 9, 1954.
Senator GUY M. GILLETTE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: Thank you very much for sending us a copy of your letter to the Secretaries of Agriculture, Labor, and Welfare. Certainly speedy action should be taken to make effective use of our surplus food stocks.

We are wholeheartedly in support of your proposal to use substantial parts of these foodstuffs for our own needy citizens. This, of course, should be an immediate and prior consideration of any disposition of the surplus.

Because there will be about \$6 billion worth of commodities in the surplus pile by June, several of us have felt that up to \$1 billion worth of these foodstuffs should be used for overseas relief. CARE, in which we have a very important role and in which you have a very great interest I know, is proposing to the Congress that a substantial part of this should be distributed by voluntary agencies, including CARE. We are taking the liberty of enclosing a copy of the CARE proposal and hope you will give it your earnest consideration.

Cooperatively yours,

THE COOPERATIVE LEAGUE,
WALLACE J. CAMPBELL.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RETAIL GROCERS,
Chicago, Ill., February 17, 1954.
Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: Your letter of February 5, asking for comments on a communication you addressed to the Secretaries of Agriculture, Labor, and Welfare, urging immediate action to dispose of surplus food stocks, was forwarded to me by our Washington office—because I am president of the association and a resident of your home State of Iowa.

At the outset, let me tell you that we join wholeheartedly in your concern about the vast stocks of food being purchased and stored by the Federal Government. The sight of the Government buying and storing mountains of edible and nutritious foods is one that is the proper subject of concern by everyone.

As representatives of independent retail grocers, we view this problem from the point of view of consumers. And there is a growing dissatisfaction with the present system which permits the accumulation of these surpluses without any adequate means for disposing of them.

Independent retail grocers are opposed to allowing this food to go to waste. However, neither can we allow the disposal of this food to threaten the stability of either agriculture or the food distribution industry.

We note you have not suggested any set plan or method, but instead ask that the matter be studied and carefully considered. The National Association of Retail Grocers is more than anxious to see this done and will consider it a privilege to join with you and other Government officials in working out some plan to prevent waste of this food, and not at the same time upset normal distribution channels.

We believe, and feel sure you will agree, that formulating a food-stamp plan or any other plan must be worked out carefully. As you so rightly stated, these surpluses hang like a Damocles sword over our market. This being so, we urge that the utmost caution be exerted so that the desired result can be accomplished economically, efficiently, and without a disturbing effect.

Very truly yours,

V. L. BROWNER,
President.

DES MOINES, IOWA, March 1, 1954.

Senator GUY Gillette,
Senate Office Building:

Iowa CIO council supports you in your plan to distribute surplus perishable foods to needy unemployed; many thousands of our members in Iowa industrial cities now in real need as unemployment benefits expire. Your plan can be of great benefit to farmers as well as needy factory workers.

KEN EVERHART,
Secretary, Iowa CIO.

BRICKER AMENDMENT VOTES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was extremely interested to read in yesterday's New York Herald Tribune a very clear summary of the various votes on the Bricker amendment, as written by the distinguished syndicated columnist, chief of the Tribune's Washington bureau, Mr. Roscoe Drummond.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Drummond's article be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

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

WHAT HAPPENED ON THE BRICKER AMENDMENT (By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Senator BRICKER is undoubtedly right in suggesting that the issues behind the defeated Bricker amendment have not been settled for all time.

Senator BRICKER himself said that he intends to renew his effort to alter the treaty-making powers of the Federal Government. Mr. BRICKER may or may not change his mind. In any event, it is important that the public not misread the one-vote defeat which the Senate finally gave to the last, watered-down version of the Bricker-Knowland-George resolutions.

On the surface it might appear that the Bricker amendment was lost by so hair-breadth a margin as to suggest that it retains strong support in Congress.

The exact opposite is the reality. Whether you are a supporter or an opponent of the Bricker amendment, you will want to have this fact clear.

The factual position is as follows:

1. The core, the central substance of the Bricker amendment, as it was advanced at the beginning of this session, was that a treaty should become effective as internal law in the United States "only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of the treaty." This was the controversial "which" clause. It was so substantially opposed by the majority of Senators and so obviously headed for defeat that Senator BRICKER never brought it to a vote.

2. Then, on February 17, the Senate rejected what many thought was an unclear adaptation of the "which" clause, rewriting the Constitution to say that no treaty shall be effective unless it is "in pursuance of the Constitution." The vote was 44 to 43, or 15 short of the required two-thirds.

3. Next came the vote on Senator BRICKER's amendment to the Knowland resolution, the effect of which was to require legislation by Congress before any treaty or executive agreement could be effective as internal law—unless a two-thirds vote of the Senate specifically ruled otherwise. This amendment lost by a vote of 50 to 42, or 20 votes short of the required two-thirds.

Thus ended all efforts to dilute the authority of the President and the powers of the Senate to negotiate and ratify treaties. The effect of these votes was to show:

That, at all times and on all tests, there was a majority judgment in the Senate against any effort to alter the treaty-making procedures of the Constitution.

That, at all times and on all tests, there was never even a majority vote (and from 15 to 20 short of the needed two-thirds) against any constitutional change in treaty-making procedure.

The final one-vote defeat of the George resolution, from which the principal provisions of the Bricker amendment had been omitted, dealt only with an uncertain generality about no treaties violating the Constitution, and with a provision that executive agreements (as distinct from treaties) would become effective as internal law only after legislation had been passed by Congress.

The essence of this record is that the heart of the Bricker amendment was defeated by substantial votes before the George resolution was put to a test and that the one-vote defeat of the George resolution dealt primarily with the residual nontreaty phases of the earlier proposals.

Most observers agree that there is a theoretical potential danger that two-thirds of the Senate could ratify an ill-considered, improper treaty or that the President could approve a similarly unwise executive agreement that could become internal law.

But the difference between the latter version of the Bricker-George resolution and present law is only this:

Under the proposed changes no such treaty or executive agreement could become effective as internal law without one or both Houses approving in advance.

Under the Constitution, unchanged, any such treaty or executive agreement can be instantly removed as internal law by an act of Congress even after it is ratified. It has been done more than once.

If the issue is to be further pressed, those who disapprove any major change in the Constitution—and the Senate votes indicate that they are the majority—will reasonably feel that the advocates should be able to demonstrate a clear and present concrete danger, not merely a theoretical, potential danger that the Senate is not doing its duty.

INCREASE PERSONAL EXEMPTION AND EXEMPTION FOR DEPENDENTS UNDER INCOME-TAX LAW

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on February 19, last, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], for himself, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], introduced

Senate bill 2983, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to increase the personal exemption and the exemption for dependents to \$800 for the 1954 taxable year and to \$1,000 for succeeding taxable years; to the Committee on Finance.

This bill would increase the personal exemptions and the exemptions for dependents from \$600, the present amount of allowable deductions, to \$800 for the taxable year 1954. Beginning next year those deductions would be increased to \$1,000. Mr. President, I wish to announce my support of that measure.

At the time of introducing that bill, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia said, among other things:

Whatever we do for corporations and whatever we do for the big business organizations may have an indirect effect on our economy, but what we do in this field, by leaving more take-home pay in the pockets of the workers, will increase the purchasing power, and will stimulate productivity in the United States. If we are courageous enough to take this forward-looking step, before our economy falls on its face, we can be of great service to the American people.

Mr. President, I am sure my announced support of this measure is no surprise to my colleagues in the Senate. Nor will it come as a surprise to the people of my State of Arkansas, whom I have the honor to represent in this distinguished body. I have long advocated this method as the proper way to begin reducing taxes. As early as May 28, 1947, when a tax bill was before the Senate, and at which time these exemptions were only \$500, I offered an amendment to increase personal exemptions to \$750.

In urging the adoption of that amendment, Mr. President, I said on the floor of the Senate:

I have said over and over again that I think that is the point where tax relief ought to begin, namely, with people in the low-income brackets, the low-wage earners, the people who are having a struggle to provide the actual necessities of life. * * * Many a man is struggling today to live on a comparatively decent standard. * * * It is obvious that we should start reducing taxes by helping those at the bottom of the ladder who have the hardest struggle.

Notwithstanding my efforts, on a roll-call the amendment was rejected by a vote of 44 to 27.

Again, on July 14 of the same year, feeling so strongly the propriety and necessity for increasing income tax exemptions, but realizing I could not get them increased to \$750 as I had originally proposed, I offered an amendment to raise exemptions to \$600, the amount they are at present. In addressing the Senate at that time, I said:

There is no use arguing the amendment. Senators know they are either for it or do not favor it. I know it will be said it would increase the loss of revenue to result from enactment of the bill. Certainly it would. That is what we are doing, proposing to lose revenues, and if we are to lose revenues, and keep on losing them, I want to lose some to the advantage and for relief to wage earners and small-salaried folks who are trying to make a living, who are having a hard struggle to meet the high cost of living. I should like to remove some of them from the Federal tax rolls. They are the ones who need tax relief most. Their

tax burden is much greater than any whom this bill is designed to benefit.

The Senate turned down that proposal, but by a vote of only 47 to 43.

Later, on December 12, 1947, I again took the floor in a special session of the Senate to urge the Republican majority of the 80th Congress to acknowledge their responsibility for the enactment of proper tax legislation by providing relief to low-income groups. In that address I said:

Those are the people, Mr. President, who are really suffering from high taxes. If our Government can stand any loss of revenue—if now is the time to make reduction in income taxes—let us start by including in any tax-reduction bill that we enact, relief for those people who need it most, by raising personal exemptions sufficiently to take them off the tax rolls.

Continuing, I said:

I hope, Mr. President, that in the next session of the Congress we will enact legislation to raise personal exemptions in order to remove many citizens from the tax rolls and help others in the low-income brackets who greatly need tax relief.

The issue raised by my amendments in 1947, although they were not adopted, helped to pave the way for the raising of personal exemptions to \$600 in the bill that was enacted the following year.

While trying to get personal exemptions increased in 1947, I also sponsored an amendment to remove the flagrant Federal income-tax discrimination that then existed against husbands and wives in Arkansas. Husbands and wives in 12 community-property States paid much less Federal income tax on the same amount of income than husbands and wives of Arkansas were required to pay. Three of those States—Oklahoma, Texas, and Louisiana—border on Arkansas. Thus, citizens of Arkansas were being unjustly penalized and discriminated against.

The first amendment I offered to remove that discrimination was defeated by a vote of 51 to 29. Later in the same session I offered the amendment again, and it was defeated by a vote of 52 to 40; but, it was not defeated until promises were given by the leadership of both the majority and the minority that the amendment I was sponsoring would be incorporated in the next tax bill, which came up the following year. That promise was kept, and in 1948 the principle of putting husbands and wives of all States of the Union on the same basis with respect to Federal income taxes was passed.

I may say that up to now it has resulted in the elimination of a discrimination which would have amounted to approximately \$40 million to the husbands and wives of Arkansas, as compared with the 3 States on its borders.

Mr. President, a general tax-revision bill is presently being developed and processed in the House of Representatives. It has not yet been reported by the Ways and Means Committee, but I think we can anticipate that a tax-revision bill will be passed by the House and sent to the Senate at this session of Congress. If that prospect materializes, then the distinguished Senator from Georgia will have the opportunity to

present his bill as an amendment to the tax bill that comes over from the House.

I understand that the Secretary of the Treasury, and the administration opposes raising personal exemptions. The Ways and Means Committee of the House has already rejected the proposal. If the House does not incorporate this provision in the bill it passes and sends to us, then we must make the fight in the Senate and adopt the George amendment.

I say this, Mr. President, because the reductions now indicated by the House Ways and Means Committee are wholly inadequate to give proper tax relief under present economic conditions. They ignore and disregard giving relief where the need is the greatest. That relief can be provided only by the increasing of personal exemptions.

It appears that the revisions now proposed by the House Ways and Means Committee and by this administration would benefit big business and individual taxpayers in the upper-income brackets.

Apparently the philosophy behind this administration's tax-revision program is based upon the so-called "trickle-down" theory—the argument being that tax cuts for big business would stimulate investments and production, resulting in more jobs and more payrolls. This "trickle-down" theory, Mr. President, is not the proper approach for relieving the tax burden where the present greatest distress exists.

The cost of living is today at the highest level in the history of our country. It has risen approximately 12 percent since 1947. If I was right in the position I took then—and I was—in urging that personal exemptions be raised to \$750, we are more than justified in insisting now that they be raised to \$800.

Instead of providing tax relief, Mr. President, that will "trickle down" to the small-income groups, I want to give them some direct relief by raising their personal exemptions and thus permit them to retain more of their wages to meet their own personal expenses and the cost of living. In other words, Mr. President, by raising personal-income exemptions we can create tax relief and benefits that will "trickle up" and bolster our economy by placing more purchasing power in the hands of the consumer. That is to say, if those in lower-income groups are given an increase in personal exemptions they will be able to spend those additional funds, taxes they are now required to pay, for those essentials and necessities of life of which they and their families are now being deprived.

That money spent by them would, of course, find its way into the possession of those in the higher income categories. It always does. Money spent in the normal course of trade by our small-income earners goes for food, clothing, and those basic essentials that make for a higher standard of living. Such expenditures ultimately go back into industry, thereby enabling it to expand, to create more jobs, and to increase production and payrolls.

It is said that the increasing of personal exemptions to \$800 as proposed by the Senator from Georgia will cause a

loss of revenues of approximately \$4 billion. While I doubt that the net loss would be that much, nevertheless, such a program is necessary in the threatening situation if we are to use tax relief for the bolstering of our economy. I am for a sound economy, but I submit that no economy is sound when, by the imposition of a Federal income tax on his meager earnings, the low wage earner is deprived of those essentials that are needed and necessary to provide for him and his family a minimum standard of living.

Mr. President, I wholeheartedly support, as I have in the past, the proposal to raise personal exemptions as a means of providing tax relief to those in the greatest distress, and who are suffering most under the present income tax burden.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORDON obtained the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield in order that I may address a question to the majority leader with reference to the course of the debate upon which we are about to enter?

Mr. CORDON. I shall be pleased to yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, there are some of us who are in the position of supporting the efforts for statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska. The first question to be voted on, as I understand, is the motion which has been made by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to attach the Alaska bill to the Hawaii bill. I should like very much to have each of these matters considered on its own merits, and, at the same time, I would not like to have the Alaskan proposal acted upon without full consideration by the Senate. So my question is this: Is it the purpose and determination of the distinguished majority leader, in the event of the passage by the Senate of the Hawaii statehood bill by itself, to take up at an early date thereafter the Alaska statehood bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that it is the purpose of the majority leader to recommend to the Senate that the Alaska statehood bill be called up subsequent to the Hawaii statehood bill, and I personally hope and expect that will be during the month of March. I do not want to

say to the Senator that the Alaska statehood bill will immediately follow the passage of the Hawaii statehood bill, because there are some matters which have a time expiration, including certain tax bills, and so forth, which we shall have to consider. But I can give full assurance to the Senator from Florida that there will be no effort or purpose on the part of the majority leader to prevent the Alaska statehood bill from coming up as early as may be possible after the Hawaii statehood bill is disposed of, so that the Senate may have a full opportunity to debate and vote on the Alaska statehood bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from California will yield further, is the Senate to understand that not only the majority leader, but also the Republican policy committee has made that decision?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should say to the Senator that I have been authorized by the Republican policy committee to make the statement on the floor that the bill providing for statehood for Alaska will be scheduled at an early date, but in the discretion of the majority leader with reference to fitting it into the program.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and its chairman, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] have given me the honor of presenting to the Senate, Senate bill 49, a bill to enable the populous and prosperous American Territory of Hawaii to become a State of the United States. The committee worked at length on the bill, which I introduced on my own behalf and that of 15 other Senators from both sides of the aisle, and has amended and improved the measure substantially over the form in which it was introduced.

The admission of a new State into the Union of States is always a historic occasion. It is an epoch-making event, both for the people of the area admitted to full partnership in the Union and also for the country itself. The growth of our Republic has been accompanied by a corresponding growth in our prosperity and economic strength, and in many ways the successive admission of States has symbolized our rise to power and riches as a Nation.

On March 4, 1791—just 163 years ago today, to the day—the United States of America was a little band of 13 States hugging the eastern seaboard of the Atlantic. On that historic date the State of Vermont was "received and admitted into the Union as a new and entire member there of," in the words of the admission statute. Authority for this action of the first Congress is found in article IV, section 3, of the Constitution, which provides in simple, straightforward language:

New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union.

The last time this authority was exercised was by the 62d Congress on February 14, 1912, when the State of Arizona was admitted into the full sisterhood.

What a splendid record of achievement and attainment has marked that span of 121 years between the admission of Vermont in 1791 and that of Arizona in 1912.

PATTERN FOR STATEHOOD

During those 121 years the authority conferred by the quoted section of the Constitution has been exercised by this body on 30 different occasions by providing for the admission of the 35 States which have been becoming a part of the Union on "free and equal footing" with the Original Thirteen.

The pattern for the admission of new States, generally speaking, was established in the famed Northwest Ordinance by the Continental Congress in 1787. The Northwest Ordinance was the statute for the government of the vast area west of the Allegheny Mountains and north of the Ohio River. From this Territory the five States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan were created.

Under this pattern, the Territory was first of all incorporated into the Union. That is, the Constitution of the United States was extended to it, and the area thereby legally and politically became a part of the Union. As soon as a part of the area had sufficient population to support statehood—the original requirement was but 60,000—and the inhabitants gave evidence of their desire for statehood, an enabling act was passed by Congress, which prescribed a procedure for the organization of a State government and certain standards for and conditions of statehood. When these steps had been taken and the requirements met, States were admitted into the Union on a free and equal basis with the Thirteen Original States.

ACTION WITHOUT ENABLING ACT

A slight variation in the above pattern has occurred in certain instances when the people of a Territory have gone ahead on their own initiative and held a constitutional convention, drafted a constitution, and submitted it to the people without waiting for the Federal Congress to authorize them to do so. The constitution would then be submitted to the Congress, and if approved, the State would be admitted by the enactment of an Admission Act by Congress. Such was the case in my own State of Oregon. Six other States also entered the Union through this procedure by taking the initiative themselves, namely, Arkansas, California, Florida, Idaho, Maine, and Wyoming.

I mention this variation of the pattern because Hawaii has followed the precedent of those States and has held its constitutional convention and drafted its own proposed State constitution. While the proposed State constitution of Hawaii is not before us at this time, it is printed in the committee's report on S. 49, and I wish to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to it. It gives us a preview, so to speak, of the kind of State we would be admitting.

However, regardless of whether the people of a Territory waited for the passage of an enabling act by the Congress or acted on their own initiative, the end

result, namely, statehood, has been the same for each of the incorporated Territories except Hawaii and Alaska. The greatness of our Union and the strength of each of the 35 subsequently admitted States today is manifest proof of the success of the policy with respect to incorporated Territories which the Continental Congress established 167 years ago.

In no instance has statehood failed. With the admission of each of the 35 States, the people in the established States have benefited as well as have the people of the new State.

There have been two historic methods for the admission of States. The first and most often used is that touched upon above; namely, in our westward march as a Nation, we first settled an area; then established local governments by a Federal statute known as an organic act, which also extended the Constitution of the United States to the area, thereby incorporating it into the Union, in the words of the Supreme Court; and finally, after a suitable period of "pupillage"—to use again the term employed by the Supreme Court in such cases—we brought the Territory into the partnership of a State of the United States.

HAWAII AN INDEPENDENT REPUBLIC

The other method is that which was employed by the 28th Congress in 1845, in admitting the free and independent Republic of Texas into the Union as a State. California also has some claim to having been an independent republic prior to her admission by the 31st Congress in 1850, but her independence was not recognized by other nations as was that of Texas.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that Hawaii, like Texas, was a free and independent republic when in 1898 it became incorporated into the Union. The Newlands resolution for the annexation of Hawaii, which I shall discuss in more detail subsequently, specifically cited that the people of Hawaii have made manifest their consent. About a half century previously, in 1854, President Franklin Pierce had authorized negotiations for a treaty under which Hawaii would have been admitted as a State after the manner of Texas. This fact is cited by the Supreme Court of the United States in case of *Downes v. Bidwell* (182 U. S. 305).

As I have pointed out, the Constitution of the United States does not itself set forth any standards for the admission of new States. However, a study of the history and the circumstances surrounding the admission of the 35 States admitted since the formation of the Union shows that the requirements for statehood for an incorporated Territory, such as Hawaii, have been the following three simple but historically effective ones:

First. The Territory has a sufficiently large population, with sufficient economic development to enable it to support the costs of statehood and to bear the burdens of full participation in the Union;

Second. The population is imbued with, and wholeheartedly in support of, democracy and the American form of government; and

Third. The people of the Territory desire statehood.

For confirmation of my analysis, I refer the Members of the Senate to the recitals in the enabling acts and acts of admission for the several States.

Each of the Territories which has been incorporated in the manner heretofore described has become a State except two: Hawaii and Alaska.

Hawaii fully meets each and every one of the historic tests of statehood. In fact, it is not too much to say that no Territory better qualified in every respect has ever been a candidate for statehood.

The first of the historic tests of the readiness of a Territory for statehood is population. According to the 1950 census, which is the latest official count, and one by which the Congress is bound in all apportionment matters—the representation in the other body of Congress likewise is controlled by it—the population of Hawaii is 499,794. Only one Territory, namely, Oklahoma, had a population as large at the time of admission into the Union as a State. This half-million population is greater than that of any one of four of our present States today. Each of the States of Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, and Nevada has less population today than does the Territory of Hawaii.

ABILITY TO SUPPORT STATEHOOD

I shall have more to say about population in a few moments, but first I wish to outline briefly how Hawaii fulfills all the other historic tests of statehood. A second qualification is ability to support statehood. Here, beyond question, are facts about which there can be no dispute. Hawaii is the richest Territory, from the standpoint of economic development, ever to enter the Union. In the fiscal year 1953 Hawaii paid more than \$136 million in Federal taxes, a sum greater than that which was paid by any one of 9 of the present States, namely, Nevada, New Hampshire, Montana, Vermont, Idaho, South Dakota, North Dakota, Wyoming, and New Mexico.

As to Hawaii's economics, again I shall have more to say in a few minutes, but first I wish to touch upon a third factor, namely, Hawaii's Americanism. Implicit in the admission of States has been the requirement that the population must be thoroughly American, American in outlook, in spirit, and in fact. Here again Hawaii meets the test, and comes through with flying colors.

A full 84 percent of the half-million population, or some 423,174, according to the 1950 census, are native-born American citizens. A substantial proportion of the 16 percent listed as aliens are in that category only because prior to the Walter-McCarran Act of 1952 they were ineligible for citizenship under our laws except through service in the Armed Forces. Since the passage of that act, hundreds have been naturalized, and thousands more are eagerly awaiting naturalization.

ALIEN GROUP DECLINING

When I made the first of my official inspection trips to Hawaii on behalf of the committee, in 1948, the average age of the surviving original Japanese im-

migrants was 68 years. Their number is, of course, steadily declining, both through natural causes and because of the fact that such immigrants can now become citizens through the 1952 Naturalization Act.

More significant for the future of the new State of Hawaii, however, is the fact that 99.2 percent of all the school children in the Territory are native-born Americans. The 1950 census studies show that the national average of children in school who are between 14 and 17 years of age is 83.7 percent, while in Hawaii the figure is 91.2 percent.

The Hawaiian Islands are less than 24 hours travel time from Washington. Churches, fraternities, veterans' and other organizations, business groups, and banking systems are closely linked with their counterparts on the mainland. Hawaii has, of course, been within the American judicial, customs, and internal-revenue systems for a half-century.

As to support of the American form of government, the people of the Islands have lived under a constitutional form of government for more than a century, the first Hawaiian constitution having been written in 1840. It was modeled along the lines of our own Constitution. In 1893 the people of Hawaii threw off even the form of monarchy, and established a representative republic under the presidency of Sanford B. Dole, a son of New England parents.

FULFILLMENT OF DUTIES OF CITIZENSHIP

Since they gave up their independence for annexation to the United States, they have exercised the rights of their limited citizenship vigorously. In the 1952 election, 87.6 percent of the registered voters in the Territory voted. The national average was only 62.5 percent, and in some States the percentage of eligible voters fulfilling their responsibilities was as low as 24.2 percent.

AMERICANISM

The Americanism of any particular group or segment of our population is a difficult matter to gage and measure accurately. It is so much a matter of spirit and point of view, that definite standards and rules for testing it are difficult to lay down.

However, I submit there is one objective standard that is hardly open to dispute. That is the willingness to fight and die for one's country. Hawaii's heroic war record on the battlefields of Europe and more recently on the battlefields of Korea is well known to the Members of this body, but I desire to briefly mention a few of the outstanding aspects of this record.

HEROISM OF HAWAIIAN SOLDIERS

In World War II, for example, the 100th Infantry Battalion and the 442d Combat Team from Hawaii, composed of so-called Japanese-Americans—Americans of Japanese ancestry, that is—together formed what has been described by Gen. Mark Clark, under whom they served, as the most decorated unit in the entire military history of the United States. Its battle honors include 7 Presidential Citations, 3,600 Purple

Heart Medals with 500 Oak Leaf Clusters, 15 Soldier's Medals, 17 Legion of Merit Medals, 342 Silver Star Medals, 1 Distinguished Service Medal, and 1 Congressional Medal of Honor.

In the recent Korean conflict, a substantial percentage of soldiers from Hawaii, representative of the varied racial background of the people of Hawaii, were on duty in Japan with the 24th and 25th Divisions when the Communist invasion occurred. These divisions were the first committed to combat in Korea, and the 24th was soon strengthened by the 5th Regimental Combat Team from Hawaii.

The percentage of Hawaii's battle casualties in Korea was three times that of the States on the mainland. With respect to the high rate of Hawaii's casualties in Korea, Gen. J. Lawton Collins, then Chief of Staff, wrote Hon. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Delegate from Hawaii, as follows:

The relatively high casualty rate suffered by Hawaii soldiers can be attributed to the large proportion of Hawaii soldiers in the 24th Infantry Division, which includes the 5th Regimental Combat Team, and the 25th Division. At the time of its deployment to the Far East Command, almost 50 percent were Hawaii-born soldiers. I doubt that any other unit of the Regular Army can be associated with a particular geographical area as closely as the 5th Regimental Combat Team is associated with Hawaii. There were also substantial percentages of Hawaii soldiers in the 24th and 25th Divisions which were already in Japan and which were, of course, the first committed in Korea. All enlisted personnel of these units, when the conflict started, were volunteers. The heavy fighting that they have encountered and the regrettably high casualty rates sustained are, of course, well known throughout the United States.

In connection with Hawaii's war record, it should be noted that J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has reported that there is not a single instance on record of a case of sabotage by an Hawaiian citizen during the entire war. That fact must be given weight when one considers the question of loyalty to the United States Government.

DESIRE OF PEOPLE OF HAWAII

To round out the fact that Hawaii meets each and every one of the historic tests of readiness for statehood, I shall mention briefly the desire of the people of Hawaii for statehood. To anyone who has had the opportunity to visit Hawaii, as I did during the recent recess of the Senate, or as has more recently, even, the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] who now occupies the chair, or our Vice President, it is almost incredible that this point would need debate or even discussion. However, one or two of the witnesses who appeared before the committee charged that a great many of the people of Hawaii were secretly opposed to statehood, but were afraid to say so publicly. Those making that charge were a little vague about just what those in opposition were afraid of, since no one was able to cite a single instance or specific example of any harm that had come to anyone or to any property because of opposition. Nevertheless, since the charge has been made, and probably will be made again,

and no doubt during the debate on this measure, I shall cite the following facts for the record.

In 1940 a Territory-wide plebiscite was held on the question, "Do you favor statehood for Hawaii?"

The vote was 67 percent yes and 33 percent no. I may point out, parenthetically, that apparently a good many citizens of Hawaii had the courage of their convictions on that occasion, at least.

In 1949—and I think this matter is of particular importance and pertinency—the Territorial legislature provided for the election of delegates to a constitutional convention, for the drafting of a proposed State constitution, and for the submission of the constitution so drafted to the people of Hawaii, for their adoption or rejection. In 1950, the constitution drafted by the elected delegates was submitted in a general election. All that anyone who at that time was opposed to statehood had to do was to vote against approval. Mr. President, again I emphasize that in that election the ballots were secret. There the most timorous might have his view registered on this occasion, also, with safety to himself and his family. So there could have been no possible fear of retaliation.

The vote was more than 3 to 1 approving the proposed State constitution for the State of Hawaii.

It is submitted, Mr. President, that this is a very effective plebiscite and that the people of Hawaii expressed themselves most impressively as desiring statehood. I can conceive of none more effective.

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY THOUSAND SIGNED
STATEHOOD PETITION

Again, within the past few days we have had a still further indication of how the people of Hawaii feel about statehood. Last Friday the elected Delegate from Hawaii and the Governor of Hawaii presented to the Vice President of the United States a statehood roll of honor signed by almost 120,000 citizens of Hawaii exercising their constitutional right of petition. This gigantic roll—it comprises a half-ton of newsprint—is a simply worded petition for immediate statehood for Hawaii. Some 120,000 citizens took the time and the trouble—most often they had to wait in line, sometimes for a long time—to go to a central place and sign this petition.

In view of all these facts, Mr. President, as well as the long history of the statehood movement which I shall touch upon in a moment, I fail to understand how anyone could suggest either that the people of Hawaii, overwhelmingly and wholeheartedly, do not desire statehood, or could think of offering them some other status, such as that of a Commonwealth.

Mr. President, this would seem to be a logical point for me to trace briefly for the Senate the history of the statehood movement in Hawaii. Beginning with the first elected Territorial legislature under the American flag in 1903, only 3 years after enactment of the Organic Act, the people of Hawaii have petitioned some 20 times for the fulfillment to them of the historic destiny of all other incorporated Territories.

On nearly 50 different occasions since 1930 bills have been introduced in successive Congresses to provide statehood for Hawaii. In the past 19 years there have been 13 separate hearings on statehood for Hawaii by various congressional committees. Five of these 13 hearings have been held in the Territory of Hawaii itself.

HUGE RECORD COMPILED

On my desk in front of me is a stack of these hearings, beginning with that conducted by the Committee on Territories of the House of Representatives in the 74th Congress.

In all, this printed record comprises some 5,100 pages of testimony and exhibits. Other hundreds of pages of evidence have been incorporated by reference or are in the committee files, not printed in the hearings. More than 700 witnesses have been heard, both in the Territory and in Washington.

The most recent of this long and impressive series was that conducted by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in the 83d Congress in 1953 and 1954. The record of the Senate committee in the 83d Congress is in 3 separate volumes comprising some 652 pages.

After hearings by the House committee in the 83d Congress on March 10, 1953, just a little short of a year ago, the House of Representatives passed H. R. 3575 by a vote of 274 to 138. This is the third time that the House has passed an Enabling Act for Hawaii, although it has never before been the order of business in the Senate. It would be well, indeed, Mr. President, if every piece of major legislation presented to the Congress for legislative action had had the thorough study that has been given to statehood for Hawaii. It is not too much to say that almost everything that can be said about the subject has been said.

Each and every aspect of the situation has been debated pro and con in the hearings and in the executive sessions. It is an impressive record, Mr. President. I ask that a summary of the hearings and investigations set forth in my report on S. 49, Report No. 886, 83d Congress, pages 80 to 84, inclusive, appear in the RECORD at this point for convenient reference.

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

SUMMARY OF CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS
OF STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII, 1935-54

I. THE 1935 CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION

The first hearings on statehood were conducted in Hawaii in 1935 by a committee of the House.

The committee held hearings for 12 days and heard 105 witnesses, 90 of whom favored statehood, and collected 343 pages of testimony. (Hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Territories on H. R. 3034, 74th Cong., 1st sess.) At that time the committee reported to Congress that it found the Territory of Hawaii to be a modern unit of the American commonwealth, with a political, social, and economic structure of the highest type. (Hearings on H. R. 3034, 74th Cong., 1st sess., p. 329.)

By the close margin of 3 to 2 the bill failed to be reported favorably to the full committee, since the majority felt that further study was necessary. (See summary, hearings on H. R. 3034, pp. 301-304.)

II. THE 1937 CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION

In 1937, the joint committee appointed to visit Hawaii held public hearings for 17 days and visited industrial, social, educational, and military establishments on the 5 major islands. Residents on all islands visited were publicly urged to appear and express their views. The committee heard 66 witnesses, 47 of whom favored statehood, and collected nearly 700 pages of testimony. (Hearings before the Joint Committee on Hawaii, 75th Cong., 2d sess.)

In its report (S. Doc. No. 151, 75th Cong., 3d sess.), the committee said, "Hawaii has fulfilled every requirement for statehood heretofore exacted for Territories." (S. Doc. No. 151, p. 94.)

The committee recommended that a statehood plebiscite be held to ascertain the wishes of the people, and that further study be made due to the disturbed condition of international affairs (S. Doc. No. 151, p. 95).

The Territorial legislature authorized a plebiscite to be held in 1940. By a majority of more than 2 to 1, the people of Hawaii voted in favor of statehood.

During the war years Hawaii held its statehood aspirations in abeyance.

III. THE 1946 CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

In 1946, a third congressional investigation was held in Hawaii.

The committee publicly invited the people to appear before them to present their views on statehood and upon any other matter relating to the welfare of the Territory.

The group held hearings for 12 days on the 5 major islands, and heard 107 witnesses, 91 of whom favored statehood. Recorded were 908 pages of testimony, including 35 written statements and exhibits relating to social, economic, and political life. (Hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Territories, House of Representatives, 79th Cong., 2d sess.)

The subcommittee submitted a unanimous report (H. Rept. No. 1620, 79th Cong., 2d sess.) in which it recommended that "since:

"1. The people of the Territory of Hawaii have demonstrated beyond question not only their loyalty and patriotism but also their desire to assume the responsibilities of statehood; and since

"2. The policy of the United States Government is one of self-determination; that peoples be allowed to choose freely their form of political status; and since

"3. Hawaii's strategic location in the Pacific plays so large a part in our country's international position in this area; and since

"4. The Congress of the United States has through a series of acts and committee reports indicated to the people of the Territory that Hawaii would be admitted into the Union when qualified; and since

"5. The Territory of Hawaii now meets the necessary requirements for statehood:

"It is the recommendation of this subcommittee that the Committee on Territories give immediate consideration to legislation to admit Hawaii to statehood."

IV. THE 1947 CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION

The House Committee on Public Lands met in Washington, D. C., in March 1947, to consider H. R. 49, and 11 other bills granting statehood to Hawaii.

The committee held hearings for 13 days and heard 35 witnesses, all of whom favored immediate statehood. Opposition to the bill consisted of three communications, one of which was printed in the record. The committee collected 310 pages of testimony. (Hearings before the Committee on Public Lands, House of Representatives, 80th Cong., 1st sess., on H. R. 49.)

Several Federal departments were requested by the committee to submit reports on Hawaii's statehood bill. The administration endorsed the bill, and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy offered no objection to the enactment of H. R. 49.

Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, testifying as a private citizen, stated, "From a military and naval standpoint, I can see no objection to these islands achieving statehood."

Maj. Gen. Charles D. Herron, United States Army (retired) former commander of the Hawaiian Department, testified that the people of Hawaii have long since shown themselves to be wise and fully worthy of full citizenship.

Many Members of the 80th Congress testified or presented statements for the record supporting the bill.

Whereas the 1946 hearings in Hawaii stressed the readiness of the people of the islands to meet the responsibilities of statehood, the testimony submitted in Washington in 1947 related largely to national aspects, such as national defense, trade relations, and foreign affairs. Hawaii's position at the crossroads of the Pacific was viewed as a reason for statehood.

For the second time in 2 years a committee of Congress unanimously recommended statehood.

The 1947 committee report (H. Rept. No. 194, 80th Cong., 1st sess.), drew particular attention to the following:

"The strategic location in the mid-Pacific of Hawaii's modern community of a half million loyal American citizens, with its modern facilities for transportation, communication, and defense, is of immeasurable value to the Nation;

"The granting of statehood to Hawaii at this time will be an actual demonstration of the purposes of the United States in granting self-determination to the peoples of the world;

"The joint committee of the Seventy-fifth Congress appointed in 1937, after thorough investigation in the islands, found that Hawaii has fulfilled every requirement for statehood heretofore exacted of Territories; and

"The subcommittee appointed in the 79th Congress unanimously recommended that immediate consideration for legislation looking to the admission of Hawaii to statehood be undertaken."

The findings and conclusions of the 1947 congressional hearings on the question of statehood for Hawaii were based on its own investigation and the investigations of two previous congressional committees.

In June 1947, an Hawaii statehood bill passed the House by a vote of 196 to 133; Congress adjourned before further action was taken.

V. THE 1948 CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION

During 1948 three separate investigations on the subject of statehood for Hawaii were held:

1. In January the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs, Hon. GUY CORDON, of Oregon, went to Hawaii at the direction of the full committee in connection with H. R. 49, the Hawaiian statehood bill before the 80th Congress.

Public hearings on statehood were held for 16 days on the major islands. Of the 231 witnesses testifying, 215 favored statehood and 16 opposed it. (Hearings before the Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs of the Committee on Public Lands, 80th Cong., 2d sess.)

Special study was given to the Territory's judicial system, the degree to which the racial "melting pot" works, the economic stability of the Territory, and the extent of the menace of communism and bloc voting.

The report held that—

(1) The courts of the Territory are functioning satisfactorily.

(2) Democracy has creditably proved itself in Hawaii.

(3) The financial condition of the Territory appears sound.

(4) Though the extent of Communist success in Hawaii is not definitely known, the total number of Communists being fewer

than 100, ample protection against the infiltration of Communist doctrines in the formation of a State constitution exist, since approval must be given both by the electorate of Hawaii and by the President of the United States.

(COMMITTEE NOTE.—By committee amendment to the present bill, this function of safeguarding the State constitution rests with the Congress, in accordance with the principles of the Federal Constitution.)

(5) Election records of Hawaii for 48 years do not support the contention of bloc voting, and there is little chance that the pattern of political behavior will undergo any drastic changes under State government.

The chairman recommended that the bill be favorably reported to the Senate with a recommendation for immediate action.

It was later decided by the Senate committee to hold further hearings in Washington, D. C., to determine national interest.

2. On April 15, the Senate subcommittee met in Washington, heard 8 witnesses, none in opposition, and collected 53 pages of testimony.

On May 8, the committee decided to take no action on its subcommittee's favorable report on statehood, and authorized the chairman to arrange a trip to Hawaii for committee members wishing to study the matter on the ground.

3. From November 1 to 12, the chairman of the committee, Senator HUGH BUTLER, conducted in Hawaii an investigation of Communist activities in the Territory. In all, 77 confidential interviews were made a matter of record, and more than 100 other witnesses interviewed.

A report of the investigation was made in June 1949; in summary, the report recommended:

(1) That statehood for Hawaii be deferred indefinitely, until communism in the Territory may be brought under effective control;

(2) That the Territorial government of Hawaii be encouraged to take positive steps within the scope of its authority to suppress unlawful communistic activities;

(3) That the executive branch of the Federal Government, through the Department of Justice, take immediate steps to prosecute lawless communism in the Territory, and to protect from force and violence those who honestly seek to support and strengthen orderly constitutional government;

(4) That Congress take cognizance of the very serious economic problems which confront Hawaii as a result of the activities of the Communist-dominated ILWU and immediately enact remedial legislation.

VI. THE 1949 CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION

On March 3 and 8, the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Possessions of the House Public Lands Committee held hearings in Washington, with the voluminous record already amassed before it. Five witnesses testified, none in opposition, though two communications in opposition to the legislation were received and made part of the record.

The Committee on Public Lands on March 10, in reporting favorably on the bill, as amended, and recommending that it pass, concluded, in part, as follows:

1. The Territory is not only self-supporting, but pays more Federal income tax than any 1 of 12 States.

2. Had Hawaii been a State, it hardly would have been subjected to the indignities which befell it in World War II.

3. There is no area under United States jurisdiction where a greater complexity of races live so harmoniously.

4. Both major political parties in the United States included a recommendation of statehood for Hawaii in their party platforms of 1948.

5. Statehood for Hawaii would increase immeasurably the prestige of America throughout the Orient.

The committee recognized that the extent of Communist influence and activity in the Territory had been the objective of intense inquiry, but was of the opinion that the people of the Territory are alert to the problem and would be better able to cope with it as a State than as a Territory.

VII. THE 1950 CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION

Though the seventh investigation by Congress of statehood for Hawaii was not held until May 1950, two activities of Congress preceded the Senate hearings.

1. In January, a House Public Lands Committee, Special Committee on Pacific Territories and Island Possessions, after an extended trip throughout the Pacific Ocean area, including Hawaii, returned to Washington and strongly urged that Congress act favorably on the Hawaii statehood legislation. The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was officially represented by its chief clerk, Mills Astin, on this inspection trip and inquiry.

2. The House of Representatives voted on March 7 by 262 to 110 to admit Hawaii to statehood.

The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee held hearings in Washington the early part of May, heard 60 witnesses, none in opposition, though several communications in opposition to statehood were inserted in the record. Subsequently, the committee met in executive session over a period of 2 weeks to consider the evidence and make necessary amendments to the bill.

VIII. THE 1951 SENATE COMMITTEE REPORT

On May 8, 1951, 9 members of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported favorably on S. 49, in one of the most emphatically worded reports in the long history of the Hawaii statehood legislation.

The majority group passed the bill without further hearings, stating that the record of testimony built up around the question of Hawaiian statehood was more complete than in the case of any other Territory prior to admission.

The committee found that Hawaii, unequivocally, had met every test applied to 29 other Territorial applications for admittance into the Union.

"It is a paradox," the report stated, "that the United States should still permit so vital a part of itself to remain in the inferior status of a Territory when that part fulfills each and every one of the historic qualifications for statehood, and is eager to assume the burdens and responsibilities of full equality, as well as enjoy its privileges." And:

"It is submitted that if the ultimate test of loyalty and patriotism is the willingness to fight and die for one's country, then Hawaii has nobly met this test also." And:

"The devotion to American ideals of the sons of Hawaii has been irrefutably written in the pages of world history on the battlefields of Europe, and, more recently, in Korea." And in conclusion:

"Therefore, conscious of their responsibility as Members of the Senate of the 82d Congress to the Senate and to the Nation, the majority of the committee recommends that the Senate continue the pattern under which America has grown great and approve this legislation to admit the prosperous, populous, and thoroughly American Territory of Hawaii to statehood."

IX. THE 1953 CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION

A subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, 83d Congress, 1st session, met on February 23, 24, 26, and 27 to continue its investigation into the fitness of Hawaii to assume the obligations and responsibilities of statehood.

Nineteen witnesses were heard or made oral depositions. One was in opposition, the remainder favorable to Hawaii's admission as a State. Among the latter was the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, who gave it as his opinion that Hawaii was fully qualified for statehood and that our American principles of constitutional self-government call for speedy and favorable action on H. R. 49.

The Navy Department, by letter, signed by the Judge Advocate General recommended enactment of the bill.

On March 3, the committee submitted its report, recommending passage by the House. The report held that admission of Hawaii is in the national interest; noncontiguity is no bar to statehood; that economic and cultural progress in Hawaii has been marked; and that the economy of the Territory was sufficient to maintain stable government.

On March 10, for the third time in the history of the Hawaii statehood campaign, the House of Representatives passed the bill to enable Hawaii to become a State. The vote was 274 to 138.

On March 6, a subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, convened to hear testimony on S. 49, introduced by Mr. CORDON and 15 other Senators; and S. 51, introduced by Mr. MURRAY and 14 other Democratic Senators. The committee heard three witnesses, among them the former attorney general of Hawaii, who testified in connection with land matters in Hawaii.

A new and full-dress investigation was started before the full committee on June 29 and continued up to July 11. Twenty-five witnesses appeared in person while scores of exhibits and statements were introduced into the record. The resultant report, of 652 pages, again comprises in up-to-date form an incisive insight into the political, economic, cultural, racial, labor, and administrative standards in the Territory.

X. THE 1954 CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION

When the 2d session of the 83d Congress convened in January, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee met on January 7-8, for the purpose of hearing former Gov. Ingram M. Stainback of Hawaii testify.

His appearance was followed by a series of executive sessions of the committee. On January 27, with a full committee represented, the Hawaii statehood bill was reported favorably by a vote of 12 to 3.

Mr. CORDON. This brief outline of the history of the statehood movement in Hawaii brings me logically to the point of saying a few words about the colorful and dramatic history of Hawaii itself. As nearly as can be determined, the islands were settled more than a thousand years ago by those most daring of primitive seafarers, the Polynesians, who crossed the mighty Pacific from the Far East in sailing canoes. So far as they were concerned, they were coming from the West. They were coming from the Asiatic side of the Pacific, most anthropologists believe, although there is some difference of opinion on the matter.

EARLY NEW ENGLAND INFLUENCE

The form of government these daring seafarers developed was that of a kingdom—an absolute, even though benign, monarchy. European discovery was by the British seaman, Capt. James Cook, who came upon them in 1778 and named them the Sandwich Islands, in honor of one of his patrons, the Earl of Sandwich.

A group of Christian missionaries arrived from New England in 1820 and

converted the approximately 142,050 inhabitants to Christianity from their outworn paganism. The New Englanders established a permanent colony, reduced the native Hawaiian tongue, which was only a spoken tongue, to writing and began the process of Americanizing Hawaii, an enterprise in which they were eminently successful. Under the influence of the Americans, in 1840 the kingdom adopted its first written constitution. This constitution was modeled along American democratic lines, as I mentioned earlier. Treaties of friendship and trade were signed with the United States in 1850 and 1876, the latter of which led to the fortification of Pearl Harbor.

Meanwhile, the Yankee influence in the commerce and culture of the islands had become predominant. Whalers came in increasing numbers; a New England firm started a plantation on the island of Kauai and laid the foundations of Hawaii's future sugar industry. The majority of ships calling at Hawaiian ports flew the American flag.

Inspired and led by American settlers and traders, the Hawaiians deposed Queen Liliuokalani in 1893 and set up the provisional government with Sanford B. Dole, the son of New England parents, at its head. The Republic was established a year later with Dole as president.

HAWAII "INCORPORATED" INTO THE UNITED STATES

In June of 1897, representatives of the Republic of Hawaii and of the United States signed a treaty, the preamble of which recited that the United States and its citizens had acquired a preponderant share of the industry and trade of the Hawaiian Islands and referred to the "express desire of the Government of the Republic of Hawaii that these islands should be incorporated into the United States as an integral part thereof." This treaty was ratified by the Senate of the Republic of Hawaii, but the 2d session of the 55th Congress adjourned without taking the required action. The following year, in 1898, Joint Resolution 55, sponsored by Senator Newlands, of Nevada, was adopted and approved on July 7. This statute recited the fact that the people of Hawaii had signified their consent and proceeded to annex the islands to the United States.

ANALOGY TO TEXAS

Thus, the people of Hawaii became a part of the United States by their voluntary act. In this way, Hawaii's position is analogous to that of Texas and California.

The Newlands resolution provided for a commission to visit the Hawaiian Islands, study the situation there, and report back to the Congress with recommendations for legislation for the government of the islands. Based on the report of the Newlands commission, basic legislation was enacted as the Organic Act of Hawaii on April 30, 1900.

Mr. President, we now come to the meat in the coconut, in a manner of speaking. American citizenship was granted to the citizens of Hawaii, and the United States Constitution was declared to "have the same force and ef-

fect within the said Territory as elsewhere in the United States."

ALL OTHER INCORPORATED TERRITORIES ADMITTED

Thus, in the language of the Supreme Court of the United States, Hawaii acquired the status of an incorporated Territory, became an integral part of the United States and, as such, became destined for admission as a State after a period of pupilage. As I have stated, Hawaii and Alaska are the sole remaining incorporated Territories that have not yet attained the destiny that has been the unvarying rule with all other incorporated Territories.

Statehood for Hawaii is the one step possible in our historic tradition. To refuse statehood would be to break the historic mold under which we have grown great. Far from establishing a precedent in admitting Hawaii, as some opponents charge, we would, on the contrary, be establishing a precedent if we refused to admit Hawaii, or attempted to set up some other political status for her, contrary to the unequivocally expressed wishes of the nearly one-half million American citizens who are residents of Hawaii.

GOVERNMENT BY CONSENT

We of the United States have prided ourselves, and justly, on our great tradition of government by the consent of the governed. That doctrine is one of our great ideological ramparts against alien philosophies, particularly communism.

The pending bill, S. 49, affords a clear-cut opportunity for the Senate to show not only to the people of the mainland and of Hawaii but to all the world that we still practice what we have long preached and practiced, namely, that we still believe in what President Abraham Lincoln so historically described as "government of the people, by the people, for the people."

HUMPHREY VERSUS HUMPHREY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to another subject. I do so in all good humor, and I hope I can do it in good taste.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BEALL. I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield for that purpose?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I suggest to my good friend from Maryland that at the conclusion of my remarks he could suggest the absence of a quorum, unless the Senator insists on doing so now.

Mr. BEALL. If the Senator from Minnesota intends to speak for some time I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not intend to speak for a very long time, I will say to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BEALL. Very well.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the subject to which I address myself is entitled Humphrey versus Humphrey. I believe I should be able to speak with some authoritative information on the

subject in view of the fact that my family name is involved.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. Is it or is it not a fact that the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota and the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury are cousins?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. I may say that I am about to direct my remarks to that subject. However, I can say early in the proceedings that, so far as I have been able to understand, there is no relationship either biologically or politically.

Mr. President, like most men in public life, I must admit I take a second look when I see my name in the newspaper headlines.

Lately, however, I must admit I have been a bit bewitched, bothered, and bewildered by some headlines about Humphrey.

I am not too happy about picking up my daily paper and reading "Humphrey Raises Interest Rates," "Humphrey Against Tax Reduction," and "Humphrey Finds No Urgency in Action to Stop Recession."

And I am sure the public must often be confused when it further reads other headlines in smaller print, to be sure, saying "HUMPHREY Protests Boosts in Interest Rates," "HUMPHREY Favors Tax Reduction," and "HUMPHREY Urges Action to Halt Recession."

I am sure it is increasingly necessary to make one thing clear: There is no relationship between Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey.

Secretary Humphrey is an extremely able gentleman and a fine man. I know that he is held in the highest esteem by the President and his associates. He is a man of great business experience, of good character and fine reputation. I am sure anyone would be proud to have him as a friend. He is doing an extremely effective job—in supporting the policies and economic views to which he subscribes. Most assuredly I respect his right to hold those views and to state them on any occasion. In fact, I admire the manner in which he advances them.

But they are not my views. So it is understandable that HUBERT HUMPHREY often disagrees with George Humphrey—and vice versa.

For that reason, this situation of Humphrey versus Humphrey in the news columns is becoming more and more confusing.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The able Senator from Minnesota has said it is becoming increasingly necessary to point out the difference and the distinction between the two honorable Messrs. Humphrey. I wonder if he would elaborate on why it becomes increasingly necessary. Might it be that November is approaching nearer and nearer?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that if he will do with me as Shakespeare

said in his great play, Julius Caesar—"Lend me thine ears"—he will soon find out why I feel it is increasingly necessary to make this statement. It is being made in the best of good humor, and, if it is humanly possible for me to do so, in the best of good taste.

Knowing my views, my Minnesota constituents were understandably rather astounded last year over headlines saying, "Humphrey Raises Interest Rates."

I am sure Secretary Humphrey's friends must have been equally surprised when they saw stories about the same time saying, "HUMPHREY Protests Boost in Interest Rates."

And I must admit that everybody will be a bit bewildered, if the press interprets these remarks as "HUMPHREY Raps Humphrey."

The situation is becoming worse instead of better. The increase in interest rates was bad enough—but now it is taxes and the recession.

My position on tax reduction should be evident. I have introduced proposed legislation calling for raising individual exemptions from \$600 to \$800 so as to spread the benefit of lower taxes where it is needed most—among the lower and middle income groups—and thereby to stimulate purchasing power. I have expressed pleasure at similar action by my good friend the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. Then I was greatly encouraged recently by a similar position taken by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] whom I regard as the foremost authority on tax and fiscal matters in the Senate. I have been endeavoring to send word to my friends at home that as a result of his significant support, the outlook is now encouraging for tax relief.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a clipping from the Washington Post of March 1, last Monday, headed "Humphrey Opposes Income Tax Relief." Whether it is sheer coincidence or whether it is a designed plot, I say this kind of headline seems to find its way back home to the Minnesota press.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

HUMPHREY OPPOSED INCOME-TAX RELIEF

(By Rex Chaney)

Treasury Secretary George M. Humphrey said yesterday that barring a drastic change in the economy he would recommend that President Eisenhower veto any bill to raise individual income-tax exemptions.

He made the statement as Representative JERE COOPER, of Tennessee, top Democrat on the tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee, served notice Democrats will wage an all-out fight on the House floor to raise the exemptions from \$600 to \$700.

Humphrey said on Man of the Week, a CBS television program, that the proposed hike would cost the Government \$2.5 billion a year in revenues and present circumstances do not call for more deficit spending.

COOPER charged in a statement that the administration's tax revision bill, which the House committee finished drafting last week, is loaded in favor of larger businesses and wealthy taxpayers.

He said it would give individual taxpayers a mere pittance of relief and demanded that

tax relief be given to the public generally rather than to selected taxpayers.

Humphrey called such talk political propaganda. He said two-thirds of the tax relief called for in the administration's bill would go to individual taxpayers. The rest, he said, would go to business to create new jobs for living as defense spending for killing goes down.

COOPER was joined by Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida, who backed a proposal by Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, Democrat, of Georgia, to raise the present \$600 exemption to \$800 this year and \$1,000 in 1955. SMATHERS said the George plan would help meet the threat of a recession. Humphrey called GEORGE's proposal a battle-axe program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may the RECORD show—and may the public know—that it is not this HUMPHREY, the one who is now speaking, who had anything to do with that story.

Recently I have been pushing for immediate, positive action to combat the signs of a recession or downward adjustment in our economy. I have urged expanding our school-construction, hospital-construction, home-building, and road-building programs to absorb some of our unemployed—maintain our Nation's purchasing power.

Yet I pick up the paper from my home State, the Duluth News Tribune, and read, "Humphrey Finds No Urgency in Action To Stop Recession." Again, I ask, may the RECORD show, please, that it is not this HUMPHREY.

It is getting so bad that I am receiving mail protesting the actions of the other Humphrey. I cannot help but wonder if he is receiving mail objecting to my views.

Even the White House staff gets confused and has called this HUMPHREY regarding an appointment for the other Humphrey.

No wonder, Mr. President, that sometimes one's constituents may be confused.

For the RECORD let me say once more: This HUMPHREY is for tax reduction; this HUMPHREY is for action now to stop the recession.

This HUMPHREY is for tax reduction where it is needed most, and where it will do most to stimulate America's purchasing power—tax reduction for the broad base of the American people.

If one reads otherwise, the reference is to the other Humphrey.

I do not mean to suggest the other Humphrey should stay out of the headlines, but I do not like the kind of headlines he gets.

This HUMPHREY has to run for office and go forth and face the people; the other Humphrey does not. I cannot help but wonder: Can this be the Republican Party's new secret weapon to try and unseat this HUMPHREY next fall? [Laughter.]

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BEALL. I was wondering if we might call this the open season on Humphreys. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would hope that it would be a season for kindness to all Humphreys. If the Secretary of the Treasury has an opportunity to read these remarks, he will know they were

made in good spirit, as is exemplified in the RECORD. The Secretary of the Treasury was kind enough on one occasion to come to my office, and we had a little chance to talk about this mixup. He is a man with a good sense of humor and a man of fine character, and I wish him well, but I certainly disapprove of his point of view.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

REDUCTION IN PRICE SUPPORTS OF DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, since we are in a rather informal session today, with apparently no votes before us, I should like to say that 2 weeks ago we were extolling the virtues of Abraham Lincoln, and I understand that tomorrow the Democrats are going to extoll the virtues of Jackson and Jefferson. We have two heroes to extol.

Today I should like to talk about some of the weaknesses of the Secretary of Agriculture. I am not going to extol virtues.

Mr. President, I wish to renew and continue my protest in behalf of America's dairy industry, against the drastic price reduction threatened by the action of Secretary of Agriculture Benson on April 1. Time is marching on. That deadline is nearing. More and more evidence is accumulating that the Secretary's decision was a mistake, a very serious mistake.

In view of the determined struggle the Secretary of Agriculture is making to rally support behind his efforts to reduce all farm price supports, there is ample reason to believe that this drastic blow proposed for the dairy industry was a part of a deliberate strategy to divide farm unity in this country, and to try to pit one segment of agriculture against another. There is reason to believe it was an attempt to turn feed consumers against feed producers, and to bring to bear pressures of the dairy industry to help force down the level of supports for basic commodities.

However, Mr. President, I am willing to be more charitable and accept the move as merely a mistake on Secretary Benson's part; a mistake in judgment.

It has been contended by spokesmen for the Department of Agriculture and spokesmen rising to Secretary Benson's defense on this floor that the Secretary had no other course to take and that he was compelled to lower price supports to 75 percent by his interpretation of the existing law.

Mr. President, I have before me an article from the Minneapolis Star of February 25 reporting on an address delivered by one of Secretary Benson's assistants at Moorhead, Minn. I call attention to the fact that it is headed "Law Forced Benson's Dairy Cut, Farmers Told." I ask unanimous consent to have the article appear at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

LAW FORCED BENSON'S DAIRY CUT, FARMERS TOLD

MOORHEAD, MINN.—Agriculture Secretary Benson has cut the dairy price-support level to 75 percent of parity "because he is a law-abiding man," farmers were told here Wednesday.

The law required Benson to make the cut, Theodore S. Gold, assistant to the Under Secretary of Agriculture, said when he spoke at the Greater Moorhead Days celebration. "A year ago Secretary Benson strained—and maybe cracked—the law a little in setting supports for dairy products at 90 percent," said Gold.

"He did so because representatives of the dairy industry said 1 more year at the 90-percent level was all they needed to work out a solution to the big surpluses on hand," he said.

This year, Gold said, that surplus is still on hand, and the range of price supports must be based on the supply.

Farmers' Day Chairman Stanley H. Mickelson asked the predominately farm audience of some 1,600 for a show of hands for and against the rigid price-support plan.

Sentiment was overwhelmingly in favor of the high, rigid price-support program.

In his address Gold declared that farm incomes last year were lower than at any time since 1940, in terms of purchasing power, in spite of a \$6 billion price-support program investment.

He explained that the conclusion to be gained from this is that price supports have not effectively protected farm income.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if that is the position of Secretary Benson, then I have a few questions to ask.

If the Secretary feels he was compelled by law to take such action, was it done against his best judgment as to the best interest of agriculture?

If the Secretary feels he was compelled by law to take such action, and did it only regretfully, does he agree that it constitutes too severe a blow to America's agricultural economy, and, too, an unfair and discriminatory blow to America's dairy industry?

If the Secretary feels he was compelled by law to take such action would he have preferred to have been able to continue effective price protection for the dairy industry through a less drastic reduction, or none at all?

If we are to accept the arguments of the supporters of Secretary Benson's position, I think we need answers to those questions. If the Secretary's answer is "No" to those questions, Mr. President, I think it becomes obvious that the argument about his being compelled to take such action is all nonsense. If his answer is "No" to the questions I have asked, it becomes apparent that the Secretary wanted to cut the support price, law or no law, and did so to the maximum extent the law would permit. If that is his position, he and his supporters should say so openly, and not peek out from behind the alibi of saying he only did what the law required him to do.

If the Secretary's answer is "Yes" to those questions, however, if Secretary Benson felt the law compelled him to take action he did not want to take, he should have fulfilled his responsibility to American agriculture by recommending that Congress change that law.

Instead, the administration indicated it was satisfied with the existing law, and recommended that it be retained intact, as far as dairy products are concerned.

I can only conclude, from such evidence, that this administration wanted all along to bring about a substantial reduction in dairy prices—without giving proper consideration to the economic consequences.

But all of this, of course, is prologue; it is now past. There is very little that can be done about the past.

Yet it is not too late to avoid such a drastic blow to the dairy industry. It is not too late for the administration to reconsider, in view of the alarm that has spread throughout the dairy industry.

I appeal to Secretary Benson and the administration to grant that reconsideration, and give further thought to the unfairness of discriminating against the dairy industry, further thought to the basic nature of dairying to our farm economy, and further thought to the effects of such a sudden decline in farm purchasing power upon our entire economy.

If Secretary Benson is really concerned about our dairy farmers, and only pulling the rug out from under them because, as he says, he feels the law compels him to do so, we are offering him a good opportunity to prove it—now.

Pending before the Senate is a bill introduced by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] calling for 90 percent support for dairy products. Pending before this body also is my own price support bill including similar provisions for the dairy industry. Also pending before this body is a more recent measure to limit reduction of dairy support to 5 percent per year, cosponsored by some 25 Senators.

If the present law is all that stands in Secretary Benson's way, I invite him to make known his support for any of these constructive efforts to prevent discrimination against the dairy industry.

The National Milk Producers Federation has written Secretary Benson asking his support for the measure on which widespread bipartisan support has been united as at least a temporary "stopgap." I refer to S. 2962, which I am pleased to co-sponsor with the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], together with other cosponsors who have joined with us.

On behalf of the dairy industry of Minnesota—yes, of the Nation—I publicly join in that request from the milk producers, and urge Secretary Benson to make known at once his willingness to accept and support this modification of his original order so that action can be expedited by the Congress.

Let me quote briefly from the letter to Secretary Benson from the National Milk Producers Federation:

We respectfully call your attention to the probable consequences to the more than 4 million farmers who derive all or part of their cash income from the sale of dairy products.

If in the coming marketing year, as in the past year, the support level should establish the selling price for these farmers, they will suffer an income loss of approximately \$600 million. In addition, there will be a decline in the value of their capital assets

because of this drop in earning power. This might approach the capital asset loss they suffered in 1953 in the value of their cows and heifers, 2 years old and over. This amounted to \$1,200,000,000, according to Department figures. If the loss should be only a fractional percent as great, say one-third, they would suffer a total loss of at least a billion dollars in 1954—an amount equaling 25 percent of their 1953 income.

We believe that you will agree that such a loss constitutes an "economic hardship," and one that you will not permit to happen to the dairymen any more than you would permit it to happen to the Nation's cotton farmers. Such a decline in the purchasing power of dairy farmers in Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, and the New England States—where dairying is the major source of farm income—would border on disastrous. It would certainly be depressing, and could have serious economic reactions in the hundreds of small towns and cities in the rural areas of those States.

Mr. President, I await with interest the reply of Secretary Benson. If he continues to persist to forge this great economic blow, and refuses to accept S. 2962 as a proper safeguard for our dairy industry, it should be obvious that any talk about his acting only because the law compelled him to do so is just a political alibi.

Mr. President, Minnesota has a tremendous stake in the outcome of this dairy crisis. I am standing on the floor of the Senate, fighting for the economic life of my State. I do not intend to quit the fight until some remedy is provided. I do not intend to see thousands of our finest people depressed by action on the part of the Government.

It is not only for our dairy farmers that I am repeatedly calling for corrective action on this floor. Instead, it is for the sake of our entire economy, including the Main Street merchants, who depend on farm income and farm purchasing power.

Minnesota annually produces some 251,389,000 pounds of butter, 45,587,000 pounds of American cheese, and 160,474,000 pounds of nonfat dry milk.

The Midwest is the real victim of this drastic drop in dairy price supports, because it lacks the fluid-milk outlets for its dairy production available on the eastern seaboard.

I make note of the fact that the milk-marketing orders prevent us from shipping our goods into many of the milk markets. So long as the milk-marketing orders are in effect, dairy farmers are denied the opportunity to compete.

Thirty percent of all the butter purchased by the Department of Agriculture nationally is handled through the Minneapolis office of the Commodity Stabilization Service. Sixty-five percent of all the cheese purchases made nationally by the Department of Agriculture are handled through the same office, and 63 percent of all the national purchases of nonfat dry-milk solids.

In those 3 categories, 96, 99.5, and 99.9 percent, respectively, of those commodities handled by the Minneapolis office of the Department originate in either Minnesota or neighboring Wisconsin.

This is not a political argument. I have said a number of times that what we are talking about is bread and butter. We are talking about economics. We

are talking about money in the bank. We are talking about mortgages which will have to be paid. Are we to suffer the consequences?

I repeat what I have mentioned before, that Secretary Benson's order is conservatively estimated to cost Minnesota a loss of \$2,500,000 each month in farm income—immediate cash income.

But that will merely be the start. A chain reaction will hurt our entire farm economy.

Already extension specialists are advising dairymen that they will have to be more efficient, and get rid of more cull dairy cattle.

That will mean lower prices of canners and cutters, and other livestock prices may also move downward.

We have already suffered a terrible liquidation because of the drop in cattle prices. In areas suitable for corn and soybeans, some farmers may produce hogs instead of milk. That will tend to roll back hog prices, since the number of hogs will be increased. In areas where there are no other alternatives—and there are many such areas in my State—dairy farmers will try to step up their production, in order to make up for the loss in income. Minnesota has thousands of acres of cutover area, stump land, where the lumber barons took the trees and left the stumps. Our farmers, over generations of hard work, have tried to clean up that land and put it into dairy farms, and in that way step up their production to make up for the loss in income. That is their only alternative.

So far as I can see, nothing will be solved, and new problems will be created.

Mr. President, I ask consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dairy Chain Reaction," published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of Wednesday, February 24, 1954.

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

DAIRY CHAIN REACTION

If Congress permits dairy price supports to be cut from 90 to 75 percent of parity on April 1 as scheduled, the chain reaction will influence many things besides the price of milk, butter and cheese.

From the standpoint of the consumer, most of the anticipated change will be to the good. From the standpoint of dairy farmers, processors and distributors, the cut will mean a sharp drop in income and a time of painful readjustment. It is up to Congress to weigh these effects before deciding whether to approve or modify Secretary Benson's order.

Dr. E. Fred Koller, an agricultural economist at the University of Minnesota, has thrown interesting light on how the parity cut may have such diverse results as lowering livestock prices, increasing the consumption of baked goods, and adding to the Iron Range labor pool.

He suggests, for example, that some dairy farmers in northern sections of Minnesota and Wisconsin will be forced out of dairy farming. As a result, some young farmers will have to take up other work and may gravitate to the expanding taconite industry.

Dr. Koller also notes that Dakota wheat and beef farmers will quit buying cull dairy cattle because such animals will no longer make a profit for them when dairy prices drop.

This will tend to lower prices of canners and cutters, and other livestock prices may move downward also. In areas suitable for corn and soybeans, some farmers may produce hogs instead of milk. That will tend to roll back hog prices as the number of animals increased.

As for the baked goods, Dr. Koller sees two possible effects. Housewives, he says, may bake fewer pies and cakes and serve more ice cream. On the other hand, commercial baked goods may become cheaper, and better, because bakers will use more dry milk at lower prices.

Another big factor in this matter is the problem of what to do about dairy surpluses. Secretary Benson is reported to be on the verge of announcing a plan for disposal of these vast stores of butter and other products.

The Department of Agriculture has been bombarded with a variety of proposals, ranging from bargain sales to a modification of the old food-stamp plan. Whatever plan is finally approved must again be assessed carefully in the light of its possible effect on our dairy production and marketing system.

Lower food prices would be welcome. But consumers will do well to think also about the effect on the dairy industry—and, in the long run, on themselves as well—of this sharp drop in supports. They might also consider whether it is fair to single out dairymen for such drastic treatment.

Legislation embodying gradual change to lower dairy price supports—by 5-percent steps—is now before Congress. Such an approach would make the necessary cutback just as effective—and a lot less painful—than an abrupt drop from 90 to 75 percent of parity.

The administration has called for a gradual transition to a system of lower supports for the basic farm crops. This philosophy should apply to dairying as well as to other segments of agriculture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the afternoon newspaper published by the same news publishing company, in one of its earlier editorials, supported the position of the Secretary of Agriculture; but I am happy to state that the light of day has seeped through the shadows, the fuzziness, and the cloudiness of that early thinking. Now the morning newspaper points out not only what this policy means to the dairy farmer but also its chain reaction to our economy.

I repeat, Mr. President, that I will not stand idly by and see an order of the Government literally put thousands of people in my State on their economic backs. There is a way to apply a remedy, and that way is now pending before the committees of the Congress, and we are asking for priority action.

Businessmen as well as farmers are deeply concerned about the trends in our farm policy, particularly since this drastic dairy action.

I ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD at this point a letter from the Baudette Civic and Commerce Association expressing the unanimous view of their organization in regard to the dairy situation and farm legislation generally.

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

BAUDETTE CIVIC AND
COMMERCE ASSOCIATION,

Baudette, Minn., February 27, 1954.

HON. HUBERT HUMPHREY,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The Baudette (Minn.) Civic and Commerce Association at a

regular meeting on February 23, 1954 unanimously went on record as favoring at least 90 percent of parity prices for agricultural products.

This group took this action because we realize that farmers prosperity will result in prosperity for the rest of the Nation.

We deplore the recent action of the Secretary of Agriculture in drastically cutting the support price of butter from 90 percent to 75 percent of parity.

BAUDETTE CIVIC AND COMMERCE
ASSOCIATION,
EDWARD EIDE, *Vice President*.
ELMER HAMRE, *Secretary*.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Minnesota speaks eloquently about the chain reaction. Does he in his speech intend to discuss where the dairy farmers buy the feed for their cattle?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, I do. Just before the Senator from South Carolina came on the floor, I was mentioning that this phase of the problem was tied in with the overall agricultural situation. To be sure, if the prices which the dairy farmer receives are low, the only thing he can do is seek to buy the basic commodities which he uses for feed at low prices. The price of every product becomes depressed as a result.

Mr. MAYBANK. I heard the Senator speak of a chain reaction. I am sorry I was not here when the Senator began his remarks. I am interested in the question of the feed dairy farmers must buy, not only in the State of Minnesota, but in all other States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has made a fine contribution. I thank him for it.

I am sure that when civic and commerce associations arrive at such views as those contained in the letter I have just presented for the RECORD, they are doing so not out of sheer sympathy for themselves, but they are doing it for unselfish reasons.

Mr. President, I further ask consent to have published in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the Triumph-Monterey Progress, one of Minnesota's fine weekly newspapers, published by Gordon and Phyllis Spielman. The editorial is entitled "Butter Hits the Skids," and warns of the effect on our economy of Secretary Benson's proposal.

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

BUTTER HITS THE SKIDS

Agriculture Secretary Benson has been playing off the consumer against the farmer in his latest move to impoverish the Midwest farmers, a move which has shocked both advocates of fixed price supports and those who favor a sliding scale.

Benson poses as friend of the consumer when he waxes indignantly about stored butter and surpluses and tumbles down butter supports to the lowest level allowed by law. He prefers to forget that the two largest classes of consumers are the farmers and the laboring people. The consumers' problem is not that farm prices are too high, but that income is too low. And Benson proposes to solve that problem by cutting income further.

The loss to farmers in income in Minnesota alone will be some \$35 million annually. This loss of income, means loss of buying power which will be reflected in less manufactured goods sold, and an increase in industrial unemployment, which, of course, means still less consumer income. It is this vicious cycle that breeds depression.

The administration refuses to listen to its own Republican Congressmen and Senators from the Midwest farm belt who are unanimous in opposing the sharp lowering of supports. In fact there is not a single midwestern Member of Congress of either party who supports Benson or the administration's farm policy.

Nor has there been a single Midwest farm organization, whether it believes in rigid or sliding supports, which backs the Benson butter fiasco. Benson must go, before all of us, whether on the farm or Main Street, go broke.

This great butter surplus Benson is acting so drastically about, is actually less than a 5-percent overproduction. The huge Government support program that Benson finds so burdensome on dairy products takes up only 8.4 percent of the CCC's investment. Yet dairy products make up some 14.6 percent of all farm income.

We think that the farmers must act and act now. When we are in a depression it will be too late.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD an article from the February 18, 1954, issue of the St. Paul Pioneer Press, headed "United States Dairy Prop Cut Called Broken Pledge," describing the reaction of Mr. A. J. Smaby, general manager of Midland Cooperatives, Inc.

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

UNITED STATES DAIRY PROP CUT CALLED BROKEN PLEDGE

A. J. Smaby, general manager of Midland Cooperatives, Inc., said Wednesday the Government broke its pledge to agriculture for orderly adjustment in the dairy program by lowering dairy price support.

The 8-cent-per-pound reduction in butter price supports will become effective April 1.

Smaby said: "The shock of the great reduction in dairy support prices will disrupt dairying in this region for many months. If supports must be lowered so drastically, dairymen should have been given adequate notice. * * *

"Cooperatives are easing some of the squeeze on net farm income. Few local cooperatives, however, can make up in cash refunds this year the loss their members will suffer from lower dairy incomes."

Midland is made up of 682 local cooperatives owned by about 285,000 farm families.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The article describes the reaction of Mr. A. J. Smaby, who was recently appointed by the President as a Director of the Federal Land Bank. I make note of the fact that Mr. Smaby, who is one of our most respected citizens, states: "The shock of the great reduction in dairy support prices will disrupt dairying in this region for many months." He points out that by lowering the dairy price supports, the Government broke its pledge to agriculture for an orderly adjustment in the dairy program.

Mr. President, I also ask consent to have published in the body of the RECORD a resolution wired to President Eisen-

hower by Chippewa Local of the Swift County Farmers Union, urging him to undo the damage Secretary Benson has done to the dairy industry.

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

The following resolution in the form of a wire to President Eisenhower was unanimously passed at the last meeting of the Chippewa local of the Swift County Farmers Union, held at district 71, on February 17:

"Secretary Benson's recent action reducing butterfat supports means disaster for the dairy industry. We urge you to undo the damage by again setting dairy supports at 90 percent of parity until a new farm program is passed around your campaign promise of full parity for American agriculture.

"JAMES HARLOW,
"Secretary.

"BENSON, MINN."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to say that the people of my State voted overwhelmingly, or at least in substantial majority, for President Eisenhower. The people of my State have high regard and true affection for the President. If my voice could reach the White House this afternoon I would ask the President not to let those people down. I would ask him not to permit one of his agents, one of his department heads, to disavow a pledge which the President made to the people of my State and to the people of the Nation. Surely, the President knows what his Secretary of Agriculture is doing. The President has concurred, apparently, in what the Secretary has done. I ask him to redeem this broken promise. I am not making this request in a tone of partisanship, but in the name of mercy and justice.

After all, the President voluntarily made a promise to the people of Minnesota on September 6, 1952. Before God and the people, he promised support of not less than 90 percent, and a more limited program for perishable commodities. No Minnesotan wrote that speech. No farmer asked him to make it. He said what I have quoted. It was a golden promise, and I say the promise must be kept. If the Secretary of Agriculture cannot keep it, I ask the President to call the Secretary in and find out who is President in this country. Ours is not a Government by committee. The President of the United States has the responsibility for his administration.

Mr. President, I have another clipping from the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of February 21, entitled "Dairymen Do Not Take Kindly to Support Cut." Let me read and extract from it:

Experts seem to agree on one thing: the lowering of prices won't get rid of the butter surplus. There'll still be too much of a spread between the prices of oleomargarine and butter.

This article further points out that some of our dairymen will have to turn to already depressed livestock, others will turn to hogs. It also emphasizes that in some areas the only answer will be feeding heavier or increasing cow herds—increasing milk output, rather than decreasing it.

I ask consent that this article be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

DAIRYMEN DON'T TAKE KINDLY TO SUPPORT CUT

How is the dairy industry taking the jolt of lowered price prospects for butter and other products?

The industry doesn't like it.

Dairymen say they're entitled to an opportunity for an orderly retreat from high production and it cannot be done overnight without assistance from the same people who brought the plea for more milk during wartime.

Most farmers had figured supports would be reduced, but gradually and not to the legal limit all at once.

Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, had hinted broadly that he'd reduce dairy support prices so the move was not unexpected.

Experts seem to agree on one thing—the lowering of prices won't get rid of the butter surplus. There'll still be too much of a spread between prices of oleomargarine and butter.

Even with the drop, butter will be in the 60-70 cents a pound range retail, while in Minnesota, even with heavy taxes, most oleo is about 20 cents lower.

How will farmers meet the price adjustment?

E. Fred Koller, professor of agricultural economics at University of Minnesota, came up with some definite ideas last week:

In southern and southwestern Minnesota, farmers may get discouraged and turn to crops or livestock. Many believe beef cattle prices have reached the bottom and may start feeding more cattle.

Hogs hit a high of \$28 a hundredweight at South St. Paul last week and this may encourage some to go heavier into hogs.

In northern Minnesota, however, farmers don't have alternative crops.

Here, Koller figures, farmers may step up production in order to maintain income with lowered prices. That could mean feeding heavier or increasing cow herds.

In all areas, the watchword will be efficiency. A cow that produces less than 6,000 pounds of milk and 200 pounds of butterfat in a year isn't earning her keep.

Some experts say there are enough of these "boarders" to solve the butter surplus problem. Sending low producing cows to market could reduce milk production between 6 and 8 million pounds almost overnight.

Among efficiency measures will be cutting of feed costs by raising more low cost but highly nutritious grasses and legumes, use of fertilizers on pastures, cutting labor by labor-saving devices and, if planning a new barn, considering pole type or pen type barns that cost less.

But even with efficient operations, Minnesota will be hard hit. Much of the milk production goes into butter. The State is the No. 1 butter-producing State in the Nation and last year churned some 290 million pounds.

Butter, however, comes from surplus milk. The area is too far away from the big milk consuming areas of the East and South. Transportation is a problem.

And many markets for fluid milk and cream have been lost to midwest producers because of artificial barriers erected by many milksheds in the form of so-called sanitary regulations.

"Get your milk inspected by our city inspectors on the farm or don't ship to us" is one of the favorites.

One of the brightest pictures in the dairy industry is increased use of milk powder. With greater attempts at merchandising, United States consumption has risen from 2 million to 100 million pounds in the past 5 years.

Coincident with release of new price-support announcement, the department of agriculture forecast milk production for 1954-55 crop year at 122 billion pounds, an increase of nearly 2 billion pounds over 1953-54.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there are in the world no better experts on the subject of dairy products than the people of Minnesota and those of the neighboring State of Wisconsin. The experts who have studied the question find no solution to the present problem in the action of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. President, there can be no doubt how Minnesota feels about this issue. It is a very disturbing situation that must be corrected, for the sake of our entire economy.

All my efforts in that direction have been in a constructive and bipartisan spirit, because when dairymen go broke it doesn't make any difference whether they are Democrats or Republicans.

When the mortgage falls due and the money is not there to pay it, the dairy farmer may go to his Republican banker and show him a card which says he is a member of the Republican Party, but that is not going to pay the mortgage, and is not going to relieve the dairy farmer of his responsibility.

He can go to the Democratic central committeeman who may be the head of a lending association, and even though the farmer is a member of the Democratic Party, when the mortgage is due the lender wants the money. So we are not talking about Republicans or Democrats; we are talking about one simple thing—farm income.

Mr. President, I ask consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a letter to me from Ross B. Clark, secretary-manager of the Mid-South Milk Producers Association, commending me for my efforts in behalf of the dairy industry, and adding their protest against Secretary Benson's action.

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

FEBRUARY 27, 1954.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have just read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 24, 1954, your comments on the floor of the Senate in regard to price supports on dairy products. The dairymen in the mid-south area have the same sentiments as you expressed from the dairymen of your State, Minnesota. We have contacted our honorable Senators EASTLAND and STENNIS, of Mississippi, and Senators GORE and KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, expressing the same viewpoints that you so ably presented to the Senate.

While our market is comparatively small, a reduction in dairy support prices to 75 percent of parity would mean from 55 to 60 thousand dollars less income a month to our producers.

Our market had been a deficit market for many years, and immediately after World War II, we encouraged 650 new producers to borrow money to buy cows; build grade A dairy barns; improve pasture lands; buy additional farm machinery to help supply our bottled milk market with an adequate supply of milk. Many of our 650 new producers were young GI's just returning from the war. Unless the support price of dairy commodities is raised from 75 to 85 percent of parity

many of our dairymen and young GI's will lose their farms and herds.

We feel that a rollback in prices in an orderly manner is justified, but such drastic actions by our Secretary of Agriculture could force our country into another major depression such as we had in the early Thirties.

We want you and our Senators to know that the dairymen all over the country appreciate your continued fight for a solid agricultural economy.

Respectfully yours,

MID-SOUTH MILK PRODUCERS
ASSOCIATION,
ROSS B. CLARK,
Secretary-Manager.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there is much more that could be said on this dairy issue, and much more that I will say, unless some action is quickly taken to reduce the effect of Secretary Benson's disastrous blow. I repeat my promise to keep this issue before the Senate until there is taken some favorable action which is reasonable and fair, and which will provide effective safeguards and protection for America's economically important dairy industry.

COST OF AGRICULTURE PROGRAMS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President some time ago Secretary of Agriculture Benson submitted a table to the Senate Agriculture Committee in which he listed the realized cost of agricultural and related programs, by function, for the fiscal years 1932-53. That table and another dealing exclusively with the price support program I submitted some time ago to the Senate. I have no doubt that the table was submitted primarily to show the cost to the Government of the United States of the price support programs, but, interestingly enough, it included the cost of other programs which are completely unrelated to the price support program.

For example, the Secretary inserted as a part of the table a section showing that the REA program cost the Government \$99.8 million from its inception. Why did the Secretary of Agriculture consider it necessary to insert figures showing losses in the case of a program such as that of the REA, which is completely unrelated to the program of price supports? Was he trying to confuse the issue? Was he trying to give the REA a black eye? Or was he playing into the hands of those who are trying to destroy the REA program, which has meant so much to the farmers of the United States.

When one compares the Secretary's figures with the official figures of the REA, as contained in its Administrator's report to the Congress for the fiscal year 1953, there is a total difference of \$145.3 million. The Secretary's table shows the REA program operated at a loss to the Government of \$99.8 million, whereas the REA report shows a profit of \$45.5 million.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator

from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator from Louisiana for clarifying this matter, because at this time I have in my office a number of letters from persons in the business area of my State, asking me which set of figures is correct. As I understand, the annual report of the REA shows a substantial profit.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Whereas the report of the Secretary of Agriculture to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry shows a loss.

Mr. ELLENDER. I propose to explain the matter thoroughly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I desire to thank the Senator from Louisiana, because the figures have been as goobledygooked and as mixed up as some other figures which have been submitted to us of late.

Mr. ELLENDER. Think of it, Mr. President—there is a difference of \$145.3 million between the figures supplied by the Department and the figures supplied by an agency within that Department. Apparently the Department of Agriculture figured its estimate on a realized-cost basis, whereas the REA figured theirs on an accrued income and expense basis. The official statement of the Secretary states that "records for these programs are maintained and reports are made on the accrued basis, pursuant to regulations governing business-type Government operations." Therefore, if the Government regulations require the agency to report its operations on an accrued basis, why did the Secretary attempt to report them on a realized cost basis?

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Louisiana is pointing to a discrepancy in figures within the Department of Agriculture. Does he realize that at the time we discussed the Commodity Credit Corporation and the liquidation of some of the loans which had been made by it—subjects which were recently discussed in the Senate—the Secretary of the Treasury valued the stores of butter the Government had on hand at approximately 38 cents a pound?

Mr. ELLENDER. I find it strange, I may say, that this table should have been presented to our Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. As I stated on the floor of the Senate during January, the table was most misleading. In my humble judgment, that was done in an effort to blacken the support program. As I indicated then, the table indicated a loss, from the agricultural programs, of \$16 billion, when, as a matter of fact, the losses sustained by the Government on the basic commodities for a period of 20 years amounted to less than \$21 million, and in the case of all commodities—whether basic or non-basic—the loss was a little more than \$1 billion.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of that amount, is it not true that the potato losses were the most significant?

Mr. ELLENDER. The potato losses accounted for \$448 million, as I recall the figures.

I may say that those tables have been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; they appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 29, 1954, at pages 1000, 1001, and 1002.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As a Senator who comes from a State with a population which is from 40 to 45 percent rural and from 55 to 60 percent urban, I wish to say that I am becoming sick, tired, and disgusted that a department of our Government should submit figures which it knows to be misleading, and which it has designed and compiled for the sole purpose of discrediting a program which functions well and to perfect which the Senator from Louisiana has dedicated years of service.

Mr. President, let no mistake be made about this matter: If the figures can be distorted, so as thereby to jeopardize the realization of truth by the American public, these programs will be "washed out" or ended, and the Nation will suffer.

The people of my State have been told again and again, through almost every means of propaganda, that the losses from the farm programs have amounted to more than \$16 billion. I believe that on the floor of the Senate we should, week after week, repudiate that misrepresentation and also the misrepresenters—those who have done the dirty deed.

Mr. President, what an outrageous performance on the part of an agency of Government that is. The Secretary of Agriculture is supposed to represent agriculture, just as the Secretary of Labor is supposed to represent labor and management. What the Secretary of Agriculture has done in this case is fantastic.

I wish to thank the Senator from Louisiana for bringing out the facts in connection with this matter. It is time for righteous indignation. One thing we should expect from the Government is simple honesty in arithmetic.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on several occasions I have tried to make the facts plain to the Senate, and it is my purpose to continue to do so in the future, because I believe it to be wrong for the Secretary of Agriculture to blacken the present agricultural program, in the hope that he can have his own program adopted. I do not mind a fair fight, but at least the American people should be told the truth about the various programs.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I believe my colleague will find it very significant to study the results of a poll taken by the very able junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young]. In yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD he placed the results of a poll he had taken among a group of North Dakotans. I notice the poll showed that among the farmers who responded, 1,478 said they had voted for President Eisen-

hower, and 1,035 said they had not. When asked how they would vote if an election were held today, by almost 2 to 1 they indicated they would not vote for President Eisenhower again.

Why did they say they would not vote for him again? The reason is not specifically stated in connection with the poll, but when we come to the answer to the 14th question we find significant figures. That question was, "Do you favor Secretary Benson's being retained as Secretary of Agriculture?"

Among the farmers the vote was 474 "yes" and 2,077 "no." That means that, whereas a majority of the farmers had voted for President Eisenhower, a large majority of them do not feel that they could vote for him at the present time, because, in the proportion of approximately 5 to 1, they do not approve the actions of his Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me at this time to permit me to make an observation in regard to another poll?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield if it is understood that in doing so, I shall not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say that within the last week or 10 days the Chamber of Commerce at Moorhead, Minn., one of our very fine, larger cities, and a neighboring city to Fargo, N. Dak., sponsored what is called the Greater Moorhead Days. They selected 2 days of the week for Farmers' Days. On one day they invited me to speak in the auditorium of Concordia College to the farmers there assembled. There was a packed house of more than 3,000. I would say that, conservatively estimated, 3,500 farm people were present.

Three days later an assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture, a man by the name of Mr. Gold, went there, to speak in behalf of the administration's program. Of course, on that occasion he had the rebuttal, he spoke after I had spoken. Having heard what I had had to say, he had the advantage of all the briefing. After he finished speaking, an informal poll was taken; at the conclusion of the two meetings, the farmers present were asked by the presiding officer, who was the chairman of the Farmers' Days:

All those in favor of flexible price supports, the Benson program, please stand.

Mr. President, I must say, that, out of courtesy, some of the fine, friendly, charitable, kindly people in that part of the State of Minnesota stood.

Then they were asked the question:

All those in favor of 90 percent price supports, the so-called rigid price supports, please stand.

Mr. President, the number of those who stood at that time was so great that they reminded one of a forest; they stood en masse. Yet I wish to say that within the political picture these folk are traditionally Republicans. However, let me say they know how to keep books. They also know what it means to pay the bills. Right now there is no shadow of a doubt. If any Senator has any doubt about it, I suggest that he

take a few days off and go home. In Washington, on the banks of the Potomac, we become easily confused over agricultural problems. But let any Senator who has any doubt in his mind make a visit back home with the folks. They will help him considerably. The voice of the people is second only to the voice of the Lord.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to continue the statement explaining the discrepancy. I repeat what I have just read, so as to preserve continuity:

The official statement of the Secretary recites:

Records for these programs are maintained and reports are made on the accrued basis pursuant to regulations governing business-type Government operations.

Therefore, if the Government regulations require the agency to report its operations on an accrued basis, why did the Secretary attempt to report them on a realized cost basis? Since the regulations stipulate that they are to be reported on an accrual basis, what is the Secretary trying to do? Is he trying to enter into an academic discussion of accounting in disregard of the wishes of the Congress; wishes that, as we shall see, are expressed in the law of the land? Surely the Secretary is not so naive as to believe that the enemies of the rural electrification program will not seize upon his figures and spread over the land the statement that the REA program has cost the American people almost a hundred million dollars. Surely it could not have been his intention to harm this fine program, a program that is bringing electricity to over 4 million farm families and rural establishments.

The report of the REA Administrator for fiscal year 1953, submitted to the Congress on January 22, 1954, states that the net income from lending operations cumulative to June 30, 1953, was \$45,543,819. This is quite a difference from the net loss of \$99.8 million listed in the Secretary of Agriculture's report. Why is there such a great discrepancy between these two sets of figures? In the Secretary's report he lists interest income as \$150.9 million to June 30, 1953, while in the REA report they list interest income as almost \$234 million. What accounts for this difference of \$83.1 million? The REA Act wisely provides that the rural electric systems are given a 5-year deferment period on the payment of interest and principal. This deferment is necessary in order to give these systems sufficient time to build up their loads so that they will have revenue enough to repay their loans. This was the decision of the Congress, and I, for one, believe it was a wise decision.

Up to December 30, 1953, this deferred interest amounted to \$86,634,911.45. I noted that the difference between the REA figures for interest income and the Secretary of Agriculture's figures is approximately \$83 million. This difference is accounted for by the deferment of interest for the 5-year period. But when the rural electric systems defer the payment of this interest, they accrue it with the understanding that they will pay it when it comes due at the end

of the deferment period. They are doing this in good faith, in the faith that they have to meet their obligations to the Federal Government. They are doing it in accord with law as enacted by the Congress. I for one know their honor is good and the obligation will be discharged in due time. Let us look at the record. Through calendar year 1953 the rural electric system had repaid \$163,300,000 in interest and \$305,200,000 in principal, of which \$62,500,000 were payments in advance of the date they were due. This was a gain in advance payments of \$10 million for the calendar year 1953. This total amount of advanced payments is now credited to more than 700 borrowers and is about equal to the total amount due in interest and principal from all borrowers during 1953. With such a fine record of financial achievement, how could anyone list this deferred interest as a cost to the Government? There should be no question in anybody's mind regarding the intent and ability of the farmers' rural electric systems to repay this money to the Government as it becomes due.

The REA Administrator, Ancher Nelson, announced in a press release on February 4 that delinquent electric loan payments to REA were the lowest in 9 years. Only \$343,352 was overdue more than 30 days at the beginning of 1954. This is very small when we consider that the amount loaned is almost \$2 billion. This was only one-twelfth of 1 percent of the total amount due. Does this fine

record of financial achievement give any cause to the Secretary of Agriculture to list the deferred interest as a cost to the Government? It seems to me that when one does this, he is playing into the hands of those who desire to destroy this great rural electrification program.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson in his table lists the interest expense to the Government as \$250.7 million while the REA Administrator in his official report to the Congress as only \$185.9 million. There happens to be a slight difference here of \$64.8 million. REA bases its statement of interest expense on the provisions of the REA act while the Secretary of Agriculture bases his interest cost on the computed interest rate on all Federal and federally guaranteed securities as of June 30 each year—in other words, disregarding the law. When REA was first established, its interest rate was 3 percent (during the period from 1935 to 1936). Then upon passage of the REA act in 1936 the act stated that the interest rate should be equal to the average rate of interest payable by the United States on its obligations having a maturity of 10 or more years.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table designated table 1, showing interest rates paid by REA borrowers and methods by which they were determined, by fiscal year.

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

TABLE I.—Interest rates paid by REA borrowers and methods by which they were determined, by fiscal years, 1936–53

Fiscal year	Rate of interest paid by REA borrowers ¹	Average rate of interest payable by United States on obligations issued yearly having a maturity of 10 years or more ²	Computed interest rate on marketable Federal securities ³	Method of determining rate of interest paid by REA borrowers
	Percent	Percent	Percent	
1936.....	3.0	2.77	2.77	Administrative determination under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act. Statutory rate prescribed by section 4-5, Rural Electrification Act of 1936—a rate equal to the average rate of interest payable by the United States on its obligations having a maturity of 10 or more years issued during the last preceding fiscal year in which any such obligations were issued. ⁴
1937.....	2.77	2.88	2.88	
1938.....	2.88	2.73	2.73	
1939.....	2.73	2.69	2.525	
1940.....	2.69	2.46	2.492	
1941.....	2.46	2.48	2.413	
1942.....	2.48	2.57	2.225	
1943.....	2.57	2.67	1.822	
1944.....	2.67	2.49	1.725	
1945 through Sept. 20, 1944.....	2.49	-----	1.718	
1945 from Sept. 21, 1944.....	2.0	-----	1.718	
1946.....	2.0	-----	1.773	
1947.....	2.0	-----	1.871	
1948.....	2.0	-----	1.942	
1949.....	2.0	-----	2.001	
1950.....	2.0	-----	1.958	
1951.....	2.0	-----	1.981	
1952.....	2.0	-----	2.051	
1953.....	2.0	-----	2.207	

¹ 2.49 percent rate was effective through Sept. 20, 1944; 2 percent thereafter.

² This was the figure that determined the REA interest rate during the 1937-44 period. Note that the rate in this column for each year became the REA interest rate the following year.

³ This is the computed annual average cost to the Government on all marketable Federal securities, and is often regarded as representing the cost of money to the Government. Since July 1, 1947, the amount in this column has been the basis of the interest rate charged REA by the Treasury for the money it makes available to borrowers. A comparable rate is not readily available for fiscal years earlier than 1939.

⁴ The rate of interest payable on amounts placed under note during fiscal year 1940, for example, was equal to the average rate of interest payable on bonds with maturities of 10 years or more issued in fiscal 1939. If no such bonds had been issued in 1939, the 1938 issues would have been used. Such average rates were computed by the Treasury Department.

Mr. ELLENDER. Table I lists the interest rates paid by the systems during that period. I ask unanimous consent that the table may be inserted as part

of my remarks. Then in 1944 the Pace Act was passed which reduced the REA interest rate to a fixed 2 percent. During all this period except for 1952 and

1953 you will note from the table the interest rate on REA loans was higher than the computed interest rate on marketable Federal securities. This rate on marketable Federal securities is considered the cost of money to the Government and has been the basis of the interest rate charged REA by the Treasury for the money it makes available to its borrowers. Because the rate paid by the borrowers for most of this period was higher than the rate paid by REA, you have a net income of \$45.5 million on interest as listed in the REA Administrator's report for fiscal year 1953.

What the Secretary of Agriculture has done is to average the amount of REA loans outstanding at the beginning of the year and at the end of the year and then multiply this by the computed interest rate on all Federal and federally guaranteed securities as of June 30 each year. This means of computing the cost

of money to the Treasury has no basis in either the REA Act as explained above or in fact. By doing this he is burdening the cooperatives with the cost of all Federal and federally guaranteed securities. This includes such things as the Panama Canal bonds, conversion bonds, postal-savings bonds, tax and savings notes, investment series bonds, depository bonds, Armed Forces leave bonds, adjusted-service bonds, Treasury bonds, and so forth. The interest rates on these issues from June 30, 1936, to June 30, 1953, as shown in table II, have varied from thirty-eight one hundredths of 1 percent to 3 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

TABLE II.—Computed interest rate on public debt, by security classes, selected dates, 1936-53

Date	Total public debt	Marketable issues					Nonmarketable issues				Special issues
		Total ¹	Bills	Certificates	Notes	Treasury bonds	Total	Savings bonds ²	Tax and savings notes	Other ³	
June 30, 1936.....	2,559	(0)	(0)	-----	(0)	(0)	(0)	2,900	-----	3,000	(0)
June 30, 1937.....	2,582	(0)	(0)	-----	(0)	(0)	(0)	2,900	-----	3,000	(0)
June 30, 1938.....	2,589	(0)	(0)	-----	(0)	(0)	(0)	2,900	-----	3,000	(0)
June 30, 1939.....	2,525	0.010	-----	-----	1.448	2.064	2.913	2,900	-----	3,000	3.091
June 30, 1940.....	2,553	2.422	.038	-----	1.256	2.908	2.908	2,900	-----	3,000	3.026
June 30, 1941.....	2,518	2.413	.089	-----	1.075	2.787	2.865	2,858	-----	3,000	2.904
June 30, 1942.....	2,285	2.225	.360	0.564	1.092	2.680	2.277	2,787	0.506	2,743	2.681
June 30, 1943.....	1,979	1.822	.380	-----	1.165	2.494	2.330	2,782	1.040	2,495	2.408
June 30, 1944.....	1,929	1.725	.381	-----	1.281	2.379	2.417	2,788	1.080	2,314	2.405
June 30, 1945.....	1,936	1.718	.381	-----	1.204	2.314	2.473	2,789	1.076	2,000	2.435
June 30, 1946.....	1,996	1.773	.381	-----	1.289	2.307	2.567	2,777	1.070	2,000	2.448
June 30, 1947.....	2,107	1.871	0.382	0.875	1.448	2,307	2,593	2,765	1.070	2,423	2,510
June 30, 1948.....	2,182	1.942	1.014	1.042	1.204	2,309	2,623	2,759	1.070	2,414	2,588
June 30, 1949.....	2,236	2.001	1.176	1.225	1.375	2,313	2,629	2,751	1,290	2,393	2,596
June 30, 1950.....	2,200	1.958	1.167	1.163	1.344	2,322	2,569	2,748	1,383	2,407	2,589
June 30, 1951.....	2,270	1.981	1.589	1.875	1.399	2,327	2,623	2,742	1,567	2,717	2,606
June 30, 1952.....	2,329	2.051	1.711	1.875	1.560	2,317	2,659	2,745	1,785	2,714	2,675
June 30, 1953.....	2,438	2.207	2.254	2.319	1.754	2,342	2,720	2,760	2,231	2,714	2,746
Sept. 30, 1953.....	2,466	2.242	2.067	2.476	1.852	2,380	2,723	2,764	2,347	2,714	2,751

¹ Total includes the following issues not shown separately: postal savings bonds, Panama Canal bonds and conversion bonds. This column contains the interest figures generally referred to as "the cost of money to the Government," i. e., the average rate of interest on marketable securities.

² Computed on the basis of the rate to maturity applied against the amount outstanding.

³ Includes investment series bonds, depository bonds, Armed Forces leave bonds, and adjusted service bonds.

⁴ Not available.

⁵ Interest rate on regular certificates was 2.476 percent on total of \$20.5 billion. In July Treasury began issuing a special tax anticipation certificate at 2.5 percent, with a total outstanding Sept. 30, 1953, of \$5.9 billion. Treasury does not supply a computed average of the 2 types of certificates. The slightly lower (0.024 percent) rate is used here because about 4/5 of the certificates are at that rate.

Source: U. S. Treasury, Annual Report and Bulletin.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask the Secretary why burden the rural electric cooperatives with the interest expense of all these varying types of Government securities? This certainly is not the rate that REA had to pay the Treasury for the moneys which is advanced to the rural electric systems. This accounts for the difference of \$64.8 million between the Secretary of Agriculture's figures and the official figures of the REA. Why does the Secretary of Agriculture insist on burdening the farmers' rural electric systems with this additional \$64.8 million? I insist that he would only do this if he did not have the best interests of the rural electric systems at heart.

The 1,022 REA borrowers at the end of calendar year 1953 were serving 4,031,000 connected consumers on 1,295,000 miles of line. Over 91 percent of the Nation's farms are now receiving central station electric service as compared with only 10.9 percent on December 31, 1934.

This is an achievement we are all proud of.

All of us are proud of the record of the farmers' rural electric systems and we want to make the record clear that we object to this juggling of figures by the Secretary of Agriculture. This manipulation is contrary to the wishes of the Congress, as expressed in the REA Act, as amended, and also is contrary to the faith that we in the Congress have in the ability of the rural electric systems to meet all their obligations to the Government. It also disregards a record of achievement that all of us in the Congress are proud of.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I shall speak today briefly on the extent of the Communist control of the economic and political life of Hawaii. Later in this debate I expect to speak at some length and in great detail in opposition to this resolution. Today, my remarks will be directed largely at occurrences in the past few months since the investigation last summer which show the extent of Communist domination of this Territory which is now knocking at the door of the American Congress demanding admission into this Union of sovereign States. This is a very dangerous matter, Mr. President, and in my judgment is fraught with grave peril to the United States.

Not one valid reason has been given why this Territory should be admitted to statehood. Not one valid proof has been given, Mr. President, that the admission of Hawaii would benefit the people of the United States. I submit all the facts point the other way. At the outset, let me state that the investigation of the ILWU by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate shows beyond any peradventure of doubt that this union is Communist controlled; that Communists control the economic life of Hawaii; that Communist control has penetrated the Government of Hawaii and that the international Communist conspiracy today exerts great influence in the county governments in the Territory and in the territorial legislature. The issue is not how many Communists are there in Hawaii. That is beside the point. The real issue is: Do they control the Territory? The issue is the extent of their power and control. The question is what is their strength rather than what are their numbers. I submit that their power is dangerous, that this power is so dangerous Hawaii should not be admitted to statehood.

I submit, Mr. President, that the admission of Hawaii to statehood would place on the floor of the Senate of the United States two Senators who, if not Communists, would be subject to influence from Moscow and that the government of the new state would be influenced by the international Communist conspiracy just as Communists today yield great power in the Territorial government of Hawaii.

There are several yardsticks to be used in evaluating the real power of communism in Hawaii. First: The extent of the control of the economic life of the community and the ability through Communist controlled unions to halt the wheels of the economic life at the whim of the party and its masters in the Kremlin. Second: The extent of the infiltration in the government through (a) elected or appointed government officials, and (b) government employees in general who belong to organizations under Communist control. Third: The percentage of the population who belong to unions under complete control of the Communist Party. Fourth: The funds spent by the Communist press, including all publications under party control, and Communist controlled unions. Fifth: The fear of the community to fight back and the ability of the Communist Party to make life intolerable for former Com-

munists who desert the ranks of the party and openly help to expose its sinister and subversive activities; and, further the fear of reprisal and the ability of the party to impose reprisals upon others who cooperate with the Government of the United States in the effort of the Government of the United States to break up the Communist conspiracy in the islands, and to convict the leaders who have participated therein.

Let me say at that point, Mr. President, the record shows that the witnesses who testified for the Government in the Smith Act trial of Communist leaders in the Islands are unable to obtain employment today and that their families are suffering, because of the power of the Communist Party in Hawaii, which says they shall not be employed.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Mississippi is familiar with the fact, is he not, that the jury was not afraid to find the Communist leaders guilty, that the trial judge was not afraid to sentence them to terms in the penitentiary, and that the Governor and leading Republicans and leading Democrats were not afraid to testify against them at the trial?

Mr. EASTLAND. Speaking of leading Democrats, the mayor of the city of Honolulu, which contains about half the population of the islands, testified as a defense witness, and many other leading citizens testified as defense witnesses.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. The Senator from Louisiana asked me a question, and I shall attempt to answer it. One of the business firms employed in a supervisory capacity one of the criminals who was convicted in the Smith Act trial. That same firm employed one of the Government witnesses who testified against the defendants. The facts disclose that after the trial the business firm promoted the convicted Communist and gave him a raise in salary, and discharged the man who had the courage to testify against the convicted traitors. Such incidents as this show the power of communism in the islands.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. There is another factor involved. In Hawaii a shortwave radio at times picks up Radio Moscow broadcasts, and rebroadcasts those anti-American lies and propaganda over the islands. That shows the tremendous power of the Communist Party in the islands.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is familiar with the outcome of the trial in question, I believe. The outcome was that the Communist leaders were convicted and sentenced to the penitentiary.

Mr. EASTLAND. I understand that to be the fact. I also understand that the economic life of the islands is controlled and dominated by Communists

through union control. I believe the facts will show that from 2,000 to 3,000 of the territorial employees of the Government in Hawaii are members of a Communist-dominated union.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator has stated and reiterated his view that the economic life of the Hawaiian Islands is controlled by Communists through the domination by Communists of union labor forces.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. Of course, that is a conclusion, as the Senator readily recognizes.

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly, it is a conclusion, but I think I shall make known the facts to sustain it.

Mr. CORDON. I assumed that the Senator would bring out facts which would show the actual exercise of control.

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall not discuss in detail that phase of the subject today. I shall discuss it later, and if the Senator will refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last year he will find the speech I made and also a speech by the then junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], citing the control of the economic life of the Territory of Hawaii by Communist leadership.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is familiar, is he not, with the fact—and it is a fact—that the most recent strike of the so-called longshoremen's group in 1949-50, tied up transportation to and from the islands, without any question? The Senator is also familiar with the fact that while the strike was in progress and while every effort Communist leaders could exert to tie up and throttle the commerce of the islands was made, the Legislature of Hawaii was called into special session and passed legislation which provided complete authority for the Territorial Government to take over and operate all longshore and wharfage operations in the Territory?

Mr. EASTLAND. The answer to that question is that the labor organization did tie up the economy of the islands. It is a fact on which we rely to show Communist control of the economic life of the islands.

Mr. CORDON. But legislation was passed by a legislature elected in Hawaii, and it was signed by the Governor, went into effect, and was used for the purpose for which it was passed. Is that not true?

Mr. EASTLAND. I know there are some persons in Hawaii who make that claim but the facts are that the strike almost destroyed Hawaii and demonstrated Communist control of the economy of Hawaii. For months the people could not obtain an adequate food supply.

Mr. CORDON. Would the Senator say it was destructive of the economy of Hawaii when the highest legislative body in the Territory took steps to place in

the hands of the courts adequate authority to control the situation?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator has made his point, but, as I have said, the same thing is happening over and over again. The strike did bring the economy of Hawaii to its knees.

Mr. CORDON. But not on its back.

Mr. EASTLAND. I will tell the Senator something else for his information. Another strike in Hawaii is threatened for this month. There is a union which not only controls all the longshoremen, but controls the pineapple workers, the sugarcane workers, and even the taxi drivers, and it is affiliated with another Communist union, the Public Workers Union, which controls hospital employees, having from 2,000 to 3,000 members among the employees of the county and Territorial governments. To say that an all-out strike of those organizations could not bring the economy of Hawaii to its knees is not correct.

Mr. CORDON. Has it?

Mr. EASTLAND. It did.

Mr. CORDON. Was it not completely met by adequate legislation enacted by the legislature of the Territory?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; it was not completely met. It caused great suffering in Hawaii.

Mr. President, when we apply these standards of measure to the Communist apparatus in Hawaii, we find a situation so shocking that the facts stagger the imagination.

Mr. President, I shall apply these tests from sworn testimony before the Internal Security Subcommittee, and largely from newspaper articles and advertisements, which reveal occurrences in the life of the islands.

The Communist Party controls the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union, dominated largely by Harry Bridges and headed in Hawaii by one Jack W. Hall, convicted last summer under the Smith Act. The ILWU has recently demonstrated its ability to bring economic paralysis to the islands. There is no place in the continental United States where the Communist Party can, at any moment of its own choosing, bring the economic life of the community to a halt. From this measure of strength, Communist power in Hawaii is many, many times greater than in the continental United States. I shall speak upon this aspect of the question in detail at a later time during the debate.

Suffice it to say, Mr. President, that the economic life of Hawaii has been brought to a complete halt on several occasions by the Communist-controlled ILWU.

The political parties in Hawaii are approximately evenly divided. The Democratic Party is largely a captive party which is controlled and dominated by Communists. However, the Communist conspiracy has infiltrated the Territorial government of the islands through both political parties. An intense drive is now in progress to consolidate the Communist hold upon the Democratic Party through the control of the ILWU and the Public Workers Union.

Mr. President, at the present time a delegation of citizens of the Territory are en route to Washington to lobby with the American Congress in the interest

of Hawaiian statehood. One of the members and one of the lobbyists is one John A. Burns, chairman of the Territorial Democratic Central Committee.

Only last week the Honolulu Star-Bulletin carried the following headline: "Fasi Challenges Burns, Akau To Denounce ILWU Reds."

The newspaper story appearing in the paper owned by the distinguished Delegate from Hawaii, Hon. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, states:

Frank F. Fasi, Democratic National Committeeman for Hawaii, has set off another crackling dispute in his party by challenging two of its top leaders to denounce "the Communist leadership of the ILWU once and for all."

The story in the Star-Bulletin states further that Mr. Fasi asserted that Mr. Burns refused to testify against Jack W. Hall, territorial director of the ILWU, who was convicted last year in the Smith Act trials of conspiring to advocate and teach the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence.

Fasi said:

I challenge you again, Mr. Burns, to deny even today that you are working hand in glove with agents of the Communist ILWU leadership to control the territorial conventions.

Mr. President, the John A. Burns mentioned by National Committeeman Frank F. Fasi, is the chairman of the Territorial Central Committee. Mr. Burns is one of those being sent to Washington by the Hawaii Statehood Commission, at government expense to lobby for statehood. This is the type man, Mr. President, who is being sent to Washington to influence the Senate of the United States to pass this bill. Does it not show the power of communism in high places in Hawaii?

I submit, that if the chairman of the Territorial Democratic Central Committee is "working hand in glove with agents of the Communist ILWU leadership to control the coming territorial conventions," the Communist menace in Hawaii is greater today than ever before. The man who has made this statement, the man who says that John A. Burns is working hand in glove with agents of the Communists, is the highly respected national committeeman of the Democratic Party, who has been an outstanding and consistent opponent of communism in the islands.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Do I correctly understand the Senator's argument to be that Communists control the Democratic Party in Hawaii, and that to support his argument the Senator calls as his witness a Democratic national committeeman, who is challenging other Democrats?

Mr. EASTLAND. I call him as one of the witnesses. I do not see how the Senator from Louisiana could for one moment imagine that I was resting my case on that one incident.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is not contending that the Democratic national

committeeman is a Communist or is Communist controlled, is he?

Mr. EASTLAND. Did the Senator from Louisiana hear what I said?

Mr. LONG. I take it from the Senator's speech—

Mr. EASTLAND. I said that Mr. Fasi was highly respected and has been an outstanding, consistent opponent of communism. I am sorry if I did not make myself clear to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator imply that the Democratic Party is controlled by the Communist Party?

Mr. EASTLAND. It is controlled by Communists.

Mr. LONG. And also that the Democratic national committeeman is a Communist or is controlled by the Communist Party?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Democratic Party is controlled by the Communists. It is an agent of the Communist Party. It is a fact I hate to admit; yet it is correct. The Democratic Party is controlled by the ILWU, which is dominated by Communists.

Mr. LONG. I completely disagree with the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. I know the Senator disagrees with me.

Two years ago Judge Metzger was the Democratic nominee for Delegate in opposition to Delegate FARRINGTON. Judge Metzger was controlled by the ILWU. He is the man who went to New York just a year ago and received an award from the Communist-front National Lawyers Guild, and also made an inflammatory speech there. He came within 10,000 votes of defeating FARRINGTON.

Mr. LONG. I simply cannot follow the argument of the Senator from Mississippi that the Democratic Party is controlled by Communists, when the same Democratic Party has named as its national committeeman one who, the Senator from Mississippi says, is a strong anti-Communist.

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly, he is; but he does not control the Democratic Party. The control of the Democratic Party in Hawaii rests in the hands of Jack Hall and the ILWU.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes, I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. I addressed the Democratic Party of Hawaii last year, and while I was in the islands I made every effort to investigate the strength of the Communists there. So far as I could determine, the control of the Democratic Party was not in the hands of Communists. I did not meet Jack Hall. I did have the pleasure of meeting the Democratic district attorney who had prosecuted Mr. Hall, and I had the pleasure of meeting the Democratic judge who had presided at the trial at which Hall was found guilty, and who sentenced Hall to the penitentiary.

Unfortunately, I did not have occasion to judge what kind of man Hall is. Perhaps I should say fortunately I did not have the opportunity to meet him, because he was not among the Democrats

whom I had occasion to meet and address.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, the Senator would not associate with characters like Jack Hall; but the fact remains that at the trial of Hall, the most powerful Democrat in the islands, the Honorable John Wilson, mayor of the city of Honolulu, was a defense witness.

Judge Metzger was a defense witness. Other leaders of the Democratic Party, persons who actually exercise power, were defense witnesses.

If the Senator from Louisiana wishes to be enlightened about whether the Democratic Party is Communist-controlled, then, if I am not mistaken, he can check the reports of his own committee, which has made that statement.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Does not the Senator from Mississippi know that other Democrats have made the mistake of testifying in behalf of Communists? There have been members of the President's Cabinet and former Supreme Court Justices who have, on occasion, been character witnesses on behalf of persons who were accused of being Communists.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. LONG. But that did not mean the Democratic Party was Communist-controlled.

Mr. EASTLAND. I think those occurrences were a national disgrace. Certainly I do not think they afford any justification for a Democratic leader accepting an award from a Communist-controlled organization.

Mr. LONG. Certainly, I would not take that to mean that the Democratic Party was Communist-controlled.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is a circumstance. I do not think there can be any dispute that the Democratic Party in Hawaii is Communist-controlled. I believe the reports of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have so stated.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Mississippi knows, does he not, that the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Representative VELDE, has given considerable study to the subject, and is strongly in favor of Statehood for Hawaii? He does not believe that the Communist danger in Hawaii is any greater than it is in many parts of the United States mainland.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator say that that is Mr. VELDE's opinion?

Mr. LONG. That is his opinion.

Mr. EASTLAND. Or is it the Senator's understanding of Mr. VELDE's opinion?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator's understanding of another individual's opinion is not probative evidence.

Mr. LONG. I had the pleasure of reading his statement. I also had the pleasure of reading the statement of

Representative FRANCIS WALTER, a very able man, who serves on the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Mr. EASTLAND. Before the debate is over, I think it will be shown beyond any peradventure of doubt that, beginning with a former Communist, who is now employed by the Government of the United States and who lives in Hawaii, and who organized the party there, down to date the Communists have controlled the economic life of Hawaii, and have had tremendous influence in its political affairs.

I have before me a Communist newspaper which shows that on one of the islands every member of the Territorial Legislature was advertising in the Communist newspaper and later was thanking that organization for its support in his election. I may say that they were Democrats.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator know there have been unions in this country which have had Communist leaders, many of whom have lost their influence in the unions? There is a union in New York which is seeking to retain control over its membership. The leadership of that union is regarded as being either Communist or Communist-inspired. Is the Senator aware of that fact?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. The Senator says such unions in this country have lost their influence. Perhaps they have, but the Communist unions which run Hawaii have not lost their influence.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it not true that the last general strike in Hawaii occurred 5 years ago, in 1949?

Mr. EASTLAND. In my statement I shall develop the facts concerning that strike; but I do not think the fact that it occurred 5 years ago means anything.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it not true that when we were at war with the Communists in Korea, and all our supplies had to be shipped through Hawaii, there was not a single act of sabotage performed there?

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, those supplies passed through one of the greatest bases we have, during which time intelligence officers of the Army and Navy were stationed there.

I wish to ask the Senator this question: Did the Navy permit the ILWU longshoremen to handle Navy cargo?

Mr. BENNETT. I do not know the answer to that question.

Mr. EASTLAND. We shall have some information on that point. I am not certain of the answer, either; but I have been informed by a former Communist Party member that they did handle such cargo. I intend to put his testimony into the RECORD in a few moments.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator aware of the fact that in our fight against com-

munist in Korea one of the units which was engaged in combat to a great extent was the Hawaiian National Guard, that those troops were among the first sent to Korea, and that they fought valiantly for this country against communism?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly, I am aware of that.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator further aware that the rate of casualties which they sustained was approximately three times as great as those of the average unit which served against the Communists on the Korean front?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly, I am aware of that. The Senator has not heard me say that all the people in Hawaii are Communists. I stated that Communists controlled the unions, and, through control of the unions, controlled the economic life of the islands, and, through control and domination of the union vote, had enormous control over the political affairs of the islands. That cannot be disputed, because it is a fact. Neither can the statement be disputed that the candidate whom the Communists backed, Judge Metzger, who received a Lawyers' Guild award, came within 10,000 votes of winning the election over Delegate FARRINGTON.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. CORDON. Does not that fact completely dispute the Senator's own conclusion that the Communist-dominated unions have control of Hawaii, when their own candidate was defeated by 10,000 votes?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; it does not. The Communist-controlled unions control the city of Honolulu, which is the most powerful area in the islands. They control great numbers of the members of the Territorial legislature. As I am going to show, they control members of the board of supervisors in the islands, and that from two to three thousand public employees of the Territorial and county governments in the islands are Communists.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Does the Senator know that the constitution which has been voted upon by the people of Hawaii contains a proviso that no Communist may hold office of any kind?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I am sorry the distinguished Senator brought that subject up. He is the man who convinced me that the pending bill should not pass because of Communist power in the Hawaiian Islands. I read the report of the distinguished Senator.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, would the Senator yield for a short remark on that particular subject?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield, not for a remark, but for a question.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I merely wish to advise the Senator that I myself have a very short address to make concerning the Communist situation in Hawaii; but I cannot make it until the Senator completes his remarks.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator may make his address when I have finished, but the fact remains that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska convinced me that communism was too powerful in the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the Senator know that of the 63 who were elected to the constitutional convention, only 1 admitted former membership in the Communist Party, and 1 refused to answer, and neither one was seated?

Mr. EASTLAND. It is not the number of Communists that counts. The number is entirely beside the point. It is a question of control. Before the debate is over, I shall show that membership in the Communist Party in Hawaii has been deliberately kept low in order to dilute the control to the few people who now run the islands.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the Senator desire to have me understand that, having refused to seat the two ex-Communists, a Communist-controlled convention proceeded then to write a constitution?

Mr. EASTLAND. I have never stated that a Communist-controlled convention proceeded to write the constitution. The Senator sets up his own strawman, knocks him over, and draws his own conclusion from alleged facts which he has stated. I have never said the constitutional convention was communistic. I have taken this thesis: The economic life of the islands is controlled by Communists. Communists exert tremendous influence over the political affairs of the islands. I am going to demonstrate that as a fact, and not as a conclusion.

I should like to exhibit to the Senator a Communist newspaper. Here it is. [Exhibiting.] The Senator has been a very prominent and very distinguished businessman. Here are four issues of the official Communist newspaper of Honolulu, taken at random, which are presented to show their power. In one issue there are paid advertisements by 562 business firms.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of giving us the date of that newspaper?

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall put the newspapers in the RECORD in my own time, and at the place at which I think they belong in my remarks.

In the same issue to which I referred there were paid advertisements by 810 individuals. In other words, there were 1,102 people who paid for advertisements in that newspaper.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator advise me whether the name of the newspaper is the Honolulu Daily Worker, if there is such a publication? What is the name of the publication?

Mr. EASTLAND. The name of the publication is the Honolulu Record. I am going to place these newspapers in the RECORD.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is that an official organ of the Communist Party?

Mr. EASTLAND. It is the organ of the Communist Party in Hawaii. Its editor is Mr. Koji Aruyoshi, who, I understand, is one of the men who was convicted under the Smith Act.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What are the dates of the newspapers?

Mr. EASTLAND. I have stated to the Senator that, in my own time, I shall place them in the RECORD, together with the dates.

I continue to read from the story in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin referring to Mr. Frank F. Fasi. The story concludes as follows:

He [Mr. Fasi] said thousands of independent voters are waiting anxiously for a responsible Democratic Party.

Mr. President, I am reading from the statement made by the Democratic national committeeman for Hawaii. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] says the Communists do not influence that man. Let me read further from the article about Mr. Frank Fasi. As I was saying the article concludes with the statement:

He [Mr. Fasi] said thousands of independent voters are waiting anxiously for a responsible Democratic Party. They don't want to go along year after year with a big-business Republican Party, but they have no alternative when a vacuum exists on the Democratic side. They can't bring themselves to work in a party for any candidate where one must bow down and kowtow to Communist ILWU leadership.

Mr. President, that statement was made last week by the Democratic national committeeman for Hawaii.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me at this point?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Does not the Senator from Mississippi know that when opposing candidates run against one another for office, they are often inclined to make very strong and perhaps overstated charges against their opposition?

For instance, does not the Senator from Mississippi know that a couple of years ago, in Louisiana, during a gubernatorial campaign, District Attorney Perez made such charges against Representative HALE BOGGS, a Member of the United States House of Representatives, but later in the campaign a letter of apology was written by the candidate on whose behalf Mr. Perez made such charges?

Does not my colleague know that Frank Fasi was a candidate for mayor of Honolulu, and is going to run again for that office?

Mr. EASTLAND. However, Mr. President, we cannot lightly brush aside the charge, which was made by that Democratic national committeeman, that in Hawaii candidates on the Democratic ticket must kowtow and bow down to the ILWU leadership. I will not remain silent when such charges are made.

The Senator from Louisiana has referred to a situation existing in Louisiana, but I do not think that situation throws any light on the matter to which I have been referring.

Mr. LONG. Does not the Senator from Mississippi know that Frank Fasi

ran last year as a candidate for mayor of Honolulu, and expects to run again for that office?

Mr. EASTLAND. The quotation I just read relates, not to the mayor of Honolulu, but to a man named Burns, who has been sent to Washington in an effort to lobby and to try to influence the votes of the Members of the United States Congress; and he has been told to disavow any connection with communism, because if a connection of that sort were known it would hurt his case.

Mr. LONG. I assume that the Senator from Mississippi does not know that Mr. Burns and Mr. Fasi see things the same way, so far as local politics is concerned.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know how the Senator from Louisiana can make that statement.

Mr. LONG. I know who ran for election as mayor of Honolulu.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes, I know that; and I know that the present mayor of Honolulu is a Democrat, and is the most powerful man in the islands, next to Jack Hall; but he has been a witness for and a stooge of the Communists. He had in his office an administrative assistant who is dead now; but there can be no doubt in my mind about what that man's connections were.

Mr. President, thus ends this significant story in an issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin only last week.

Another story which appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of Thursday, February 25, throws further light on the evergrowing and sinister Communist menace. The story is headed "UPW Official Here Is Listed as Communist." The story states that there are three full-time, paid officials of the United Public Workers in Hawaii, and identifies them as Henry Epstein, Stephen Murin, and Max Roffman. It states that—

Epstein and Murin have been previously identified as Communists by the Territorial commission on subversive activities.

The article then proceeds to designate Max Roffman as having been an active Communist Party member on the mainland before he went to Hawaii.

Recently the Honolulu Star-Bulletin published a series of articles on the Communist-dominated United Public Workers in organizing government employees in the Territory. According to the data published in December of 1953, the progress of this Communist union in recruiting government workers is truly terrifying. At the lowest estimate this subversive organization has not less than 3,000 government employees in the Territory or Hawaii on its membership rolls, and has recruited a majority of the firemen in the Territory. The Communist union bosses have already brought all of the sugar workers, taxi drivers, pineapple workers, and the waterfront workers under their control, and now the octopus is extending its tentacles into the ranks of government employees. How can one say that communism has not penetrated the Territorial government, when several thousands employees of the government deliberately join a Red union? Could anyone have confidence in such a State, if Hawaii were admitted to this Union?

The government workers are joining this identified Communist organization, which, unfortunately, is working closely with Harry Bridges' ILWU, and are simply following the example of the important elected officials in the Territory. In testimony last week before the Senate Judiciary Committee, copies of the Communist weekly Honolulu Record were introduced in evidence by a witness who is now a Federal Government employee in the islands. Mr. President, let me say that the facts I am recounting are taken from sworn testimony which I shall place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

In looking over that Communist sheet, which had 60 pages in its anniversary issue of August 6, 1953, I find on page 49, advertisements paid for by 10 top officials of the county government of Kauai. The headline begins: "Greetings to the Honolulu Record on Its Fifth Anniversary." The advertisement is signed by A. C. Baptiste, Jr., chairman and executive officer, county of Kauai. There are, on the same page, paid display advertisements of greetings to the weekly voice of treason in Hawaii, and they were inserted and paid for by the county attorney of Kauai County, Mr. Toshio Kabutan, and four members of the County Board of Supervisors—Matsuki Arashiro, Chris Watase, Raymond Souza, and Tom Okura.

I understand there are six members of the county board of supervisors in that county. Four of the six have brazenly advertised their support of this Communist publication. How can anyone say, Mr. President, that Communist influence in the islands is nil, when county officeholders advertise in a Communist newspaper?

There are four other items from representatives in the Territorial legislature from the county of Kauai. They are Toshiharu Yama, Toshio Serizawa, William Fernandes, and Manuel Henriques, all four of whom are members of the Territorial legislature from the county of Kauai, and all four are proud to align themselves with Communist traitors.

To describe this, Mr. President, as a serious situation is to make the understatement of the year. It is high time that the Governor of Hawaii, the Honorable Samuel Wilder King, took steps to remove these pro-Communists from their high positions, and if he needs the backing of the Congress of the United States in doing so, he should let this be known.

Mr. President, at this point let me say that I have before me an advertisement, which I shall place in the RECORD, from the county treasurer of Honolulu City and County. The advertisement was placed in that Communist newspaper, and in the advertisement the Honolulu treasurer thanks the newspaper for its support in his successful campaign for election.

Another issue of the Honolulu Record, organ of the Communists in Hawaii, dated December 24, 1953, contains a display ad by Eddie Tam, chairman and executive officer of the county of Maui.

Mr. President, we see 2 of the 4 heads of the county governments in

Hawaii openly lined up with Harry Bridges, Jack W. Hall, and other agents of world communism. We see them appealing for Communist support. We see them soliciting Communist aid. What reasonable man can say they will not be influenced by communism? Something should be done about this situation and without delay.

Mr. President, to show the power of the Communist Party in Hawaii one has but to read the Communist Honolulu Record. I hold in my hand the issue of this newspaper for Thursday, August 7, 1952. On this date a total of 329 business firms were advertising in this newspaper. There were greetings from 54 local labor unions; there were 7 classified advertisements; there were 8 advertisements from candidates for public office and public officeholders in the islands. On December 25, 1952, 197 business firms were advertising in this newspaper. There were 59 local labor unions, 6 classified local advertisements, and, in addition, there were 7 advertisements of greetings from public officials and candidates for public office. One year later, on Thursday, August 6, 1953, a total of 562 business firms were advertising in this newspaper. There were paid greetings from 100 local labor unions. In addition, there were 10 advertisements from candidates for public office and public officeholders in the Territory. On Thursday, December 24, 1953, a total of 239 business firms were advertising in this Communist newspaper. There were paid greetings from 53 local labor unions and 4 classified advertisements.

These four editions of this Communist newspaper were picked at random. They prove conclusively the terrific influence of communism when more than 500 business firms find it necessary to advertise in the Communist newspaper. More than 500 business firms find it necessary to advertise in the Communist newspaper, when the total population of the islands is only about 467,000. Where in the continental United States would one find such Communist power?

I submit, Mr. President, that the Communist publication in Hawaii contains more advertisements from business than one would find in Communist newspapers in Iron Curtain countries.

Some supporters of Hawaiian statehood say that communism was once strong in the Hawaiian Islands but that it has weakened, and they give that as their reason for changing their position on Hawaiian statehood. I hold in my hand the January 15, 1954, copy of a newspaper published in Honolulu named Spot Light. This is an anti-Communist newspaper which, I understand, was created by some of the best people in the islands to fight the growing menace and power of communism in the Territory. I read the headline in its lead article: "Is Communism on the Wane in Hawaii? An Inventory Says 'No'."

Let me read excerpts, Mr. President: The expression "communism is on the wane in Hawaii" is the wishful thinking of some residents, especially those who believe the best way to combat communism is to ignore it, and then it will quietly fade away. A candid, down-to-

earth inventory of the situation disproves such wishful thinking. A first-of-the-year inventory of the known Communists and their activities indicates that all of them are still with us and all of them are at liberty to pursue their Red activities.

FREE PRESS

And, even though convicted of conspiracy under the Smith Act, Koji Ariyoshi, editor, and Jack Kimoto, employee, still continue to edit, publish, and distribute the weekly Communist newspaper, the Honolulu Record.

That Red tabloid issued a 24-page Christmas edition containing paid ads by 292 business firms or organizations, plus 810 individuals, or a total of 1,102 paid advertisements.

This show of Communist strength in Hawaii is all the proof necessary to dispel the wishful-thinking idea that "Communism is on the wane in Hawaii."

This newspaper was created and is supported by some of the best people in the islands, to oppose the power and menace of communism.

I continue to quote from the newspaper, Spot Light:

RADIO MOSCOW

The chief spokesman for communism and against Americanism, Robert W. McElrath, is growing even bolder in his presentation of Communist propaganda.

On Monday evening, January 4, he presented, on transcription made by means of direct shortwave, a program broadcast in English from Radio Moscow.

What would happen in the United States, Mr. President, if Communist propaganda, and anti-American lies direct from Radio Moscow were broadcast over the United States? All these links in the chain show the stranglehold which communism has in Hawaii. They show that Hawaii does not merit statehood. They show Communist influence upon life in the islands.

Another prominent man in Hawaii is Delbert E. Metzger, one of the members of the Hawaiian Statehood Commission and Democratic nominee for Delegate from Hawaii in the last election. He is the man who was given an award by the Communist-front National Lawyers' Guild, the same man who came within a hair's breadth of defeating Delegate FARRINGTON for the office of Delegate from the Territory. In the election he was defeated by the Honorable JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, but by a margin of only some 10,000 votes.

Delbert E. Metzger was one of the major witnesses for the Communist leader, Jack W. Hall, in the recent Smith Act trial where Hall and his co-conspirators were convicted and sentenced to a Federal penitentiary. Only 1 year ago, in February 1953, Delbert E. Metzger went to New York City to speak before and receive an award from the notorious Communist-front Lawyers' Guild.

It is interesting to read the speech of this member of the Hawaii Statehood Commission, as it appeared in the Daily Worker.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi if he does not feel that that fact shows

that perhaps there are some people within the continental limits of the United States who are affiliated with the Communist Party, if they bring such a man here to decorate him in a gathering of that kind, an event which apparently was publicized in the local continental papers.

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly; but the Communists do not have much power here. The power of the Communists in Hawaii is a thousand times stronger than it is in the continental United States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. The Senator knows, I believe, that that is not the appraisal of the FBI, that it is not the appraisal of the Un-American Activities Committee, and that it is not the appraisal of the Attorney General.

Mr. EASTLAND. No; I do not know any such thing. The FBI has made a statement on the number of Communists in the islands.

Mr. LONG. I assume the Senator from Mississippi is familiar with the statement made by Representative WALTER, to the effect that the Un-American Activities Committee of the House had the FBI records available to it when it investigated communism in Hawaii.

Mr. EASTLAND. I know that such information, which comes from the FBI, is not supposed to be used in debate. I know something about the subject myself. I care not what a Representative or a Senator may do. I take very great issue with such a conclusion. I tell the Senator from Louisiana that before our subcommittee there appeared a great many former intelligence officers of the Army and of the Navy, as well as of other agencies. So far as any information from the Attorney General's office is concerned, that is political.

Mr. LONG. Of course, the Attorney General of the United States does have access to the information in the FBI files, and he has sent us a letter stating his appraisal of the Communist situation.

Mr. EASTLAND. The best information on that subject would be found in the files. I am not going to discuss the FBI files, or what is in them. I believe I know as much about that subject as does Representative WALTER or the Senator from Louisiana. I will not discuss that type of information.

Mr. LONG. The Senator has just as much right to state his conclusions from what he is able to obtain from FBI information as has any other person.

Mr. EASTLAND. I will not discuss it. It would be a breach of faith to do so. I will not go into that subject. If the Senator from Louisiana desires to ask me a question on any phase except that one, I shall be glad to answer it.

Mr. LONG. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi whether he does not feel that he or any one else, who has had the benefit of seeing information and of reviewing information which the FBI had made available, would have the right to state his overall thinking with regard to a given subject matter

after he had apprised himself of the information contained in the FBI files.

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly; but the Attorney General did not have the benefit of the testimony of high ranking Communists who organized the party in Hawaii. I refer to a man who is now employed by the United States Government. He is a man in whose veracity the present Attorney General has confidence, because he has used him in trials as a witness against other Communists. He was trained in the Lenin Institute in Moscow, and was formerly the Communist director in the Nevada-California-Hawaii district. He organized the district, and he now lives in Hawaii. What better proof could anyone want? He is now employed by the Government of the United States, and his integrity and veracity are sanctioned by the Government of the United States, because it uses him as a witness. He has testified for the present administration and for the previous Democratic administration.

Apparently believing that association with Communist activities is as popular in New York City as in Honolulu, Delbert E. Metzger, a member of the statehood commission, insisted that he be one of those sent to Washington at public expense to lobby for statehood. Although Metzger is kept on the statehood commission in Hawaii, his associates on the commission felt that his activities in support of the Communists would make him an ineffective lobbyist in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. President, Metzger is a member of the statehood commission. He is a high-ranking Democrat, one of the most powerful politicians in the islands, and a former judge—and he was too chummy with the Communists when he was judge—but the commission would not send him to Washington because of his Communist connections.

The Honolulu Advertiser on February 24, 1954, last week, carried a headline saying, "Tavers Says Judge Would Harm Bill—Commission Votes 4 to 2 Against Approval of Metzger Trip Even if Private Funds Used." Those are headlines. The story states:

Former Federal Judge Delbert E. Metzger asked the Hawaii statehood commission, of which he is a member, yesterday whether it thinks he is an acceptable advocate for statehood in Washington and the answer came back "No."

I should like to read from an editorial which appeared in the Honolulu Advertiser of Thursday, February 25, 1954. It refers to a member of the statehood commission, one of the men who is directing the fight for Hawaiian statehood. I read from the editorial:

UNPLEASANT BUT THE RIGHT ACTION

The Hawaii statehood commissioners acted with courage and, within the possible limits of the situation, with compassion when they put off former Judge Delbert E. Metzger's bid to go to Washington to work for statehood. They performed an unpleasant duty in a high and forthright manner.

It was like a surgical operation in which the patient is only partially anesthetized, and in which the surgeons find the cutting equally as painful as the patient. It is, after

all, no pleasure to tell a man bluntly that he just won't do.

Unfortunately, the telling would not have been necessary had the judge not insisted on being told. It was obvious in advance what the answer would be.

Commission Chairman C. Nils Tavers handled a delicate situation in an exemplary manner. He was gentlemanly, impersonal, and restrained in conducting what amounted to a self-sought trial of Judge Metzger's suitability as a statehood spokesman.

Democratic Commissioner Katsuro Miho showed not only personal strength but great humanity in his attempt to dissuade the judge from the course in which he was persisting. And Mr. Miho helped again to prove that statehood is not a partisan affair.

Judge Metzger insisted that he had been given no good reason for opposition to a journey to Washington. It was he, not the rest of the commission, who injected his own controversial conduct into the discussion. The commissioners kept the argument to the single point—

Note this, Mr. President—

that in view of intense feeling against the judge in some Senate quarters it would be better for him not to go.

That was certainly keeping it to a single point, because there is no feeling against the judge himself, but against his connections.

As the judge remarked, there was indeed a concerted effort to keep the matter from coming to a head. Since he forced the issue, however, the commissioners acted in the only way possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks there be printed in the body of the RECORD the editorial from which I have read. It appeared in the Honolulu Advertiser of February 25, 1954.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the supporters of statehood for Hawaii why Delbert E. Metzger is acceptable as a member of the commission in Hawaii but is not acceptable as one of their spokesmen in Washington, D. C.? Could it be that the sponsors of statehood for Hawaii are afraid that we might ask some embarrassing questions of Delbert E. Metzger?

Are they afraid we would ask Delbert E. Metzger why he testified in defense of one of the most notorious Communists in the world in the Smith Act trial and why he accepted an award from an identified Communist front, the Lawyers' Guild?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I ask the Senator to permit me to finish this paragraph. Then I shall be happy to yield.

Are they afraid that we might ask Delbert E. Metzger whether he did not receive the active backing of the Honolulu Record, weekly organ of the Communist Party, of Communist leader Jack W. Hall, and of all the Red leaders in Hawaii in the last election campaign, both in the primary and in the final elections?

I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if he is aware of the fact that the Hawaii Statehood Commission sent several witnesses to Washington at the expense of the commission, who were not in favor of statehood for Hawaii?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; I know that.

Mayor John H. Wilson, of Honolulu, was also a defense witness for Communist leader Jack Hall. Jack Hall is one of the biggest Communists in the Western World. What would we think in this country if the mayor of our largest and most important city should testify in defense of a notorious Communist "big shot"? Or, Mr. President, what would we think if the mayor of that city were a defense witness in behalf of notorious Communists in this country?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Do we not have a record on the mainland of persons far above the position of mayor appearing as character witnesses and giving reputation testimony—

Mr. EASTLAND. That was a national disgrace, and, knowing the sterling character and ability of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, I thought he would be the last man to raise such a point as justification for the conduct of Mayor Wilson.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator realize that if he had kept still until I completed my question he would have received the answer, that here on the mainland the same kind of people head the Communist Party as head it in Hawaii?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mayor Wilson has been elected over and over again. He is old and has spent a great deal of his time in the hospital. I think the records of the Senator's committee show—I know the records of the Internal Security Committee show—that a notorious Communist ran the city government for him while he was in the hospital.

Mr. CORDON. I have somewhat the same information which the Senator from Mississippi has. The old gentleman, Wilson, who is mayor of Honolulu, is in his mid-eighties and has lived all his life in Hawaii. He is a big-hearted, friendly, but ignorant man who, throughout the years, has made many friendships in the Honolulu area. Many people support him because of his lovable personal characteristics.

On the other hand, I know of many who recognize that the Communists have used the old gentleman. He has apparently been duped into having as an administrative assistant a man who is strongly suspected, at least, of Communist leanings.

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator says is exactly correct, except his explanation in justification of Mr. Wilson's conduct.

Mr. Wilson is a tool of the Communists but I think he is a very able politician. He knew that to remain in office he had to kowtow and be influenced by the Communist leadership in the islands. That has worked successfully, because the Communists have kept him in office.

Mr. President, during the past month the Communist leaders in Hawaii who control the ILWU have been considering the advisability of using their power to bring about another complete paralysis of island economy. The Territory of Hawaii lies at the complete mercy of the Communist bosses who control 30,000 members of the ILWU and the United Public Workers Union. Former members of the Communist Party who have broken with the party and have rendered valuable service to our Government through testimony in the Smith Act trial find themselves unemployed today as the employers in Hawaii are afraid to give jobs to those who are targets for the hatred and vengeance of the Communist Party.

Mr. CORDON. I should like to ask whether the Senator from Mississippi has the names of the persons involved so that a check for accuracy may be made.

Mr. EASTLAND. The testimony on which the statement is based is going into the RECORD.

Mr. CORDON. But the Senator does not have the names?

Mr. EASTLAND. They are in the record. I do not know whether I have them.

One of the leading contractors in Hawaii prior to the Smith Act trial employed not only one of the defendants in the proceedings, the secretary of the Communist Party of Hawaii, but also one of the major Government witnesses. I understand that this employer continued the salary of the secretary of the Communist Party of Hawaii throughout the many months of the trial and after the trial gave him an increase in pay and today is employing him as a construction superintendent.

That is sworn testimony coming from the one who organized the Communist Party in Hawaii. It shows tremendous Communist power when members of the party who broke with it and testified for their Government against treason were denied the right to make a living because of the strength of the Communists in Hawaii.

In contrast, the witness for the Government who had been employed by this firm was told that his services were no longer needed and he is still unemployed, though a highly qualified and capable man.

That shows the Communists' power. Here is a major employer having two men working for him, one of whom is secretary of the Communist Party who was indicted under the Smith Act, and during the trial, when he was not working, his employer continued to pay him. After the trial, he gave him an increase in salary.

Here is another man, who worked for the same employer, who had the courage to testify for the United States and to bring to light a Communist conspiracy

against the safety of the United States. He was discharged.

Can anyone say that does not show terrific Communist power in Hawaii? This is certainly an alarming condition when an anti-Communist employer is forced to fire a worker who testifies for his country against a Communist charged with conspiring to teach and advocate the overthrow of the United States by force and violence.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. CORDON. Can the Senator from Mississippi refer me to the pages in the testimony, or elsewhere, so that I may at least have an opportunity to determine the facts upon which an inquiry should be made?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly. As I have told the Senator, I do not have the page numbers, but the information is in the testimony.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the testimony of Paul Crouch, given in executive session before a work team of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary, dated February 26, 1954, volume 301; and also testimony by the same witness before the same subcommittee on March 1, 1954, contained in volume 302.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibits 2 and 3.)

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. CORDON. Certainly. The Senator from Oregon will never transgress intentionally.

Am I to understand that the Senator from Mississippi does not have the names of any of the persons involved in the matter he has been discussing, and whose actions, if they took place, he has been condemning?

Mr. EASTLAND. Probably they are in the record. As I told the distinguished Senator from Oregon, my information is based on the sworn testimony of the man who organized the Communist Party in Hawaii, and who now is a trusted employee of the United States Government in the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Did not the Senator state at the beginning of this particular portion of his address that some witness had said he understood these things to be facts?

Mr. EASTLAND. No, I did not. The Senator from Mississippi said, "I understand these things to be facts."

Mr. CORDON. Then, the Senator from Mississippi has not verified the facts for himself, has he?

Mr. EASTLAND. Oh, certainly, yes, from the sworn testimony of the man

who organized the Communist Party in Hawaii, and who now is a trusted employee of the Government, a man whom the Senator's administration vouches for with respect to his truthfulness and veracity, because he was put on the witness stand as a Government witness.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Is not the Senator making an argument predicated merely on generalized statements and opinion, when he does not even know the names of the persons involved in the matter he has been discussing?

Mr. EASTLAND. Oh, no; all the Senator from Oregon has to do, if he has an open mind, is to read the testimony.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon will be glad to do so, but he would like to know how carefully the Senator from Mississippi has read it.

Mr. EASTLAND. I have read it very carefully. What I have said is based on sworn testimony and also on newspaper articles which were published currently in the press, and which I have listed. I have the newspapers here.

Mr. CORDON. With respect to the testimony, I assume it would appear to be factual to the extent that either we can get evidence that it is true or it is not true. That is the point.

Mr. EASTLAND. The whole point is that the condition should be investigated in Hawaii by a senatorial committee which could obtain the facts. That is the whole point. There has been no investigation made in the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. CORDON. Is not the Senator from Mississippi aware of the fact that an established office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation staffed by trained agents is located in Hawaii, and also that the Security and Intelligence Service of the Armed Forces are on duty throughout the area?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator from Mississippi say that these agencies are not aware of the situation and are not capable of making such investigations if additional ones are indicated?

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator refer to an investigation of communism, to determine whether Hawaii should be admitted to statehood? No such question would ever confront them.

Mr. CORDON. Why not let them investigate communism and reach their conclusions? Then we would have an expert, professional inquiry into what is going on in Hawaii with respect to Communist activity and its power.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the course the Senator suggests should be followed, why hold committee hearings on the question at all? We would not have anything at all to do with the question. Then, let us simply abolish the McCarthy Committee and the Internal Security Subcommittee, and do exactly what the Senator from Oregon indicates he would want us to do.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator from Mississippi agree with me that there are a great number of questions with respect to statehood for Hawaii in addition to communistic activity there

which a congressional committee ought to consider before it recommends passage of a statehood bill?

Mr. EASTLAND. Oh, certainly. I think the Senator's committee has done very fine work.

Mr. CORDON. I am appreciative of the Senator's compliment.

Mr. EASTLAND. But the hearings to which I have just referred contain sworn testimony which I think is very material. I think that before the bill is passed, a committee of Congress should go to Hawaii and conduct an investigation.

Mr. CORDON. Was all the testimony in both volumes of the transcript the Senator from Mississippi has put into the RECORD given by the same individual?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. CORDON. So if I read the volumes from cover to cover, I am bound to come upon the testimony which the Senator from Mississippi has been discussing? Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. If I understand the Senator from Mississippi correctly, he just made a remark to the effect that no investigation of communism ever had been made in Hawaii.

In 1948, when I held the same view which the Senator from Mississippi now holds on the question of statehood for Hawaii, I advocated an investigation. It was the 80th Congress and I was then chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. An investigation was made in the islands. I had Secret Service operatives working there for 6 months before I, my staff members, and committee members went there officially.

Mr. EASTLAND. What did the Senator from Nebraska find? What was the Senator's recommendation?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I will furnish the Senator from Mississippi with a list of the many things which were found; but in 1948 there were named several members of the Communist Party, who recently were indicted, tried, and convicted by a jury of Hawaiian citizens.

Mr. EASTLAND. What did the Senator find as a result of his visit, and what was his recommendation as to whether Hawaii should be admitted to statehood?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I caused my report to be reprinted in this year's hearings on statehood. I told the Senator from Mississippi a while ago that as soon as I can obtain the floor I shall make a statement as to the results of my 1952 investigation on behalf of the committee on the Communist situation in Hawaii. I spent a considerable period of time in an intensive personal inquiry on all of the islands.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator decline to state what he found on the 1948 visit?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. It is in this year's hearings, as I stated. I found that in 1948 communism, at least according to my impression, was a threat

to Hawaii. There was a longshoreman's strike which lasted for 6 or 8 months, and which had serious effects on the economy of Hawaii at that time. The situation was very serious.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct. I agree with him that the situation was serious.

I have before me a newspaper published by some of the best people in Hawaii who oppose statehood. They found in January of this year that the influence of communism had not waned.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I shall answer that point a little later with a statement this year from the Attorney General of the United States, among other things.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the Senator. I shall be glad to hear what he has to say.

The Governor of Hawaii, Hon. Samuel Wilder King, the Honorable Joseph R. Farrington, Democratic National Committeeman Frank F. Fasi, Justice Stainback, and others are making a brave fight against the ever-growing Communist menace in the islands. Unfortunately, some of them try to whitewash the picture and let personal ambition guide them in their desire for statehood at all costs. They should admit the facts, the undisputable and documented facts, and instead of asking for statehood at this time, they should be asking this Congress and the administrative agencies of the Federal Government for immediate aid in dealing with the Communist menace in the islands.

Mr. President, the finances available to the Communists in Hawaii can best be understood by a population percentage comparison with the situation on the mainland. The population of Hawaii is 467,000 people, but for easy calculation let us consider the islands as having a half million people and the mainland 150 million. The Communist newspaper in Hawaii operates on a budget of \$40,000 a year. If the Communist press on the mainland received equal support, the Daily Worker would have a budget of \$12 million a year.

The total income of Communist controlled organizations in Hawaii—most of it being through the ILWU—is about \$600,000 a year. If Communist-controlled organizations on the mainland had an income in the same proportion according to population, the total income of such groups would be \$180 million a year. The number of people who belong to organizations controlled by the Communists in Hawaii is about 30,000. The same returns on the mainland would mean 9 million people belonged to Communist-controlled unions and other organizations. The actual number in the Continental United States is about 1 million. Therefore, according to this particular yardstick, Communist strength in Hawaii is nine times as great as on the mainland. This is without taking into consideration the far greater degree of Communist control over unions in Hawaii than on the mainland. The Hawaiian labor movement is definitely

controlled by Communists. The union members are disciplined. They support candidates selected by the Communist leaders. All the power of their numbers is used to promote the ends of the Communist leadership. These leaders are controlled from Moscow, and they in turn control thousands of Hawaiians who do their bidding.

But Communist influence in Hawaii is many more than nine times greater than is Communist influence on the mainland. This is true because Communism is very, very powerful in the political life of the islands. The question, Mr. President, as I said in the beginning, is not the actual number of Communists. The question is Communist control, and there can be no doubt that the Communists control the economic life of Hawaii, and very closely influence its political affairs. This political control is growing, and I submit that if Hawaii were admitted to statehood, she would be a cancer in the body politic of the United States.

It is a theory of the American Government that our 48 States are sovereign States. If Hawaii were added as a 49th State, she could not be a sovereign State because of the vast influence and control which Moscow would exert upon her elected representatives through Communist control of the labor movement in the islands. We would have an American State which, in my judgment, would be influenced by a foreign power.

I submit, Mr. President, that Hawaii is not ready for statehood. Her economic and political fabric is tinted with Red. Her admission would weaken and not strengthen the United States. We can have no assurance that she would have a republican form of government, as guaranteed in the Constitution. We can have no assurance that she would master her own destiny and walk in unison with her sister States. It is my judgment, that great influence, if not control, would rest behind the walls of the Kremlin in Moscow.

The admission of Hawaii into the Union would give her Senators and her Representatives in Congress, under Communist influence, a power over our domestic affairs. Her admission would give communism power and influence over the foreign policy of the United States. Her admission would weaken our beloved country, and, therefore, this bill must at all costs be defeated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, an article which appeared in IMUA Spot Light, of January 15, 1954, published in Honolulu, Hawaii. The title of the article is "Is Communism on the Wane in Hawaii? An Inventory Says 'No.'"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Communism in Hawaii," written by Paul

Crouch, Founder Federation of Former Communists.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 5.)

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I stated that I would place in the RECORD several copies of the Honolulu Record. The editions of the paper consist of 40 or 50 pages, and I shall not put the entire paper in the RECORD, but I shall make them available to the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] or to any other Senator who desires to see them.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Honolulu Advertiser of February 25, 1954]

UNPLEASANT BUT THE RIGHT ACTION

The Hawaii statehood commissioners acted with courage and, within the possible limits of the situation, with compassion when they put off former Judge Deibert E. Metzger's bid to go to Washington to work for statehood. They performed an unpleasant duty in a high and forthright manner.

It was like a surgical operation in which the patient is only partially anesthetized, and in which the surgeons find the cutting equally as painful as the patient. It is, after all, no pleasure to tell a man bluntly that he just won't do.

Unfortunately, the telling would not have been necessary had the judge not insisted on being told. It was obvious in advance what the answer would be.

Commission Chairman C. Nils Tavares handled a delicate situation in an exemplary manner. He was gentlemanly, impersonal, and restrained in conducting what amounted to a self-sought trial of Judge Metzger's suitability as a statehood spokesman.

Democratic Commissioner Katsuro Miho showed not only personal strength but great humanity in his attempt to dissuade the judge from the course in which he was persisting. And Mr. Miho helped again to prove that statehood is not a partisan affair.

Judge Metzger insisted that he had been given no good reason for opposition to a journey to Washington. It was he, not the rest of the commission, who injected his own controversial conduct into the discussion. The commissioners kept the argument to the single point that in view of intense feeling against the judge in some Senate quarters it would be better for him not to go.

As the judge remarked, there was indeed a concerted effort to keep the matter from coming to a head. Since he forced the issue, however, the commissioners acted in the only way possible.

EXHIBIT 2

UNITED STATES SENATE, SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS, OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, WASHINGTON, D. C., FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1954

The subcommittee met at 2 p. m., pursuant to call, in room 411, Senate Office Building, Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND presiding.

Present: Senator EASTLAND.

Senator EASTLAND. Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate of the United States will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. CROUCH. I do.

TESTIMONY OF PAUL CROUCH, 1565 ST. LOUIS DRIVE, HONOLULU, HAWAII

Senator EASTLAND. Please give your name and residence.

Mr. CROUCH. My name is Paul Crouch; my residence is 1565 St. Louis Drive, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Senator EASTLAND. How long have you been in Hawaii?

Mr. CROUCH. I have been in Hawaii since December 24, 1953. Prior to that I was in Hawaii in the fall of 1952, and I served a year in the Army in Hawaii in 1924 and 1925.

Senator EASTLAND. By whom are you now employed?

Mr. CROUCH. I am now employed by the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, and have been so employed for 2½ years.

Senator EASTLAND. In what cases have you testified for the United States Government under both the Eisenhower and Truman administrations?

Mr. CROUCH. I was a witness for the Government in the perjury trials ending in conviction of Harry Bridges and William Remington. I was an expert witness in the case of Dr. Joseph Weinberg in Washington. I have been a witness in four Smith Act trials—Baltimore, Honolulu, Seattle, and St. Louis. I have appeared in 19 proceedings of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Senator EASTLAND. Who organized the Communist Party in Hawaii?

Mr. CROUCH. Set up the first Communist organization in Hawaii in the United States Army in 1925 and was closely connected with supervision of the organization of the Communist movement there from 1928 until I left the Communist Party in 1942.

Senator EASTLAND. I can tell from your answers that you have been a member of the Communist Party. Please state how long you have been a member of the Communist Party and what official positions you held within the Communist Party.

Mr. CROUCH. I was a member of the Communist Party from 1925 until the spring of 1942. The major positions I held were head of the national department of the Communist Party for infiltration of the Armed Forces; representative of the Communist Party to the executive committee of the Communist Internationale in Moscow, or, rather, as one of the representatives to the Communist Internationale; honorary regimental commander of the Red army; member of various commissions of the Communist Internationale; State or district organizer of the Communist Party in the United States in Virginia, Utah, North and South Carolina, and Tennessee; editor of the New South, the official Communist organ for the Southern States; member of the district bureau of the Communist Party for California, Nevada, and the Hawaiian Islands; a member of the Negro Trade Union, agricultural and anti-imperialist commissions of the central committee of the Communist Party of the United States; national educational director of the Young Communist League, youth section of the Communist Party; editor of the Young Worker, official Communist youth paper; member of the editorial staff of the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party; candidate for Congress in New York on the Communist ticket; Communist candidate for governor of New York; Communist nominee for United States Senate from Tennessee; and various other positions, such as head of the control commission for the Communist Party in Alabama, Mississippi, and Georgia; and a member of the steering committee that set up the Southern Conference for Human Welfare in 1938.

Senator EASTLAND. Mr. Crouch, you have heretofore testified before this committee about setting up the Communist Party in Hawaii, and the facts on communism, its control of the economic and political life of the islands. I would ask you, is it your judgment if Hawaii were admitted to statehood that the Communist Party would be able to influence the governor of the new State, the Congressmen which would represent the new State, and the lower House of the American Congress, and the two United States Senators from Hawaii?

Mr. CROUCH. Yes, Senator. The Communist Party would be one of the major factors in any State government as it is today in the Territorial government. I would like to give some illustrations of the political power of the Communist Party to substantiate this statement on my part.

There are in Hawaii four counties: Honolulu County, covering the island of Kalawao; the county of Maui, which includes some smaller islands; the county of Kauai; and the county of Hawaii, or the Big Island, as it is generally known.

Outside of Honolulu County there are three counties in the Territory. The heads of these county governments are known as chairman and executive officers. In two of these counties, Kauai and Maui, the chairmen of the counties have publicly advertised to the world in substance that they are disloyal to America and loyal to the Soviet Union by publishing paid advertisements in the Communist weekly paper, the Honolulu Record.

I have before me the Honolulu Record of December 25, 1952, and I am looking at page 5 of that issue. On that issue you see an ad reading, "To all a Merry Christmas and thanks for electing me your county attorney, Toshio, Kabutan, Hanapepe, from Kauai."

Senator EASTLAND. That appeared in the Honolulu Record, which is the official Communist publication for the Territory?

Mr. CROUCH. That is correct. Later I will give you considerable data on that.

Senator EASTLAND. I want this in here. The editor of that paper has been convicted under the Smith Act.

Mr. CROUCH. He has. Coji Ariyoshi. He was convicted last year.

Also on the same page is a display ad reading, "My sincerest thanks and the season's greetings to all," signed Anthony C. Baptiste, Jr., chairman and executive officer, county of Kauai, and below it—

Senator EASTLAND. Is his father a territorial senator?

Mr. CROUCH. I do not recall.

Below it are a number of individual greetings, including one by the name of Morimoto. This Morimoto is one of the three Communist Party leaders on the Island of Kauai, and has been a publicly identified Communist since 1947. When I visited the island of Kauai a few weeks ago, during the early part of February, I found that Morimoto, the well-known top Communist leader, was serving on a grand jury in the territorial courts.

I have been informed by a former judge in Honolulu that it is impossible on the island of Kauai to be elected to any position without first receiving the support of the Communist controlled ILWU. I have just received information from Hawaii that a leader of the Democratic Party in the islands has stated that the Democratic Party's next candidate for mayor of Honolulu must be a man who is approved by the ILWU and supported by it. This ILWU in Hawaii is nothing more nor less than a rubber stamp for the Communist Party.

The Democratic Party at the moment in Hawaii is split wide open between the Truman Democrats who are loyal Americans and those who are agents of the Communist Party. The extent to which the Communist Party is now infiltrating every walk of life is shown by the fact that one of the top leaders of the Communist Party, one of their main leaders at the present moment, is Jean King, wife of James King, nephew of the Governor of Hawaii.

The Governor of Hawaii is a true and loyal American and will have nothing to do with his nephew and his nephew's wife. But this illustrates the far-reaching tentacles of the Communist octopus which has penetrated every field of life in Hawaii today.

Senator EASTLAND. Is King, the nephew of the Governor, a Communist?

Mr. CROUCH. He is known to have received orders from the Communist Party and to have transmitted orders from the Communist Party. He is employed on the law firm of Simons & Bourslog, the firm which represents the ILWU. His name has appeared in paid greetings in the Communist weekly, the Honolulu Record.

Senator EASTLAND. Proceed.

Mr. CROUCH. The Communist Party's influence in Hawaii in the present Territorial legislature is reflected in the extremely low appropriations made for the Territorial Un-American Activities Committee which, I believe, is only about \$17,500 a year, an appropriation so low that it makes it impossible for the Territorial committee to publish its findings in printed form or to conduct public and effective hearings.

The support, the open support and encouragement given by the mayor of Honolulu to the subversive, Communist-controlled Public Workers Union also reflects the political danger of Communist infiltration of both the present Territorial Government and any State government that might be set up.

The Public Workers Union is headed by a Communist named Henry Epstein.

Senator EASTLAND. Is it affiliated with the ILWU?

Mr. CROUCH. And it works closely with the ILWU, operating out of the same headquarters. Henry Epstein appears on radio programs paid for by the ILWU.

Senator EASTLAND. How do you know Henry Epstein is a Communist?

Mr. CROUCH. Henry Epstein has been known to me as a Communist over a period of many years through material I have handled in connection with my work for various Government agencies from the time I was on the staff of the California Un-American Activities Committee in 1950. He has never made any denial under oath of his membership in the Communist Party.

He has never denied he has belonged and was transferred from Chicago to Hawaii when he went to Hawaii.

The Public Workers Union, which has the closest alliance with the ILWU, has organized the majority of the firemen in various municipalities of the Territory. All observers in Hawaii agree that not less than 3,000 Territorial, county, and municipal employees at the present time belong to the Communist-controlled Public Workers Union.

I mentioned earlier the name of the county executive officer of Kauai County. I am now looking at page 17 of the Communist weekly, the Honolulu Record of Thursday, December 24, 1953. That is about 2 months ago. There is before me a large display ad on this page reading, "Holiday greetings from one and to one and all from friendly Eddie Tam, chairman and executive officer, county of Maui."

Mr. Tam, the head of the county government of Maui, knows that the Honolulu

Record has been identified and proven to be the Communist organ by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and by the Territorial Un-American Activities Committee.

Senator EASTLAND. You can read that paper and tell it is a Communist paper. What was the job that this man held?

Mr. CROUCH. This man holds at the present time the position as chairman and the executive officer of the county of Maui, and is the head of one of the four county governments in the Territory of Hawaii.

Senator EASTLAND. What are his duties?

Mr. CROUCH. His duties are to preside over the law enforcement, to supervise the functioning of the various government departments of the Territory and the county of Maui, to supervise government expenditures in that county embracing the islands of Maui and Molokai; and by his position he is one of the most important government officials in the Territory of Hawaii and certainly would be one of those likely to be elected to the United States Senate or to the House of Representatives if Hawaii becomes a State, or to be elected as one of the highest officials in a State as he now holds one of the highest positions in the Territorial setup in Hawaii.

The increasing political power of the Communist Party in Hawaii is well illustrated by the increase in paid advertising in its weekly paper.

Senator EASTLAND. So what we have here is public officials of the Territory who are advertising in the Communist paper, is that correct?

Mr. CROUCH. That is right. I have the issue of August 7, 1953, which contains 32 pages, of which about 90 percent is paid advertising.

I also have before me the issue of August 6, 1953—that is, last summer—an issue published about 2 months after the conviction of its editor in the Smith Act trial. It has 60 pages with about 90 percent of paid advertising by many hundreds of business firms in all the islands of the Territory and thousands of individuals.

I would like to call the attention of the committee here to the fact that I have found that many of these paid ads were obtained by paid officials of the International Longshoremen's Union who, while on the payroll of the union, went from house to house among the business firms soliciting their ads for the Communist paper and then transmitted these funds through the union apparatus, so-called, to be turned over to the Communist Party.

The ILWU obtains approximately \$600,000 a year in checkoff dues of about 27,000 members, and a large percentage of this is used to promote the cause of revolution and subversion. They finance from dues collected from the workers of Hawaii a daily radio program in English, a daily radio program in the Filipino language, a weekly program in the Japanese language—all filled with Communist propaganda. And at least three-fourths of the \$40,000 a year budget of the Honolulu Record can be traced to the ILWU.

It is obvious that where a large part of the businessmen of Hawaii find it necessary to contribute money to advance treason that the political power of the Communists is literally terrific. If a subcommittee of the United States Senate could go to Hawaii and hold a thorough hearing on the spot and hear the real facts about the situation, our Nation would be astounded and dumbfounded. I might say that in my opinion the situation in Hawaii as I have seen it is so serious to our national security that such an on-the-spot investigation is most urgent.

Senator EASTLAND. Why would this country be astounded? Why would the people be astounded?

Mr. CROUCH. People of this country would be astounded to find that one of the two major parties in Hawaii is infiltrated to such a degree, to learn that the heads of half of the county governments in Hawaii are associated with the Communists that witnesses do not dare testify for the Federal Government because they know they would be blacklisted as other witnesses have already been.

Senator EASTLAND. What do you mean by blacklisted?

Mr. CROUCH. I mean men like Ichiro Isuka and Jack Kawano, born in the islands, men who have worked as longshoremen all of their lives until they came out against the Communist Party. Today they cannot find employment in their trades and are living under conditions that would shock the American people if they were publicized.

Also, Robert Kempa, one of the Government's major witnesses in the Smith Act trial, was employed by the Nicholas Construction Co., a large contracting firm in Hawaii which also employed Dwight James Freeman, one of the convicted Communist leaders who is secretary of the Communist Party of Hawaii. Nicholas paid Freeman's wages while he was on the witness stand, and after he was convicted gave him a raise. Today Freeman is working as a construction superintendent.

Senator EASTLAND. That is, while his case is on appeal?

Mr. CROUCH. Yes, and while he is out on bail. Kempa was also employed by the Nicholas Construction Co. before his testimony at the trial. When he testified, the Nicholas Construction Co. told him his services were no longer needed. He is today unemployed in Hawaii. I do not know of any business firm that has the courage to defy the Communist leaders by giving decent jobs to Isuka, to Kawano, or to Kempa. This fact prevents many other potential witnesses from testifying for the various agencies of our Federal Government because they know that to come out against the Communist Party would be to face the danger of starvation for their wives and children.

If a hearing were held in Hawaii where the full facts were brought out, our country would realize that unless something is done quickly to correct the situation there, a major war would likely result in the loss of Hawaii to the Communist enemy.

I might say here that one of the leading officials of the Communist Party who broke with it at a relatively recent date was informed before he left the party by Dwight James Freeman, secretary of the Communist Party of Hawaii, that the Communists have sufficient power in the islands to physically seize the islands by force at any time they wished to do so and that such action will, of course, depend on the international situation. They would be foolish to seize the islands prematurely. The party must wait until the time comes.

This former official of the Communist Party also informed me that to his knowledge and belief the actual membership of the Communist Party is only from 50 to 75, but these people consist of the hardboiled core of leaders that all security risks have been dropped and that Jack Hall could, if he wished, sign up 500 new members of the Communist Party any day in the islands. His estimate accords with all the information that I have received that the Communist Party restricts its actual nominal membership to a small hard core and that hundreds are daily working under its directives.

Senator EASTLAND. Do you have anything else to add?

Mr. CROUCH. One matter I would like to call to the attention of this committee is the situation on the waterfront in the—

Senator EASTLAND. Those copies of the Honolulu Record will be made a part of the record.

Mr. CROUCH. One matter I would like to call to the serious attention of this committee is the situation on the waterfront in the handling of naval and military cargo. Last summer after the conviction of the defendants in the Smith Act trial several naval ships were being loaded at Honolulu with cargo for our boys fighting in Korea. By direction of the Communist leadership the members of the ILWU walked off their jobs for several days and deserted their work in loading this essential war material.

The Navy took steps to have the ships loaded and thereafter hired civil-service personnel numbering, I believe, about 300. These today continue to handle all naval cargo. The result of this in ILWU ranks has been tremendous and there has been bitter criticism of the Communist leaders for their action in causing them to lose their work from the Navy. However, the Army has not followed a similar policy. The Army continues to have its cargo handled in Hawaii by longshoremen who belong to the ILWU.

If the Army had followed the example of the Navy and refused to have any member of an organization controlled by the Communist Party touch its cargo, the results would have been so tremendous that I believe the Communist apparatus on the waterfront would have been shattered, or at least would have been severely damaged.

I have learned through authoritative, confidential sources that Harry Bridges and the officials of a private company employing ILWU members to handle Army cargo and which formerly handled naval cargo have planned concerted action to have the civil-service work of the Navy discontinued and to return this work to the ILWU. Such a capitulation on the part of the Navy would be a terrific victory for the Communists in Hawaii.

I think the Senate should look into this situation; that the Navy should be directed to continue its handling of the work through the Civil Service and the Army should be asked to follow the excellent example of the Navy. If this is done, the Communist power on the waterfront will be dealt a very severe blow.

It is my opinion that the critical situation in Hawaii calls for strong legislative action by the United States Congress. I think that Congress should consider what legislative steps are necessary to prevent officials of unions from diverting funds obtained by checkoff of dues to the Communist Party and papers of the Communist Party, as is done in Hawaii, and to look into the entire question of Communist representation through the Labor Relations Board.

If Hawaii is to become a State, legislative action would be imperative on immigration matters, particularly in view of the fact that at the present time admission to Hawaii does not provide admission to the United States. The copies of the Honolulu Record which I am giving this committee to be a part of the record contain the names of thousands of people who have advertised their disloyalty to America and their hatred of our Government by paid greetings in the paper. A large part of these self-advertised subversives are aliens.

Senator EASTLAND. Do you know how many people have advertised?

Mr. CROUCH. I have not counted them, but they are in the thousands. The staff of the committee can count the exact number. If Hawaii becomes a State, these aliens who have advertised to the world their disloyalty through the columns of the Honolulu Record

would be eligible to come to the United States and to any part of the mainland at will. At the present time they cannot do so.

Every alien in Hawaii who wishes to come to the mainland must pass through inspection by the Immigration Service and meet the same qualifications that he would if he were coming from Europe or some other foreign country. So to throw down the barriers and permit all these people freedom to come to the mainland and travel throughout the country would be a serious danger, and legislative steps should be considered in that connection.

Also, there are many boats, fishing boats, in Hawaii that travel throughout the Pacific, and smuggling of aliens into Hawaii would be very easy. This is no problem at the present time because they cannot come to Hawaii, from Hawaii to the mainland without examination by the Immigration Service, and they would be caught with little difficulty. However, if Hawaii becomes a State, this inspection between Hawaii and the mainland would no longer exist. Anyone who might land on the various isolated islands of Hawaii, Maui, Molokai, Kalawao, or Lanai could take a plane from those local islands to Honolulu and from there to the mainland. This could easily make the smuggling of aliens from Asiatic countries to the United States a most profitable business.

Senator EASTLAND. It would also facilitate smuggling of Communist agents into this country.

Mr. CROUCH. It would greatly facilitate the smuggling of espionage and Communist agents and trained saboteurs from the Soviet Union. To prevent this it would be necessary for our Government to establish a large border patrol station on all of the islands in Hawaii and equipped with hydroplanes to make such inspection effective.

If Hawaii is to become a State, this question should receive the very serious consideration of the United States Congress if our Nation is not to be flooded with espionage agents, saboteurs, and criminals who could never enter our country through legitimate channels.

Senator EASTLAND. I have in my hand the Washington Evening Star printed in Washington, D. C., dated Friday, February 26, 1954. I see here a statement, "Paul Crouch, former Communist Party member, is expected to resume his testimony when the trial continues." Have you been testifying in St. Louis?

Mr. CROUCH. I have testified during the past 4 days in the Smith Act trial in St. Louis, completing cross examination yesterday.

Senator EASTLAND. The statement says, "Crouch under cross examination yesterday testified he may have erred on some dates in his testimony about meeting three of the Communists on trial here." Then it quotes you, "I am not the all-wise guy that Stalin claimed to be." Did you make that statement?

Mr. CROUCH. I did not make that statement. It is completely and wholly incorrect. I certainly regret such a statement published under a heading of the Associated Press. If not corrected by the Associated Press after investigation of the transcript, it will certainly be of tremendous value to the Communist Party in future hearings where I will appear. I made no statement that could conceivably be interpreted as saying I had made any error on the question of dates or other testimony.

Senator EASTLAND. Then you were not wrong in dates you gave on cross examination?

Mr. CROUCH. No.

Senator EASTLAND. Do you have anything else?

Mr. CROUCH. No, sir.
(Whereupon, at 3:15 p. m., the hearing closed.)

EXHIBIT 3

UNITED STATES SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS, OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, WASHINGTON, D. C., MONDAY, MARCH 1, 1954

The subcommittee met at 2 p. m., in room 411, Senate Office Building, Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, presiding.

Present: Senator EASTLAND.
Senator EASTLAND. The committee will come to order.

Mr. Crouch, do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate, will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. CROUCH. I do.
Senator EASTLAND. Mr. Crouch, you testified in executive session of the committee last Friday and we did not finish that testimony. Now will you please go into it and give us any other facts that you might know about the Communist penetration in the Territory of Hawaii?

TESTIMONY OF PAUL CROUCH, 1565 SAINT LOUIS DRIVE, HONOLULU, HAWAII

Mr. CROUCH. Senator, I refer to advertisements placed in the Honolulu Record by some officials in the government.

Senator EASTLAND. That is the Government of Honolulu?

Mr. CROUCH. That is the Territorial and county governments.

Senator EASTLAND. Now, those officials are paid by the United States Government, are they not?

Mr. CROUCH. The members of the Territorial legislature draw their salaries from the Government of the United States. Other officials are paid from funds obtained by public taxation in the Territory.

Now, on page 49 of the Communist weekly Honolulu Record, August 6, 1953, there are found on 1 page alone 10 display paid advertisements by public officials. They include, first of all, A. C. Batiste, Jr., the chairman and executive officer of the county of Kauai who I mentioned previously.

Senator EASTLAND. What are his duties as chairman and executive officer?

Mr. CROUCH. His duties are to preside over the meetings of the county supervisors, see that all the county officials perform their duties, to attend to the general administrative work of the county, to prepare budgets, and in general to do the work required of the head of a county government.

Senator EASTLAND. How many counties are there in the Territory?

Mr. CROUCH. There are four counties in Hawaii. First, Honolulu, which has a city-county form of government and includes the island of Oahu. There is the county of Hawaii, known as the big island, with headquarters at Hilo. There is the county of Maui, also including the island of Molokai, and 1 or 2 other minor islands, and the county of Kauai, which also includes the islands of Nihau, the island of Kauai, which is most completely influenced and dominated by the Communist Party as big paid advertisements by responsible officials on one page of the Honolulu Record clearly show.

To continue, Senator, there was also an ad by county attorney and by 4 of the 6 members of the board of supervisors. There are 6 supervisors. There are 4 of the 6 supervisors that have paid advertisements in

this well-known, well-identified Communist paper.

And last, but not by any means least, are the ads of all of the 4 representatives from that county in the Territorial legislature.

That county is represented by 4 representatives in the Territorial legislature and all of the 4 have demonstrated either their loyalty to communism or the extent to which they are willing to be unscrupulous politicians and capitulate to Communist pressure and appear as Communist, whether they are, or not.

Now, these 4 representatives are not paid by taxes in Hawaii. They all draw their salaries from the Government of the United States in Washington, D. C.

Now, here is something I would particularly like to call to the attention of the Senate. These men are giving money to one of the best identified Communist papers that is published. This paper has been identified by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and by the Territorial Committee on Un-American Activities as the voice of the Communist Party of Hawaii.

These 10 public officials through these ads not only contributed moral support but financial support as well.

Under the laws that have been passed by the United States Congress an alien in Hawaii who contributes money to the Communist Party through its press would automatically make himself liable to deportation and yet these aliens if brought before the Immigration Service under deportation warrants, they are in a position to point out that they are only doing the same things against our Government that 10 public officials in their country are doing.

This certainly is prejudicial to the security efforts of our Federal agencies in Hawaii.

Another matter I would like to call attention to is the increasingly sharp battle between the loyal Americans and Communist agents for control of the Democratic Party in Hawaii. This is best illustrated by a story which appeared in the Honolulu Star Bulletin last week, which is headed "Fasi challenges Burns, Akau, To Denounce ILWU Reds."

Now, to understand this story, it is necessary to remember that Frank F. Fasi is a Democratic national committeeman from Hawaii. He is a man of unquestioned loyalty and integrity and for years has been making an outstanding fight in Hawaii to save his party, the Democratic Party, from Communist infiltration and control.

The chairman of the Territorial Democratic Central Committee is Mr. John A. Burns, who is shortly coming to Washington, D. C., as one of the Territorial spokesmen on the statehood issue.

Mr. Burns is coming to Washington at public expense, so it is important to keep in mind the personalities, Mr. Fasi, the outstanding fighter against communism, and Democratic national committeeman and the fact that he is talking about the chairman of the Territorial Democratic Central Committee.

The story states, and I quote from the Honolulu Star Bulletin, owned by Delegate Farrington of Hawaii:

"Frank F. Fasi, Democratic National Committeeman for Hawaii, has set off another crackling dispute in his party, challenging two of his top leaders to denounce the Communist leadership of the ILWU once and for all."

He singled out John A. Burns, chairman of the Territorial Democratic Central Committee and Jack Akau, Jr., chairman of the party's Oahu County Committee and prime target in his attack on a radio broadcast last night.

Mr. Fasi asserted Mr. Burns refused to testify against Jack W. Hall, Territorial director of the ILWU, who was convicted last year in the Smith Act trials of conspiring to advo-

cate and teach the overthrow of the Government by violence.

I might say here to make the record clear that this quote is from Democratic National Committeeman Mr. Frank F. Fasi regarding Mr. John A. Burns, chairman of the Territorial Democratic Central Committee.

"I challenge you again, Mr. Burns, to deny that even today you are working hand in glove with agents of the Communist ILWU leadership to control the coming Territorial convention," Fasi said.

Skipping some paragraphs of the story, it continues in reference to Fasi, and I am reading from the Star Bulletin:

"He said thousands of individual voters are waiting anxiously for a responsible Democratic Party.

"They don't want to go along year after year with a big business, the 'punkin' party, but they have no alternative when a vacuum exists on the Democratic side. They can't bring themselves to work in a party where any candidate must bow down and kow-tow to Communist ILWU leadership," he said.

Now, Senator, we have here a statement by a responsible man like Mr. Frank F. Fasi that the Territorial chairman of the party to which he himself belongs is working hand in glove with the agents of the ILWU leadership to control the coming Territorial convention.

I think this is evidence that the threat of Communist political control in the Territory is grave indeed.

Now, these views are not my own. These are views expressed by a man like Mr. Frank F. Fasi who really knows the picture in Hawaii and had it not been for Mr. Fasi's fight against communism, I might say that the situation would be even more grave than it is there today.

Turning to another matter, I would like to state for the record some information obtained from Mr. Robert Kempa, who broke with the Communist Party in July of 1952. Mr. Kempa was one of the top leaders of the Communist Party in the islands and was in the newly organized, the newly reorganized underground apparatus. Mr. Kempa tells me that when he left the Communist Party the members were all in units of three and were directed to meet only in moving automobiles.

This illustrates the extent to which the party is underground and the virtual impossibility of obtaining accurate data because of this underground structure.

Mr. Kempa estimates the membership of the Communist Party at the time he left, in the summer of 1952, as between 50 and 75, where he states that those who were dropped for security reasons continue to work under the party and are just as loyal to the Communist Party now as they were when they had formal membership.

He also advised me that without question Jack W. Hall could go out any day he wished and sign up 500 new members for the Communist Party in the Territory.

Mr. Kempa also advised me that Dwight James Freeman, secretary of the Communist Party of Hawaii, and one of those convicted in the Smith Act, told Kempa, that is prior to Kempa's break with the party in 1952, that the Communist Party in Hawaii has the physical strength and power to seize physically the Hawaiian Islands any time the international situation might make it desirable to do so.

Freeman, the head of the Communist Party, went on to say that the actual carrying out of such action actually would depend upon the international situation; it would be foolish indeed to try to seize the island when the United States Army and Navy could immediately retake them, but that the party would wait for the proper moment in the international situation before taking such revolutionary action.

In analyzing the situation in Hawaii one must consider the close relationship with

events there, with the situation there, and developments in Asia.

For example, if the Philippines should fall under Communist rule, the pressure on the Filipino residents of the island would be very great. The Filipinos are subjected to Communist influence to a greater degree than any other nationality in the islands.

Most of them do not speak English and they get their information largely through a daily Filipino-language program and through Communist Filipino leaders in their unions.

I would like to make clear for the record that the formal dues-paying membership of the Communist Party, which is organized on an underground basis, is no index to Communist strength, because the people attached to these small units are the generals of the army. They do not need a large party so far as formal and official membership is concerned, and the Communist leaders are particularly careful to keep the number of formal members among the aliens as low as possible to protect them from deportation.

I am of the opinion that the Senate committee should make a thorough study of Communist methods of organization, with a view to possibly some changes to make our present immigration and naturalization laws fully applicable to the conditions in Hawaii.

The Communist Party in Hawaii, in effect, operates on a different structural basis from the mainland. There are at least 2,000 or 3,000 people who without question regard themselves as Communists, and one can count at least that many names by looking through paid individual greeting ads in the issues of the Honolulu Record, which I have given as part of my testimony.

I have not counted names, but I think there must be at least 3,000 individuals who paid money to advertise their support of communism in the Communist weekly paper in Hawaii.

I certainly agree with the opinion of Mr. Kempa that Jack Hall could, if he wished, sign up 500 new members of the party in 1 day.

Several other former leaders of the Communist Party have told me the same thing as Mr. Kempa on that point.

Senator, there is another matter in connection with Communist activities in Hawaii to which I should like to call attention. That is the diversion by union leaders of union money to the Communist Party.

We have laws on our statute books regarding embezzlement, but in Hawaii we have actually wholesale embezzlement of union money obtained through checkoff for the use of the Communist Party.

The ILWU contributes huge sums in paid greeting ads in the Communist weekly, Honolulu Record. The ILWU has its official paper, the Dispatcher, printed on the press of the Communist weekly paper in the islands and pays a very substantial amount for each issue.

The budget of the Honolulu Record is \$40,000 a year, and at least \$30,000 of this is contributed or raised directly or indirectly through the ILWU.

It is my opinion that this Senate committee and Federal agencies should investigate the actual embezzlement of union money and its diversion to the revolutionary purposes of the Communist Party in Hawaii.

The total income of the Communist-controlled organizations in Hawaii is between \$500,000 and \$600,000 per year, of which between \$150,000 and \$200,000 are sent to the mainland to be used under the direction of Harry Bridges.

To get some idea of the strength of communism in Hawaii, we should compare the funds and membership of Communist-controlled organizations with the mainland on a per capita basis.

The population of Hawaii is 470,000, but, for comparison purposes, we might call it

half a million and the mainland United States 150 million. The budget of the Honolulu Record is \$40,000 a year. If the Communist press had as much per capita support in the United States, the Daily Worker would have a budget of \$12 million a year. The Communist-controlled organizations in Hawaii, mostly ILWU, have an income of around \$600,000 per year.

If the Communist-controlled organizations on the mainland had similar income, they would have \$180 million a year to use for Communist activities.

There are about 30,000 members of organizations completely controlled by the Communist Party in Hawaii.

A similar issue on the mainland would mean 9 million people in the United States under the control of the Communist Party.

(Thereupon, at 3 p. m., the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene subject to the call of the Chair.)

EXHIBIT 4

[From the IMUA Spotlight of January 15, 1954]

IS COMMUNISM ON THE WANE IN HAWAII?—AN INVENTORY SAYS "NO"

The expression "Communism is on the wane in Hawaii" is the wishful thinking of some residents, especially those who believe the best way to combat communism is to ignore it, and then it will quietly fade away. A candid, down-to-earth inventory of the situation disproves such wishful thinking.

A first of the year inventory of the known Communists and their activities indicates that all of them are still with us and all of them are at liberty to pursue their Red activities.

THE HAWAII SEVEN

The Hawaii seven are the best known of the identified Communists. First indicted under the Smith Act in August 1951, they were finally brought to trial on November 5, 1952.

Following a trial of almost 8 months (longest trial in Hawaii's legal history) they were found guilty on all counts, by the unanimous verdict of a jury of 12 men. The guilty verdict was rendered on June 19 of last year, and now, 6 months later, all 7 are still at liberty on bail set at \$15,000 each.

NO JAIL FOR HALL

Jack Hall, ILWU regional director, has not as yet spent 1 minute in jail. He faces, with the others, a 5-year prison term, for being convicted of conspiring to teach and advocate the overthrow of our Government by force and violence.

Due to the rich coffers of the ILWU defense fund, thousands of dollars collected from the rank and file union members, bail for Hall was posted immediately, thus permitting him to remain at large. He has also been permitted to make a trip to the mainland, ostensibly on union business.

VERDICT APPEALED

As was expected, and as has occurred in all Smith Act cases, the verdict of the jury has been appealed, to the ninth circuit court in San Francisco. The date for final filing of the appeal by the defense was originally set for November 17.

This was first postponed, at the request of the defense, to December 17 and then a second delay was granted to January 17, 1954. As this article is written (Jan. 10) what action, if any, will occur on this twice-delayed appeal case is unknown.

In any event, it is not expected that the Hawaii seven will actually be put in prison for many months. Even if the ninth circuit court denies the appeal, the defense will no doubt resort to the final appeal to the Supreme Court in Washington.

COMMUNISTS AT LARGE

In other words, as 1954 gets underway, at least the whereabouts of seven identified Communists is known. They are at liberty in Honolulu, devoting their time as usual to the promotion and advancement of communism in every way possible.

Charles K. Fujimoto is still functioning as the full-time secretary of the Communist Party of Hawaii. His wife, Eileen, is still at work in the ILWU offices. John E. Reincke is often seen, with his usual large armful of books and papers, in the vicinity of Bouslog and Symonds law offices, doing "research" as always.

FREE PRESS

And, even though convicted of conspiracy under the Smith Act, Koji Ariyoshi, editor, and Jack Kimoto, employee, still continue to edit, publish and distribute the weekly Communist newspaper, the Honolulu Record.

That Red tabloid issued a 24-page Christmas edition, containing paid ads by 292 business firms or organizations, plus 810 individuals, or a total of 1,102 paid advertisements.

This show of Communist strength in Hawaii is all the proof necessary to dispel the wishful-thinking idea that "communism is on the wane in Hawaii."

RADIO MOSCOW

The chief spokesman for communism and against Americanism, Robert W. McElrath, is growing even bolder in his presentation of Communist propaganda.

On Monday evening, January 4, he presented, on transcription made by means of direct shortwave, a program broadcast in English from Radio Moscow.

BRAZEN COMMUNISM

Such broadcasts by the "little Red school-boy" offer the most positive proof that communism is not on the wane in Hawaii.

In the meantime, McElrath continues with his nightly propaganda, aimed at creating dissension among races and social, political, religious and economic groups within our community; and always devising tricky and sneaky ways and means of casting disrespect on all properly constituted authority, including our laws, our courts and judges; disrespect for all American institutions.

THE VOTELESS CRITIC

Robert W. McElrath, in spite of his many years of residence in the Territory, has never even bothered to register or to vote in Hawaii. He, who received part of his training at the Communist school in San Francisco, and is therefore known as the "little Red schoolboy," is also properly called the "voteless critic of America."

All other identified Communists; all such Communist fronts as the Civil Rights Congress; all fellow-travelers, stooges, and sympathizers are, to the best available knowledge, still functioning in their usual traitorous manner, working for, aiding and abetting the cause of communism.

HENRY B. EPSTEIN

This identified Communist (he has never officially denied it) is the top leader of the United Public Workers union, a group of some 2,000 members, mostly Government or hospital workers.

One of Epstein's top assistants is another well identified Communist, Steve Murin.

LEARN MORE IN 1954

It is the sincere hope of IMUA that the good, loyal people of Hawaii will make and keep one New Year's resolution, and that is to learn more about communism; how it works; who its leaders are; its ultimate aims and purposes.

Remember—all that is necessary for the triumph of evil—the triumph of communism—is that good men do nothing.

Won't you resolve not to be among the ranks of "good men" who do nothing, during 1954?

EXHIBIT 5

COMMUNISM IN HAWAII

(By Paul Crouch, founder, Federation of Former Communists)

Hawaii is indeed a land of superlatives. It has the best climate in the world, one of the lowest—if not the lowest—of death rates to be found, music and dances that are justly famous, and varied scenic attractions that make the islands a tourist paradise. But Hawaii today has one superlative feature that is anything but desirable. Hawaii has the most powerful Communist apparatus to be found under the American flag. Communism is a malignant cancer, quietly but rapidly destroying the foundations of Hawaii's economic and political life.

"How strong is communism in Hawaii?" Experts have given rather contradictory answers to this question, yet all were based on facts. In many cases the facts were but small fragments of the entire picture, and from them a false and dangerous sense of security was obtained. One must have accurate yardsticks to measure Communist strength and an understanding of what makes communism a truly dangerous force. The least important of all factors is the number of formal and dues paying members of the Communist Party, especially if the party is in control of trade unions and other organizations through which its decisions can be carried out. In a formal organizational sense the party has been stripped down to a hard core of perhaps no more than 50 leaders. They belong to cells of 3 members each and hold "meetings" in moving automobiles. The maximum formal membership of the Communist Party in Hawaii at any one time was about two hundred. Only about 25 former Communists have given real evidence of a break with communism by public testimony and open opposition to it. Most of those who have been "dropped" from formal membership for security reasons remain under Communist discipline and without hesitation or question carry out directives from the party leadership.

Here are far more basic yardsticks for estimating the real power of communism in Hawaii. First, the extent of control of the economic life of the community and the ability, through Communist controlled unions, to halt the wheels of economic life at the whim of the party and its masters in the Kremlin. Second, the extent of infiltration in the Government through (a) elected or appointed Government officials; and (b) Government employees in general who belong to organizations under Communist control. Third, the percent of the population who belong to unions under complete control of the Communist Party. Fourth, funds spent for the Communist press (including all publications under party control) and Communist controlled unions. Fifth, fear of the community to fight back and ability of the Communist Party to make life intolerable for former Communists who desert the ranks of the party and openly help to expose its sinister and subversive activities. When we apply these standards of measure to the Communist apparatus in Hawaii we find a situation so shocking that the facts stagger the imagination.

The Communist Party controls the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, controlled nationally by Harry Bridges and headed in Hawaii by Jack W. Hall, convicted last summer under the Smith Act. The ILWU has repeatedly demonstrated its ability to bring economic paralysis to the islands. There is no place on the mainland where the Communist Party can at any moment of its own choosing bring the economic life of the community to a halt. From

this measure of strength, Communist power in Hawaii may be a thousand times what it is on the mainland.

The extent of Communist influence in the Territorial Government and the four counties of the Territory has been a subject of sharp dispute, because most undercover Communist Party members and fellow travelers can be expected to deny the fact and try to conceal the evidence. But there are documentary facts beyond question. The main publication of the Communists in Hawaii is the Honolulu Record. For several years it has been officially identified as a Communist publication by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and Hawaii's own Territorial Committee on Un-American Activities. The Record's editor, Koji Ariyoshi, is one of the Communist Party leaders convicted under the Smith Act during the early summer of 1953. About 2 months after the conviction of its editor, the weekly Honolulu Record published its fifth anniversary issue on August 6, 1953. Page 49 of this issue contains ten display paid advertisements that are without precedent in documentation of the power of the Red termites in the Territory.

To understand the full significance of the ten paid advertisements we must keep in mind the fact that there are only four counties in the Territory of Hawaii, and Kauai is one of them. The county of Kauai includes the islands of Kauai and Niihau.

The first of these advertisements in the Communist weekly begins: "Greetings to the Honolulu Record on its fifth anniversary" and ends: "A. C. Baptiste, Jr., Chairman and Executive Officer, County of Kauai." A second advertisement reads: "Aloha, County Attorney Toshio Kabutan, Hanapepe, Kauai." This County Attorney Toshio Kabutan, called a former Communist, Ichiro Izuka, a stool pigeon because he testified for the United States Government, thereby rendering invaluable service to Hawaii and our country by exposing the Red conspiracy. Four of the advertisements are from County Supervisors Matsuki Arashiro, Chris Watase, Raymond Souza and Tom Okura. There are six members of the county board of supervisors in Kauai County; 4 of the 6, by paid advertising in a Communist weekly, openly placed themselves in the camp of the enemies of our country, civilization and freedom.

The remaining four advertisements from Government officials on page 49 of the August 6, 1953, issue of the Communist Honolulu Record, are from four Representatives in the Territorial legislature. They are advertisements by Representatives Manuel Henriques, William Fernandes, Toshio Serizawa, and Toshiharu Yama. Mainland readers may ask how many representatives there are from the county of Kauai in the Territorial legislature. There are only four—and every one of them through the Communist weekly advertised the fact that he is either part of the Red conspiracy or is such an unprincipled politician that he will betray his country and give both money and moral support to its enemies in exchange for the Communist support essential for election to any position in the county of Kauai.

One of the leaders of the Communist Party on the island of Kauai is Y. Morimoto. He has been repeatedly identified since 1947. On a visit to Kauai early in February I found this Communist leader to be serving on a grand jury at that time.

I will agree with those who say that Kauai is the hotbed of communism in the Territory and that in none of the other three counties is the political power of the Communists so complete and unchallenged. But the picture in the other counties is bad enough.

On page 17 of the Honolulu Record of December 24, 1953 (published less than 3

months ago), there is a paid display advertisement reading: "Holiday greetings to one and all from friendly Eddie Tam, chairman and executive officer, county of Maui."

The highest official in the three counties other than the city-county government of Honolulu is the chairman and executive officer. We see the official heads of half of Hawaii's four counties openly and defiantly taking their place in the ranks of Harry Bridges, Jack W. Hall, Dwight James Freeman, and other Communists who are plotting to destroy our country. If the official heads of half of the counties in Florida, California, New York, or any other State were to display their loyalty to the Kremlin through paid advertisements of greetings in the Daily Worker it would create national consternation. The governor of the State would take immediate steps to remove such officials. Governor Samuel Wilder King, actually a militant anti-Communist, has as yet taken no steps to remove Eddie Tam, head of the county of Maui, A. C. Baptiste, Jr., head of the county government of Kauai, and the four county supervisors who joined Baptiste in open and paid support of the Communist weekly.

Turning to lower levels of Territorial, county, and municipal employees, we find that at the lowest estimate, about 3,000 belong to the Communist-controlled Public Workers Union. The three top officials of this union are Henry Epstein, Stephen Murin, and Max Roffman. The Honolulu Star-Bulletin of February 25, 1954, stated that Epstein and Murin had been identified as Communists by Hawaii's Commission on Subversive Activities, and the Star-Bulletin then published evidence of Roffman's membership in the Communist Party on the mainland before he came to Hawaii. This red union has organized the majority of employees of fire departments throughout Hawaii, as well as many other strategic departments in Territorial, county, and municipal governments. The Red-controlled Public Workers Union works closely with the ILWU and uses radio time paid for by the Bridges-Hall union. The Public Workers Union has received open support and encouragement from many government officials.

It is well known that Delbert E. Metzger, Democratic nominee for Delegate to Congress, who was defeated in the last election by a margin of only about 10,000 votes, was a major defense witness for Jack W. Hall in the Smith Act trial. In February 1953 he went to New York to accept an award from the notorious Communist-front National Lawyers Guild. Mayor John H. Wilson, of Honolulu, also was a defense witness for the Communist leader, Jack W. Hall.

At the present time National Committeeman Frank F. Fasi is making a real effort to free the Democratic Party from the Communists seeking to capture it. He is meeting with terrific resistance from the Red forces and the outcome cannot be predicted at this time. Other true Democratic leaders like Justice Stainback are fighting bravely against the rising tide of communism, together with Republicans like Governor King and Delegate Farrington.

The finances available to the Communists in Hawaii can best be understood by a population percentage comparison with the situation on the mainland. The population of Hawaii is about 470,000, but for easy calculation let us consider the islands as having half a million people and the mainland 150 million. The Communist newspaper in Hawaii operates on a budget of \$40,000 per year. If the Communist press on the mainland received equal support the Daily Worker would have a budget of \$12 million per year.

The total income of Communist-controlled organizations in Hawaii, most of it being through the ILWU, is about \$600,000 per year. If Communist-controlled organizations on the mainland had an income in the same proportion according to population, the total

income of such groups would be \$180 million. Yes, \$180 million. As a matter of fact, the Communist ILWU sends from \$150,000 to \$200,000 per year to the mainland for use under the supervision of Harry Bridges.

The number of people who belong to organizations controlled by the Communists in Hawaii is about 30,000. The same ratio on the mainland would mean 9 million people belonging to Communist-controlled unions and other organizations. The actual number probably is about 1 million—so from this yardstick Communist strength in Hawaii is about 9 times as great as the mainland average. This is without taking into consideration the far greater degree of control over unions in Hawaii than on the mainland.

Last but not least is the power of the Communists to take vengeance on those who desert their ranks and cooperate with our country in exposing subversive forces. The study of the economic suffering endured by former Communists is in itself a dramatic and shocking story. I have yet to find an industrialist or employer in Hawaii with the courage to provide decent employment for ex-Communist leaders who were key witnesses for the Federal Government. They are afraid of the power of the Communist bosses of the ILWU and Public Workers Union. The fact that employers in Hawaii are afraid to provide jobs for these former Communists who have done so much to save Hawaii and our country is, in my opinion, the most striking evidence of the extent of Red power in Hawaii.

Hawaii has another superlative quality. It is one of the most vital spots in America's national defense. The Soviet Government knows this and since 1928 the world Communist movement has devoted intensive efforts to building a base in Hawaii. With communism continuing to make new gains in Asia, Hawaii is as much an outpost of our defense as it was in the last war. It is time for our Nation to wake up to the real facts and quickly do something about the situation in the islands.

Hawaii—land of superlatives—is likely to play an important role in coming events that will shape the course of history for centuries to come. The fate of humanity and civilization may well depend on the present struggle between two philosophies and ways of life in this mid-Pacific island paradise.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its work today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President of the Senate be empowered to sign duly enrolled bills or resolutions during the recess of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted

into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to read a telegram which I have just received. It is addressed to me and reads as follows:

Both political parties strongly urge passage of Hawaii statehood bill on its own merits. Earnestly request bill not be encumbered by any extraneous questions. Friends of both Hawaii and Alaska convinced that if Hawaii enters Union of States Alaska cannot be far behind. Combining Hawaii and Alaska in one bill may be fatal to both. All Hawaii awaits decision with hopeful anxiety.

SAMUEL P. KING,

Chairman, Republican Party of Hawaii.

JOHN A. BURNS,

Chairman, Democratic Party of Hawaii.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I listened with interest to the splendid address of the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. He apparently based most of his argument on statements which were made by one man who appeared before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary on January 7 and 9, 1954, when the bill was under consideration by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I am chairman. The chairman of the committee addressed a letter to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, asking for as much of a detailed report as it was possible to give us at that time.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield for a question? Then I shall not again interrupt him.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator said I was resting on the testimony of one witness. As I stated at the beginning of my remarks, I merely prefaced my remarks at that time with the testimony to which the Senator refers. That testimony was limited to occurrences in the islands since the conclusion of the investigation last summer, which would be from August up to date. It could not have been the testimony of one witness, when we relied on the average daily happenings throughout the islands.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. The hearings which the Senator has had inserted were of recent date.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct. Two were in 1952. The point was to compare August, 1952, and December 25, 1952, to the same dates of last year.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I desired to have the RECORD show that the committee which handled the proposed legislation did the best it could—at least, it thought it did—to survey the Communist situation in the islands of Hawaii. After making a direct inquiry of the Director of the FBI, we had a very polite letter from him, in reply, explaining that because the FBI operates under the Department of Justice, he would have to submit our letter to the Attorney General for reply, if any reply was to be obtained.

The committee received a reply under date of January 13, and that letter appears on page 37 of the report. I think the letter is as factual as anything can possibly be with reference to the Com-

munist situation in the islands of Hawaii.

I shall not take time to read the entire letter, but shall read only the closing paragraph:

The fact that it has been necessary to prosecute the leaders of the Communist conspiracy in Hawaii is, in my opinion, no more of an indication of the strength of the party in that area than the convictions of the Communist leaders in New York, Pittsburgh, Seattle, and Los Angeles are indications of party control and dominance in those areas.

HERBERT BROWNELL, JR.,

Attorney General.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1954.

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Reference is made to your letters of January 7 and January 9, 1954, to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation concerning communism in Hawaii. In his reply the Director explained the reasons that precluded him from a reply. Some of these considerations also apply to the Department, but I am glad to oblige you with as broad a response as circumstances permit.

The facts known to me concerning communism in Hawaii do not indicate any reason to believe that communism is a greater menace in Hawaii at the present time than it was in 1950. As a matter of fact, the known members of the Communist Party in Hawaii appear to be fewer in number at present than they were in 1950. Undoubtedly the recent conviction of the leaders of the Communist conspiracy in Hawaii has contributed to this decline in Communist Party membership. I believe it inevitable that this conviction will have a weakening effect on the strength of communism in Hawaii.

I do not mean to suggest, however, that the seriousness of the Communist menace in Hawaii can be measured by these facts alone. These convictions have a relation to the convictions of Communist leaders in other parts of the United States. All of these cases serve to reveal the widespread nature of the Communist conspiracy with the fact that Communist activities are related in all parts of the country and the trials contributed to a public understanding of the undermining tactics of communism which the President recently described as akin to treason.

The fact that it has been necessary to prosecute the leaders of the Communist conspiracy in Hawaii is, in my opinion, no more of an indication of the strength of the party in that area than the convictions of the Communist leaders in New York, Pittsburgh, Seattle, and Los Angeles are indications of party control and dominance in those areas.

Sincerely,

HERBERT BROWNELL, JR.,

Attorney General.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, before making my brief remarks, which will be mostly on the subject which the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has just covered, I wish to pay a compliment to the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], who

conducted the hearings and who opened the debate with a statement before the Senate this morning. He has done fine work and has labored diligently, as have members from both sides of the Senate who served on the subcommittee.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that, as the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I have taken an active part, for a number of years, in consideration of the Hawaii statehood question, I should like to make a statement in connection with the pending measure, and set forth my present views on this subject.

I am strongly in favor of statehood for Hawaii at this time. I intend to support the pending bill, and I very much hope it will pass by an overwhelming majority.

I do not intend to analyze all the details of this issue. I should like to address myself particularly to one objection to statehood for Hawaii that has been raised, namely, the issue of communism.

I am convinced that today the people of Hawaii are alert to the problem of communism and are fully able to cope with the Communist danger.

Some Members of the Senate may recall that in 1948, I was the first Member of Congress to expose the extent of Communist influence in Hawaii. At that time I visited the Territory, and made a thorough study of the situation; and I filed a report which outlined the extent of Communist power in Hawaii and named the leaders. On the basis of those conditions, I opposed statehood for Hawaii until strong action could be taken to break the strength of communism there.

Since that time I have followed closely the struggle in Hawaii against communism. As late as 1951, I felt obliged to oppose statehood because of the Communist question. The following year I visited the Islands again, for an on-the-spot study of the question.

In view of my past opposition to statehood, it is a real pleasure for me to be able to say now that in my opinion during the intervening years the people of Hawaii have brought the Communist menace under control.

I still believe firmly that my opposition to Hawaiian statehood in former years was correct. But since then, the people of Hawaii have taken vigorous action to clean out un-American influence. If they had not done so, I assure the Senate that I would still be just as much opposed to statehood as before.

During the course of this debate, I am sure the Senate will hear charges that there are still a few known or suspected Communists in positions of influence, or that there is still too great a degree of tolerance by certain elements in Hawaii toward communism. During our hearings there were two or three witnesses who still insisted that communism was a threat in Hawaii. I am sure their words will be seized upon by the opposition to this bill, and quoted and re-quoted, as justification for postponing action one more time on this matter.

Certainly a few Communists are still at large in Hawaii. No one denies that. Against that is the determination of the people of Hawaii, growing steadily

stronger and stronger, to destroy communism and destroy Communist influence wherever it shows itself and whenever opportunity arises.

Of that fact, we have had many proofs in recent years. Several times, the forces of communism have raised a challenge to the people of Hawaii. Each time, that challenge has been repulsed. Each time, the forces of freedom have grown stronger, while the forces of communism have grown weaker. I wish to mention a few of those incidents.

The year after my visit to the Islands in 1948, at which time I first exposed the Communist menace, the Communist high command inflicted upon the Territory its greatest economic disaster in recent history, in the form of a six months' strike by the Communist-led International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union. The Territory of Hawaii is, of course, entirely dependent upon sea transportation for its food supply and its other necessities—in fact, for its very existence. The effect of that strike was to cut the economic life-line of Hawaii with the continental United States.

The impact of the strike was equivalent to the effect which a general strike would have on any of our mainland cities. In effect, it represented a clear-cut Communist challenge to organized civilized life and to civil government itself.

The people of Hawaii refused to knuckle under to that challenge. Upon the urging of the then governor, the territorial legislature enacted emergency legislation authorizing the territorial government to seize the docks and carry on stevedoring operations until the strike was settled. The Communist leadership in Hawaii, of course, fought this rather drastic proposal, using as a smokescreen all the conventional arguments regarding the rights of labor and so forth. Such arguments undoubtedly would have had an appeal if that strike had been merely a weapon in a conventional labor conflict. But the people of Hawaii and the legislature of Hawaii could recognize a Communist threat when they saw one. The legislature voted the proposed legislation by an overwhelming majority. The strike was settled.

Incidentally, during this debate we may hear argument to the effect that we must control Hawaii from Washington because the people of Hawaii cannot cope with communism by themselves. In the case of that strike, Hawaii pleaded to Washington for help in stopping the strike, but received no help. So the Hawaiians themselves stopped the strike.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

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

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Nebraska knows, of course, does he not, that it would be completely beyond the power of the United States Government to conduct a trial in a Federal court in Hawaii and there have a citizen of

Hawaii convicted on a charge of disloyalty, unless the jury, picked in Hawaii, saw fit to convict him?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Nebraska also knows, does he not, that the jury which tried and convicted certain Communists of violating the Smith Act was composed of Hawaiian citizens, and it was a judge of the Territory of Hawaii who sentenced them?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I think the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, after that refusal by the Federal Government to help Hawaii in her grave crisis, it is no longer convincing to argue that we can control communism in Hawaii better than the Hawaiians can.

A year later, communism posed another challenge to the people of Hawaii, and again it was beaten back decisively. Preparatory to statehood, a proposed state constitution was drafted, for submission to the people of Hawaii for ratification in November of 1950. Keenly alive to the Communist problem, the Hawaiian constitutional convention had inserted in that constitution the most stringent possible anti-Communist oath. As a result, the Communist leadership in Hawaii, including the leadership of the ILWU, campaigned bitterly against the popular ratification of that constitution.

Thus, the opposition to ratification was made up of several classes of people—those opposed to statehood, as such; those opposed to various particular provisions of the constitution, and the Communist leadership, and all those whom it could lead or mislead.

The result? The people of Hawaii ratified the proposed constitution by an overwhelming majority—about 3 to 1.

Nineteen hundred and fifty brought yet another test of the loyalty and determination of the people of Hawaii—this time a test that had to be faced on the battlefield. When the Korean war broke out, the sons of Hawaii fought, as they have always fought, for the United States and also for the United Nations, for human dignity, and freedom. They compiled an impressive record on the battlefield. On a per-capita basis, Hawaii contributed more than her share of young men in that effort, and young men of Hawaii contributed more than their share of the blood that was spilled. The figures on casualties, and also on decorations are given in the hearings. Hawaii had more than her share of both.

Mr. President, a few weeks ago this Nation had the unpleasant experience of realizing that there were a few—fortunately a very few—of our young men taken prisoner in Korea who, when offered a choice between communism and Americanism, chose communism. Those 21 young men came from homes and communities scattered all over our Nation—not every State; there were only 21 of them—but every part of the continental United States, north, east, south, and west. I do not mean to cast any reflection on the homes or the communities from which those young men

came. I do not know the particular circumstances in each case. I do wish to point out that young men from Hawaii were in our armies, some of them were captured, too, but not a single one of them chose communism over Americanism.

I mention one more test of the strength of communism in Hawaii. That test came last year, when the United States Government took to court a prosecution of seven leading Communists under the Smith Act. The case had to be presented, of course, before a local jury, drawn from every occupation and racial group in the Territory. Something has been made of the fact that Hawaii has a rather high proportion of citizens of oriental ancestry. All those racial groups were represented on the jury which tried that case.

Throughout that case skilled defense attorneys did everything possible to awaken racial prejudice, to create class hatred, to distort and confuse the issues. Every possible kind of red herring was drawn into the case by the defense. Time-serving politicians were induced to lend their names as character witnesses to the disreputable cause of the defense.

Yet that jury of diverse racial origins promptly proved that it recognized the Communist menace very clearly. The lawyers took 7½ months to present the case, but the jury took only 1 ballot to decide unanimously for conviction in all 7 cases.

Mr. President, what else is Hawaii supposed to do, to prove that it is anti-Communist? Shall we postpone statehood until the last lone Communist has been run out of the Territory? If Hawaiians have not yet done enough about the Communist question, what further action should they take to convince us of their determination? What further assurance of their loyalty can we think up, to demand of them? Shall we defer statehood year after year, until all hope and all faith in the hearts of the people of Hawaii are gone?

I know it will be said that such-and-such a person is a suspected Communist, that there is a party-line newspaper in Hawaii, that the largest union is Communist led. Mr. President, there are Communist-led unions in continental United States. There are Communist Party publications in continental United States, freely published and freely circulated. There are still leading Communists at large on the continent, some of them in positions of influence, perhaps some of them still in official positions, for all I know. Just a few weeks ago a major in the Army, a "fifth amendment" Communist, received an honorable discharge—why, I do not know.

We heard testimony from several witnesses about the Communist danger in Hawaii. One of them, former Governor Stainback, said he thought the Communist danger was growing. But he gave no evidence to support that opinion. He gave us no new facts of any kind about the Communist problem. He did not even tell us how he had arrived at that opinion. He simply gave us his

opinion. I admire Governor Stainback very much for the fine, statesmanlike service he rendered the people of Hawaii when he was their Democratic-appointed Governor.

I yield to no other Member of this body in my opposition to communism. Furthermore, I lay credit to having first exposed the Communist danger in Hawaii. Today, I am convinced that the people of Hawaii have the Communist problem under control.

I hope the Senate will agree with my judgment in this matter. If there is such a thing as earning the right to statehood, the people of Hawaii have earned that right. Statehood for Hawaii would strengthen our Nation, as well as do justice to a loyal group of American citizens. No one contends that everything about Hawaii is absolutely perfect. Few things are perfect in this world. Some of our existing States are not perfect. Certainly Hawaii is at least as well qualified for statehood as any of the 35 States admitted since the adoption of our Constitution. Statehood for Hawaii has been more thoroughly studied and investigated than any of the previous cases. Hawaii has had to pass more rigorous tests for admission than any of the existing States. In simple justice, we ought not to deny statehood any longer.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 355) amending the act approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461-1468), as amended, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1954—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

This matter has been discussed between the majority leader and the minority leader, and there is no objection to the consideration of the report at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1265)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$8,120,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,431,909"; and the Senate agree to the same.

HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOHN TABER,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
CLIFF CLEVINGER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT THOMAS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

THE COST OF THE PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, approximately 6 weeks ago the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and submitted a chart showing the realized cost of agricultural and related programs, by function or purpose, for the fiscal years 1932 to 1953.

The chart showed the total cost of those programs to be between \$16 billion and \$17 billion.

Mr. Benson was promptly charged by his political enemies with trying to make it appear that the support-price program had cost \$16 billion.

Nothing could have been further from the truth than such charges made against the Secretary of Agriculture. Nevertheless, Mr. President, inasmuch as the figures were not broken down in detail, I asked the Secretary of Agriculture to have prepared, at the earliest possible moment, charts breaking down his figures in detail and showing what it had cost to support each commodity during the past 22 years; grouping the various basic and other commodities together and showing what each group had cost; and breaking down the cost of the

Rural Electrification Administration over the life of that agency.

The Secretary of Agriculture has furnished me with such charts, and I ask unanimous consent to have them inserted in the RECORD.

The first chart shows the realized cost of agricultural and related programs, by function or purpose, for the fiscal years 1932 to 1953. Attached to it is a statement showing the relationship of realized costs to statements of accrued income and expenses for noncorporate lending programs. It shows how different figures can be arrived at in estimating the cost of the rural electrification program, which, incidentally, has not been large.

Another chart is an appendix to the table Realized Cost of Agricultural and Related Programs, by Function or Purpose, Fiscal Years 1932 to 1953. It shows the distribution of realized cost by commodities, where possible, of programs primarily for stabilization of prices and farm income.

It shows the amounts which have been spent, so far as it was possible to determine them, on every agricultural commodity, from almonds to wool.

The total cost of the support program has been a little more than \$9 billion.

There has been deducted from that amount approximately \$2 billion, which was collected in processing taxes, which, after all, was a cost on the consumer just the same.

The third chart is an appendix to the table Realized Cost of Agricultural and Related Programs, by Function or Purpose, Fiscal Years 1932 to 1953.

These charts altogether cannot possibly show all the costs of a program, because there is no way of including in them the billions of dollars which were charged off to the armed services and the foreign-aid programs in the years immediately following the war.

There is no possible way of showing the profits which were gained because of the fact that Congress raised the support prices of the commodities from the 52 percent, which prevailed in 1942, to the 90 percent, which was legislated by an act of Congress.

Nevertheless the cost is less than \$500 million a year. In my opinion it has been a good investment.

I believe that the political enemies of the Secretary of Agriculture are extremely unfair, and display a great lack of statesmanship, in questioning his integrity. We know that anyone who questions the integrity of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, is talking merely for political purposes, and nothing else.

I believe the charts will at least counteract some of the vicious charges which have been made against the integrity of an honest man.

I believe the charts answer the critics and the political enemies of Secretary Benson. The charts are as accurate as an agency headed by an honest man can make them.

There being no objection, the charts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Realized cost of agricultural and related programs, by function or purpose, fiscal years 1932-53

(The basis for the costs reflected in this table is as follows: (1) For activities financed from appropriated funds, the expenditures less receipts arising from the activities so financed; (2) for noncorporate loan funds, the losses on loans and the net interest cost or income; (3) for Commodity Credit Corporation and Federal Crop Insurance Corporation corporate funds, the net gains or losses from operations and the interest cost to Treasury on Government-subscribed capital; and (4) for corporations of the Farm Credit System, the interest cost to Treasury on Government-subscribed capital and payments made by Treasury on account of reductions in interest rates on mortgages less dividends and franchise taxes paid to Treasury. Interest cost to Treasury on noncorporate loan funds and on Government-subscribed capital of corporations has been computed on the basis of the average rate on the public debt paid by Treasury in each of these years.)

[Millions of dollars]

	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943
Program primarily for stabilization of prices and farm income:												
Commodity Credit Corporation:												
Program operations:												
Price support programs.....					8.7	5.3	0.4	4.6	7.4	34.0	169.1	149.9
Supply, foreign purchase, commodity export, and other CCC activities.....											1.1	2.0
Administrative and other general costs.....			10.6	10.9	11.7	3.9	2.1	13.0	8.7	2.2	19.6	12.1
International Wheat Agreement ²												
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities ³					32.2	35.2	35.2	211.6	143.9	226.1	196.3	112.0
Sugar Act.....							127.4	16.5	125.2	130.0	132.7	1.6
Federal crop insurance.....								4.4	7.7	9.8	14.8	14.6
Acreage allotment payments under the agricultural conservation program.....						313.6	217.4	350.7	380.2	326.7	332.5	218.1
Other, including Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, parity payments, and other adjustment and surplus removal programs.....	297.8	75.1	148.2	179.6	417.3	84.9	1.5	28.0	224.1	197.2	202.7	203.7
Total.....	297.8	75.1	148.8	178.7	469.9	442.9	227.2	589.8	746.8	766.0	634.8	512.0
Programs primarily for conservation of resources:												
Agricultural conservation program (exclusive of acreage allotment payments).....					.5	55.1	88.8	119.8	202.0	132.7	136.6	212.0
Soil Conservation Service programs ⁴2	.2	.1	.2	3.5	21.0	24.2	25.7	30.9	23.0	23.4	23.4
Forest Service programs ⁵	19.6	12.2	6.8	8.3	9.5	14.2	17.9	21.4	24.3	18.9	17.8	18.5
Flood prevention program.....							.3	1.4	2.3	2.9	1.5	.4
Total.....	19.8	12.4	6.9	8.5	13.5	90.3	131.2	168.3	259.5	177.5	179.3	254.3
Credit and related programs for electrification and telephone facilities, and farm purchase, maintenance, operation, and housing:												
Lending programs:												
Rural Electrification Administration.....						.2	.7	1.3		2.5	1.0	1.9
Farmers' Home Administration.....	13.7	13.2	13.7	14.5	9.5	14.5	12.2	17.7	11.4	9.3	7.1	1.3
Farm Credit System.....	5.4	6.5	22.3	33.5	49.9	55.2	60.0	61.1	58.5	51.5	50.9	48.1
Grants and other expenses, including salaries and expenses related to the above lending programs.....	4.9	6.6	9.1	12.7	77.3	157.7	110.8	72.5	72.9	69.8	67.3	51.3
Total.....	24.0	26.3	45.1	60.7	136.7	227.6	183.7	152.6	142.8	133.1	126.3	97.2
Research and education:												
Research.....	20.6	18.1	15.3	15.6	18.4	20.9	22.6	25.7	30.2	31.2	31.6	30.9
Extension Service, including payments to States.....	10.1	9.9	9.4	9.3	17.4	17.0	17.9	18.5	19.2	19.2	19.5	19.5
Total.....	30.7	28.0	24.7	24.9	35.8	37.9	40.5	44.2	49.4	50.4	51.1	50.4
Other, chiefly school lunch, marketing services, control and regulatory activities:												
School lunch program ⁶												1.0
Other.....	23.9	22.2	18.0	37.1	41.5	34.7	35.6	33.7	32.8	30.9	31.1	31.0
Total.....	23.9	22.2	18.0	37.1	41.5	34.7	35.6	33.7	32.8	30.9	31.1	32.0
Programs primarily for wartime, defense, and other special needs:											5.3	14.1
Total, above items.....	396.2	164.0	45.9	309.9	697.4	833.4	618.2	988.6	1,231.3	1,157.9	1,027.9	960.0
Wartime consumer subsidies on agricultural commodities:											8.3	145.5
Paid by Commodity Credit Corporation.....											.9	23.4
Paid by Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....												
Total.....											9.2	168.9
Other special activities not a part of the agricultural programs of the Department:												
Special activities conducted by the Department under transferred funds as a service for other agencies (chiefly for purchase of commodities for lend-lease, UNRRA, Mutual Security and other foreign aid programs).....	2.1	3.1	32.1	161.8	72.3	64.0	26.1	30.0	20.6	20.9	698.4	2,031.2
Government procurement of agricultural commodities for foreign-aid programs other than through the Department of Agriculture.....												
Total.....	2.1	3.1	32.1	161.8	72.3	64.0	26.1	30.0	20.6	20.9	698.4	2,031.2

	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	Total
Programs primarily for stabilization of prices and farm income:											
Commodity Credit Corporation:											
Program operations:											
Price support programs.....	15.9	29.4	130.1	71.9	125.4	254.7	249.2	345.6	67.4	61.1	1,110.1
Supply, foreign purchase, commodity export, and other CCC activities.....	12.4	5.8	135.9	1242.7	138.4	14.7	12.7	1.6	1.3	6.4	1319.8
Administrative and other general costs.....	10.4	26.1	33.2	13.9	16.5	15.9	48.1	42.0	34.6	55.3	299.6
International Wheat Agreement ²								75.6	180.4	171.3	558.1
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities ³	63.4	24.9	19.2	78.4	51.2	75.6	96.6	46.0	37.5	82.3	1,567.6
Sugar Act.....	121.3	132.9	15.2	17.4	13.1	123.3	114.5	114.8	121.8	119.4	1,296.1
Federal crop insurance.....	18.1	2.9	21.5	36.9	11.8	1.4	9.6	4.6	8.7	6.4	157.8
Acreage allotment payments under the agricultural conservation program.....	193.1		22.5								2,354.8

See footnotes at end of table.

Realized cost of agricultural and related programs, by function or purpose, fiscal years 1932-53—Continued

[Millions of dollars]

	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	Total
Programs primarily for stabilization of prices and farm income—Continued											
Other, including Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, parity payments, and other adjustment and surplus removal programs.....	156.7	16.1	11.5	12.2		10.9	25.0	18.9	7.2	7.7	2,078.3
Total.....	402.1	50.1	23.7	151.2	116.8	328.7	486.9	624.3	306.2	330.6	7,510.4
Programs primarily for conservation of resources:											
Agricultural conservation program (exclusive of acreage allotment payments).....	226.6	278.9	275.3	329.2	230.6	167.6	237.2	275.5	262.0	270.3	3,500.7
Soil Conservation Service programs ⁴	25.1	28.2	34.6	43.1	41.3	47.9	52.8	52.1	56.0	59.6	616.5
Forest Service programs ⁵	18.3	21.0	28.0	36.4	37.7	33.8	33.5	9.8	7.6	6.2	421.7
Flood prevention program.....	.1	.1	.6	2.6	3.8	5.9	6.7	7.5	7.8	6.3	50.2
Total.....	270.1	328.2	338.5	411.3	313.4	255.2	330.2	344.9	333.4	342.4	4,589.1
Credit and related programs for electrification and telephone facilities, and farm purchase, maintenance, operation, and housing:											
Lending programs:											
Rural Electrification Administration.....	14.4	11.9	1.9	2.5	6.5	9.7	14.4	20.2	23.2	26.7	99.8
Farmers' Home Administration.....	19.8	17.6	12.6	14.9	14.6	14.8	13.2	15.4	15.3	15.1	83.2
Farm Credit System.....	43.2	18.1	9.4	7.3	7.0	1752.3	111.2	18.0	17.8	12.6	506.0
Grants and other expenses, including salaries and expenses related to the above lending programs.....	39.8	36.0	37.6	42.5	26.4	29.0	33.8	35.4	37.1	36.8	1,067.3
Total.....	68.8	44.6	43.5	47.4	35.3	118.4	33.8	42.2	47.2	55.8	1,756.3
Research and education:											
Research.....	28.2	29.7	31.6	37.1	42.4	52.6	56.8	55.2	54.8	55.2	724.7
Extension Service, including payments to States.....	19.5	19.4	23.9	27.4	27.2	31.1	32.1	32.3	32.6	32.6	465.0
Total.....	47.7	49.1	55.5	64.5	69.6	83.7	88.9	87.5	87.4	87.8	1,189.7
Other, chiefly school lunch, marketing services, control and regulatory activities:											
School lunch program ⁶	33.7	45.4	56.6	77.5	68.4	75.0	83.2	82.8	83.6	82.8	690.0
Other.....	35.8	36.3	40.3	48.5	40.5	48.1	52.8	55.2	53.9	57.4	841.3
Total.....	69.5	81.7	96.9	126.0	108.9	123.1	136.0	138.0	137.5	140.2	1,531.3
Programs primarily for wartime, defense, and other special needs.....	73.8	54.7	31.1	31.3	41.3	45.9	31.5	1.6	8.2	5.4	344.2
Total, above items.....	932.0	608.4	589.2	629.3	685.3	818.2	1,107.3	1,238.5	919.9	962.2	16,921.0
Wartime consumer subsidies on agricultural commodities:											
Paid by Commodity Credit Corporation.....	390.1	741.7	845.1	122.4	14.0	12.2	.1	.3	1.3	1.1	2,102.1
Paid by Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	570.4	626.3	924.8	13.0	.1						2,142.9
Total.....	960.5	1,368.0	1,769.9	125.4	13.9	12.2	.1	.3	1.3	1.1	4,245.0
Other special activities not a part of the agricultural programs of the Department:											
Special activities conducted by the Department under transferred funds as a service for other agencies (chiefly for purchase of commodities for lend-lease, UNRRA, Mutual Security and other foreign-aid programs).....	2,139.9	1,382.1	1,610.8	579.1	744.6	1,018.4	611.4	447.6	331.8	118.7	12,147.0
Government procurement of agricultural commodities for foreign-aid programs other than through the Department of Agriculture.....						1,425.9	1,236.3	741.8	312.4	351.3	4,067.7
Total.....	2,139.9	1,382.1	1,610.8	579.1	744.6	2,444.3	1,847.7	1,189.4	644.2	470.0	16,214.7

¹ Excess of credits—deduct.
² The expenditures under this program are for payment of the difference between the price specified in the International Wheat Agreement and the domestic market price of wheat. The program is essentially international in nature, and is included in this classification with the kinds of items to which it most nearly relates.
³ Exclusive of cash payments for school-lunch programs.
⁴ The amounts shown include the purchase of 9,643,738 acres of submarginal land at a total cost of approximately \$60,061,000.
⁵ The amounts shown include the purchase of 14,450,711 acres of land at a total cost of approximately \$68,532,000.
⁶ Includes costs under the National School Lunch Act and sec. 32 funds used for cash payments for school-lunch programs.
⁷ Includes \$9.3 million representing the cumulative net loss of capital subscribed to the regional Agricultural Credit Corporations which were liquidated in 1949.

RELATIONSHIP OF REALIZED COSTS TO STATEMENTS OF ACCRUED INCOME AND EXPENSES FOR NONCORPORATE LENDING PROGRAMS

The financial aspects of the noncorporate lending programs of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farmers' Home Administration, which are reported on this statement on a realized cost basis, are also susceptible of being reported on an accrued income and expense basis. Records for these programs are maintained and reports are made on the accrued basis pursuant to regulations covering business-type Government operations. To illustrate the differences involved in these two concepts the following tabulation, using the REA as an example, shows the results, from the beginning of the REA programs through the fiscal year 1953, on the accrual basis compared with the realized costs reflected in this statement.

Lending operations of REA from inception to June 30, 1953

[Millions of dollars]

	Accrued income and expense basis	Net realized cost basis
Interest income.....	234.0	150.9
Expense:		
Interest expense.....	185.9	250.7
Provision for possible losses on loans.....	2.5	
Net income.....	45.5	
Net expense.....		99.8

The principal differences in the two bases are as follows:

(1) Interest income: The accrual basis includes interest earned but not collected. A substantial part of the difference is due to the inclusion on the accrual basis of interest

deferred under the law during the first 5 years of a loan but properly accounted for as accrued interest earned although it is not due or payable. The realized cost basis includes actual collections of interest.

(2) Interest expense: The accrual basis includes only the interest actually charged to REA on funds borrowed from RFC (in the earlier years) and from the Treasury, under borrowing authorizations provided by Congress. The realized cost basis includes as interest expense the amount resulting from applying to the average total of loans outstanding in each year the average interest rate paid by the Government for the funds it borrowed in that year.

(3) Provision for possible losses on loans: The accrual basis includes projected or anticipated losses based on the best estimate that could be made at the end of the fiscal year 1953. The realized cost basis, which takes into account only those costs that have actually come about, does not include any anticipated losses on loans.

Appendix to table of "Realized cost of agricultural and related programs, by function or purpose, fiscal years 1932-53"—Distribution of realized cost by commodities, where possible, of programs primarily for stabilization of prices and farm income¹

[Millions of dollars]

	Total	Commodity Credit Corporation			International Wheat Agreement	Removal of surplus agricultural commodities	Sugar Act	Federal crop insurance	Acreage allotment payments under the Agricultural Conservation Program	Agricultural production programs (principally acreage allotments and marketing quotas) ²	Parity payments	Retirement of cotton pool participation trust certificates	Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 and related acts	Removal of surplus cattle and dairy products ³	Agricultural Marketing Act Revolving Fund, and payments to stabilization corporations for losses incurred ⁴	Other
		Price support programs	Supply, foreign purchase, commodity export, and other CCC activities	Administrative and other general costs												
Almonds.....	1.7															
Apples.....	81.5															
Apricots.....	1.3															
Barley.....	10.1	10.1		10.1												
Beans.....	60.6	35.0		35.0				0.3								
Beef.....	1.5								1.5							
Beets.....	1.0								1.0							
Blackberries.....	.1								.1							
Butter.....	158.8	48.7		48.7					110.1							
Cabbage.....	5.1								5.1							
Carrots.....	1.3								1.3							
Castor beans.....	.2	.2		.2												
Cattle and dairy products.....	76.6													76.6		
Cauliflower.....	.1								.1							
Celery.....	.5								.5							
Cheese.....	28.7	25.0		25.0					3.7							
Cherries.....	2.2								2.2							
Citrus.....	1.1								1.1							
Citrus (juice and salad).....	.1								.1							
Coffee.....	.6								.6							
Corn, cornmeal, and corn-hog program:																
Corn.....	860.6	70.9		70.9				.9	441.0	8.9	347.5					
Cornmeal.....	17.5							17.5								
Corn-hog program:																
Program expenses.....	488.7													488.7		
Miscellaneous receipts.....	1.6													1.6		
Processing taxes (net).....	261.4													261.4		
Total, corn-hog.....	226.7													226.7		
Total, corn.....	1,113.8	70.9		70.9				18.4	.4	441.0	8.9	347.5		226.7		
Cotton:																
CCC price support program:																
Upland cotton.....	268.2	268.2		268.2												
Puerto Rican cotton.....	.1	.1		.1												
Cotton export differential.....	41.4	41.4		41.4												
Cotton-rubber barter.....	11.1	11.1		11.1												
Total, CCC price-support program.....	237.8	237.8		237.8												
Other cotton programs:																
Program expenses.....	2,050.4	12.5		12.5				348.9	67.8	771.2	21.1	279.7	1.3	416.7	140.2	
Miscellaneous receipts.....	9.5									7.7				1.8		
Processing taxes (net).....	247.2													47.2		
Total, cotton.....	1,564.9	237.8	12.5	225.3				348.9	67.8	771.2	13.4	279.7	1.3	167.7	140.2	
Cottonseed and products.....	13.6	15.3		15.3					1.7							
Cranberries.....	1.2								1.2							
Dairy products.....	.5															.5
Dates.....	.4								.4							
Eggs.....	331.6	189.7		189.7					141.9							
Figs.....	2.6								2.6							
Filberts.....	.6								.6							
Fish.....	1.2								1.2							
Flax.....	21.8	.4		.4					.2	3.3	24.5					
Flaxseed and linseed oil.....	72.0	66.2		66.2					5.8							
Fruits and vegetables.....	5.6															5.6
Fruits, dried.....	14.9	14.9		14.9												
General depleting crops.....	627.5									627.5						
Grain.....	83.0		12.0	12.0												71.0
Grain sorghums.....	41.4	35.4		35.4					6.0							
Grapes.....	.5								.5							
Grapefruit (fruit and juice).....	27.8	1.7		1.7					26.1							
Hay.....	8.0		8.0	8.0												
Hemp and hemp fiber.....	21.5	21.5		21.5												
Hides (miscellaneous receipts).....	13.0															13.0
Hominy grits.....	3.5								3.5							
Honey.....	12.2	.9		.9					11.3							
Hops.....	1.7	1.0		1.0					.7							
Lard.....	19.3								19.3							
Lemons (fruit and juice).....	.4								.4							
Livestock.....	.1															.1
Meat, miscellaneous.....	.2								.2							
Milk.....	51.1								51.1							
Milk, dried.....	62.8	62.8		62.8												
Multiple crops.....	5.0															
Naval stores.....	1.4	1.4		1.4						5.0						
Nuts.....	.3															.3
Oats.....	1.4	1.4		1.4												
Oats, rolled.....	3.4								3.4							
Olive oil.....	.4	(1)		(1)					.4							

See footnotes at end of table.

Appendix to table of "Realized cost of agricultural and related programs, by function or purpose, fiscal years 1932-53"—Distribution of realized cost by commodities, where possible, of programs primarily for stabilization of prices and farm income¹—Continued

[Millions of dollars]

	Total	Commodity Credit Corporation			International Wheat Agreement	Removal of surplus agricultural commodities	Sugar Act	Federal crop insurance	Acreage allotment payments under the Agricultural Conservation Program	Agricultural production programs (principally acreage allotments and marketing quotas) ²	Parity payments	Retirement of cotton pool participation trust certificates	Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 and related acts	Removal of surplus cattle and dairy products ³	Agricultural Marketing Act Revolving Fund, and payments to stabilization corporations for losses incurred ⁴	Other
		Price support programs	Supply, foreign purchase, commodity export, and other CCC activities	Administrative and other general costs												
Onions.....	2.9					2.9										
Oranges (fruit and juice).....	51.6					51.6										
Peaches.....	10.0					10.0										
Peanut butter.....	1.7					1.7										
Peanuts:																
Program expenses.....	142.9	92.6		92.6		26.8		6.2	13.6				3.7			
Miscellaneous receipts.....	¹ 1.3								² 1.3							
Processing taxes (net).....	³ 3.7												⁴ 3.7			
Total, peanuts.....	137.9	92.6		92.6		26.8		6.2	12.3							
Pears.....	11.9					11.9										
Peas (canned, dried and fresh).....	3.2	.9		.9		2.3										
Pecans.....	3.8	(11)		(11)		3.8										
Pineapples.....	.1					.1										
Plums.....	.6					.6										
Pork.....	66.0					66.0										
Pork and beans.....	2.1					2.1										
Potatoes.....	635.8	478.1		478.1		¹¹ 131.6		20.1								
Potatoes, sweet.....	4.0	.1		.1		3.9										
Poultry.....	.3														.3	
Prunes.....	36.6					36.6										
Raisins.....	33.1					33.1										
Rice:																
Program expenses.....	35.4	1.5		1.5		6.6		11.7	.4	5.6			9.6			
Processing taxes (net).....	.5												.5			
Total, rice.....	35.9	1.5		1.5		6.6		11.7	.4	5.6			10.1			
Rye:																
Program expenses.....	.4	.2		.2									.2			
Processing taxes (net).....	¹ .2												² .2			
Total, rye.....	.2	.2		.2												
Seeds:																
Program expenses.....	5.6	4.9		4.9											.7	
Miscellaneous receipts.....	³ 5.4												⁴ 5.4			
Total, seeds.....	.2	4.9		4.9									5.4		.7	
Shortening, vegetable.....	.1					.1										
Soup.....	.9					.9										
Soybeans.....	¹ 4.4	² 4.4		³ 4.4												
Spinach.....	.3					.3										
Squash.....	.1					.1										
Sugar:																
Sugar Act program:																
Sugar payments.....	819.9					819.9										
Sugar taxes.....	¹ 1,135.2					² 1,135.2										
Net total, Sugar Act.....	³ 315.3					⁴ 315.3										
Other sugar programs, including sugar beets:																
Program expenses.....	111.2	16.5		16.5		.1		3.6					91.0			
Processing taxes (net).....	¹ 76.2												² 76.2			
Total, other sugar.....	35.0	16.5		16.5		.1		3.6					14.8			
Total, sugar.....	³ 280.3	16.5		16.5		.1	⁴ 315.3	3.6					14.8			
Sirup.....	.4					.4										
Tangerines.....	1.1					1.1										
Tobacco:																
Program expenses.....	186.4	¹ 1.6		² 1.6		18.1	³ 3.0	85.0	19.8	6.1			62.0			
Miscellaneous receipts.....	⁴ 23.3								⁵ 21.2				⁶ 2.1			
Processing taxes (net).....	⁷ 68.5												⁸ 68.5			
Total, tobacco.....	94.6	¹ 1.6		² 1.6		18.1	³ 3.0	85.0	⁴ 1.4	6.1			⁵ 8.6			
Tomatoes.....	3.8					3.8										
Tung oil.....	.1	(11)		(11)												
Turkeys.....	33.4					33.4										
Vegetables.....	42.7	(11)		(11)		¹² 35.9		6.8								
Walnuts.....	13.8					13.8										

See footnotes at end of table.

Appendix to table of "Realized cost of agricultural and related programs, by function or purpose, fiscal years 1932-53"—Distribution of realized cost by commodities, where possible, of programs primarily for stabilization of prices and farm income¹—Continued

[Millions of dollars]

	Total	Commodity Credit Corporation			International Wheat Agreement	Removal of surplus agricultural commodities	Sugar Act	Federal crop insurance	Acreage allotment payments under the Agricultural Conservation Program	Agricultural production programs (principally acreage allotments and marketing quotas) ²	Parity payments	Retirement of cotton pool participation trust certificates	Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 and related acts	Removal of surplus cattle and dairy products ³	Agricultural Marketing Act Revolving Fund, and payments to stabilization corporations for losses incurred ⁴	Other	
		Price support programs	Supply, foreign purchase, commodity export, and other CCC activities	Administrative and other general costs													Total
Wheat, wheat cereal, and wheat flour:																	
Wheat:																	
Program expenses.....	1,870.4	95.1	* 1.2	96.3	546.5	21.7	1.8	351.2	22.0	328.2		354.6		148.1			
Miscellaneous receipts.....	\$ 15.4								\$ 15.4								
Processing taxes (net).....	\$ 244.9											\$ 244.9					
Total, wheat.....	1,610.1	95.1	1.2	96.3	546.5	21.7	1.8	351.2	6.6	328.2		109.7		148.1			
Wheat cereal.....	4.5					4.5											
Wheat flour.....	107.0					107.0											
Total, wheat and wheat products.....	1,721.6	95.1	1.2	96.3	546.5	133.2	1.8	351.2	6.6	328.2		109.7		148.1			
Wool.....	104.6	92.2		92.2											12.4		
Total, all commodities.....	7,279.8	1,110.1	33.8	1,143.9	546.5	1,514.4	* 315.3	68.9	2,354.8	40.2	967.1	1.3	515.0	76.6	379.4	* 13.0	
Interest cost:																	
Interest payments.....	272.5		261.7	261.7	10.8												
Imputed interest cost ⁵	71.5		31.9	31.9				13.7							25.9		
Interest income.....	\$ 174.0		\$ 149.3	\$ 149.3				4.7							\$ 24.0		
Other costs not allocable to specific commodities ⁶	63.4		\$ 353.6	155.3	\$ 198.3	.8		19.2	75.9	(18)	10 6.8	49.5	.1	56.2			
Receipts not allocable by commodities.....	\$ 2.8												\$ 1		\$ 20 2.7		
Realized cost.....	7,510.4	1,110.1	* 319.8	299.6	1,089.9	558.1	\$ 1,567.6	\$ 296.1	157.8	2,354.8	47.0	1,016.6	1.4	571.1	76.6	381.3	* 15.7
RECAPITULATION																	
Commodity totals:																	
Program expense (before deduction of miscellaneous receipts and taxes).....	9,385.1	1,110.1	33.8	1,143.9	546.5	1,514.4	819.9	68.9	2,354.8	85.8	967.1	1.3	1,426.5	76.6	379.4		
Miscellaneous receipts.....	\$ 68.5									\$ 45.6			\$ 9.9				
Sugar taxes.....	\$ 1,135.2							\$ 1,135.2									
Processing taxes (net).....	\$ 901.6												\$ 901.6				
Total, commodities.....	7,279.8	1,110.1	33.8	1,143.9	546.5	1,514.4	* 315.3	68.9	2,354.8	40.2	967.1	1.3	515.0	76.6	379.4	* 13.0	
Other amounts not allocable by commodities.....	230.6		\$ 353.6	299.6	\$ 54.0	11.6		88.9		6.8	49.5	.1	56.1		1.9	\$ 2.7	
Realized cost.....	7,510.4	1,110.1	* 319.8	299.6	1,089.9	558.1	\$ 1,567.6	\$ 296.1	157.8	2,354.8	47.0	1,016.6	1.4	571.1	76.6	381.3	* 15.7

¹ The distribution by commodities is necessarily estimated in most instances since accounting records were not required to be maintained on an individual commodity basis.

² The amounts indicated hereunder are principally for salaries and expenses for fiscal years 1947 to 1953 in connection with acreage allotments and marketing quotas on the commodities shown. Prior to 1947, such work was handled as a part of the agricultural conservation program, and administrative expenses for this work were not maintained separately from administrative expenses of the agricultural conservation program. Accordingly, amounts for acreage allotments and marketing quotas for 1946 and prior years are not included in this statement.

³ Program conducted under the Jones-Connally Act.

⁴ Represents principally losses incurred on loans made from the revolving fund by the Federal Farm Board to stabilize the prices of wheat and cotton. A large portion of such losses resulted from donations authorized by Congress to the American Red Cross, without reimbursement to the fund, of wheat and cotton acquired in stabilization operations.

⁵ Represents income or minus expenditures.

⁶ Represents cost of commodity export program on cotton and wheat exclusive of export differential on cotton owned or pooled by CCC.

⁷ Includes \$163.2 million for cotton-price adjustment.

⁸ Breakdown by commodity is not available. In general, row crops were considered to be soil-depleting if grain or forage was removed from the land. In addition, small grain crops harvested for grain or hay fell into this category.

⁹ Represents cost of the storage facilities program which applies primarily to the cost of providing local and emergency storage for corn and wheat in the earlier years of the Corporation's program.

¹⁰ Represents net loss on sales of hay for feeding in drought emergency areas in 1953.

¹¹ Less than \$50,000.

¹² This item applies to a type of insurance which covers several crops on the farm and on which indemnities are paid only for crop deficiencies based upon the total value of the insured crops.

¹³ Includes \$25.6 million and \$4.9 million applicable to potatoes and vegetables, respectively, in incentive payments under the 1943 agricultural conservation program.

¹⁴ Includes \$163.2 million cost applicable to the cotton-price-adjustment programs and \$30.5 million in incentive payments under the 1943 ACP program. An item of \$12.1 million of program cost, which cannot be allocated to individual commodities, is included in "Other costs not allocable to specific commodities" below.

¹⁵ Interest computed for each year on the basis of the average rate on the public debt paid by Treasury in that year.

¹⁶ Consists of administrative expenses and other general costs or income not distributable by specific commodities.

¹⁷ Includes charged-off accounts and notes receivable of \$1.3 million and the net

realized gain on the supply and foreign purchase programs which are identifiable by broad commodity groupings as follows:

	Millions
Supply:	
Cotton and linters.....	\$ 1.9
Grains and seeds.....	\$ 76.0
Oils (bulk).....	\$ 9.9
Tobacco.....	\$ 4.8
General commodities purchase.....	\$ 185.8
Processed and packaged commodities.....	\$ 39.1
Other.....	3.4
Total.....	\$ 305.1
Foreign purchase:	
Cotton.....	\$ 5.9
Fats and oils.....	\$ 38.9
Foodstuffs.....	\$ 5.7
Other.....	.2
Total.....	\$ 50.3

These programs were separate from the major activity of the Corporation and were undertaken as a means of supplying the requirements of Government agencies, foreign governments and relief and rehabilitation agencies, and to meet domestic requirements. The gain of \$185.8 million reflected under general commodities purchase resulted from the establishment of sales prices at a level which would prevent losses to the Corporation on the supplying of commodities and products thereof to meet the requirements of the United States armed services, lend-lease participants, foreign governments, relief agencies, etc., during World War II.

¹⁸ No administrative or other general costs are included for these acreage allotment payments. The program was conducted as a part of the agricultural conservation program and records of administrative and other nonpayment costs were not maintained separately for acreage allotment payments as distinguished from payments for conservation practices.

¹⁹ Represents activities to assure production of crops in short supply and assistance to farmers in obtaining equipment and materials necessary to achieve the production required by the Korean mobilization.

²⁰ Represents receipts from liquidation of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation.

²¹ Exclusive of cash payments for school-lunch programs.

NOTE.—Details may not add to totals shown due to rounding. February 1954.

Appendix to table of "Realized cost of agricultural and related programs, by function or purpose, fiscal years 1932-53"—Summary of realized cost of agricultural programs primarily for stabilization of prices and farm income, showing distribution of cost by commodity groups¹

[Millions of dollars]

	Total	Commodity Credit Corporation			International Wheat Agreement	Removal of surplus agricultural commodities ²	Sugar Act	Federal crop insurance	Average allotment payments under the Agricultural Conservation Program	Agricultural production programs (principally acreage allotments and marketing quotas) ³	Parity payments	Retirement of cotton pool participation trust certificates	Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 and related acts	Removal of surplus cattle and dairy products ⁴	Agricultural Marketing Act Revolving Fund, and payments to stabilization corporations for losses incurred ⁵	Other
		Price support programs	Supply foreign purchase, commodity certificates, and other CCC activities	Administrative and other general costs												
BASIC COMMODITIES																
Corn (including cornmeal and AAA corn-bog program):																
Program expense	1,375.8	70.9			70.9	18.4		.4	441.0	8.9	347.9		488.7			
Miscellaneous receipts	\$ 6.6												\$ 6.6			
Processing taxes (net)	\$ 261.4												\$ 261.4			
Total, corn	1,113.8	70.9			70.9	18.4		.4	441.0	8.9	347.5		226.7			
Cotton:																
CCC price support:																
Upland cotton	\$ 268.2	\$ 268.2			\$ 268.2											
Puerto Rican cotton	.1	.1			.1											
Cotton export differential	41.4	41.4			41.4											
Cotton-rubber barter	\$ 11.1	\$ 11.1			\$ 11.1											
Total, CCC price support	\$ 237.8	\$ 237.8			\$ 237.8											
Other cotton programs:																
Program expense	2,059.4		7 12.5		12.5	\$ 348.9		67.8	771.2	21.1	279.7	1.3	416.7		140.2	
Miscellaneous receipts	\$ 9.5									\$ 7.7			\$ 1.8			
Processing taxes (net)	\$ 247.2												\$ 247.2			
Total, cotton	1,564.9	\$ 237.8	12.5		\$ 225.3	348.9		67.8	771.2	13.4	279.7	1.3	167.7		140.2	
Peanuts:																
Program expense	142.9	92.6			92.6	26.8			6.2	13.6				3.7		
Miscellaneous receipts	\$ 1.3									\$ 1.3						
Processing taxes (net)	\$ 3.7													\$ 3.7		
Total, peanuts	137.9	92.6			92.6	26.8			6.2	12.3						
Rice:																
Program expense	35.4	1.5			1.5	6.6			11.7	.4	5.6		9.6			
Processing taxes (net)	.5												.5			
Total, rice	35.9	1.5			1.5	6.6			11.7	.4	5.6		10.1			
Tobacco:																
Program expense	186.4	\$ 1.6			\$ 1.6	18.1		\$ 3.0	85.0	19.8	6.1		62.0			
Miscellaneous receipts	\$ 23.3									\$ 21.2			\$ 2.1			
Processing taxes (net)	\$ 68.5												\$ 68.5			
Total, tobacco	94.6	\$ 1.6			\$ 1.6	18.1		\$ 3.0	85.0	\$ 1.4	6.1		\$ 8.6			
Wheat (including wheat cereal and wheat flour):																
Program expense	1,981.9	95.1	7 1.2		96.3	546.5	133.2		1.8	351.2	22.0	328.2	354.6		148.1	
Miscellaneous receipts	\$ 15.4									\$ 15.4						
Processing taxes (net)	\$ 244.9												\$ 244.9			
Total, wheat	1,721.6	95.1	1.2		96.3	546.5	133.2		1.8	351.2	6.6	328.2	109.7		148.1	
Total, basic	4,668.7	20.7	13.7		34.4	546.5	552.0		67.0	1,666.3	40.2	967.1	1.3	505.6		288.3
DESIGNATED NONBASIC COMMODITIES																
Butter	158.8	48.7			48.7	110.1										
Cheese	28.7	25.0			25.0	3.7										
Milk	113.9	62.8			62.8	51.1										
Potatoes	635.8	478.1			478.1	131.6			26.1							
Wool	104.6	92.2			92.2										12.4	
Other	12.8	1.0			1.0	11.3									.5	
Total, designated nonbasic	1,054.6	707.8			707.8	307.8			26.1						12.9	
OTHER NONBASIC COMMODITIES																
Eggs	331.6	189.7			189.7	141.9										
Flaxseed and linseed oil	72.0	66.2			66.2	5.8										
Sugar:																
Sugar act program:																
Sugar payments	819.9					819.9										
Sugar taxes	\$ 1,135.2					\$ 1,135.2										
Net total, sugar act	\$ 315.3					\$ 315.3										
Other sugar programs	11.2	16.5			16.5	.1			3.6				91.0			
Processing taxes (net)	\$ 76.2												\$ 76.2			
Total, sugar	\$ 280.3	16.5			16.5	.1			3.6				14.8			

Footnotes at end of table.

Appendix to table of "Realized cost of agricultural and related programs, by function or purpose, fiscal years 1932-53"—Summary of realized cost of agricultural programs primarily for stabilization of prices and farm income, showing distribution of cost by commodity groups—Continued

[Millions of dollars]

	Total	Commodity Credit Corporation			International Wheat Agreement	Removal of surplus agricultural commodities ¹	Sugar Act	Federal crop insurance	Acreage allotment payments under the Agricultural Conservation Program	Agricultural production programs (principally acreage allotments and marketing quotas) ²	Parity payments	Retirement of cotton pool participation trust certificates	Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 and related acts	Removal of surplus cattle and dairy products ⁴	Agricultural Marketing Act Revolving Fund, and payments to stabilization corporations for losses incurred ⁵	Other	
		Price support programs	Supply, foreign purchase, commodity export, and other CCC activities	Administrative and other general costs													Total
OTHER NONBASIC COMMODITIES—CON.																	
Other:																	
Program expense.....	1,452.0	109.4	20.0	129.4		506.9	1.9	658.8					5.9	76.6	78.2		
Miscellaneous receipts.....	18.4												5.4			13.0	
Processing taxes (net).....	2												2				
Total, other.....	1,433.4	109.4	20.0	129.4		506.9	1.9	658.8					5.4	76.6	78.2	13.0	
Total, other nonbasic.....	1,556.7	381.8	20.0	401.8		654.7	315.3	1.9	662.4				9.4	76.6	78.2	13.0	
Total, all commodities.....	7,279.8	1,110.1	33.8	1,143.9	546.5	1,514.4	315.3	68.9	2,354.8	40.2	967.1	1.3	515.0	76.6	379.4	13.0	
Interest cost:																	
Interest payments.....	272.5			261.7	261.7	10.8											
Imputed interest cost ¹⁰	71.5			31.9	31.9			13.7									
Interest income.....	174.0			149.3	149.3			7								25.9	
Other costs not allocable to specific commodities ¹¹	63.4			198.3	8	53.2	19.2	75.9	(12)	14.6	49.5	.1	56.2			24.0	
Receipts not allocable by commodities.....	2.8												1			2.7	
Realized cost.....	7,510.4	1,110.1	319.8	299.6	1,089.9	558.1	1,567.6	296.1	157.8	2,354.8	47.0	1,016.6	1.4	571.1	76.6	381.3	15.7
RECAPITULATION																	
Commodity totals:																	
Program expense (before deduction of miscellaneous receipts and taxes).....	9,385.1	1,110.1	33.8	1,143.9	546.5	1,514.4	819.9	68.9	2,354.8	85.8	967.1	1.3	1,426.5	76.6	379.4		
Miscellaneous receipts.....	68.5									45.6			9.9			13.0	
Sugar taxes.....	1,135.2						1,135.2										
Processing taxes (net).....	901.6												901.6				
Total, commodities.....	7,279.8	1,110.1	33.8	1,143.9	546.5	1,514.4	315.3	68.9	2,354.8	40.2	967.1	1.3	515.0	76.6	379.4	13.0	
Other amounts not allocable by commodities.....	230.6			353.6	299.6	54.0	11.6	53.2	19.2	88.9	6.8	49.5	.1	56.1	1.9	2.7	
Realized cost.....	7,510.4	1,110.1	319.8	299.6	1,089.9	558.1	1,567.6	296.1	157.8	2,354.8	47.0	1,016.6	1.4	571.1	76.6	381.3	15.7

¹ The distribution by commodities is necessarily estimated in most instances since accounting records were not required to be maintained on an individual commodity basis.

² Exclusive of cash payments for school-lunch programs.

³ The amounts indicated hereunder are principally for salaries and expenses for fiscal years 1947 to 1953 in connection with acreage allotments and marketing quotas on the commodities shown. Prior to 1947, such work was handled as a part of the agricultural conservation program, and administrative expenses for this work were not maintained separately from administrative expenses of the agricultural conservation program. Accordingly, amounts for acreage allotments and marketing quotas for 1946 and prior years are not included in this statement.

⁴ Program conducted under the Jones-Connally Act.

⁵ Represents principally losses incurred on loans made from the revolving fund by the Federal Farm Board to stabilize the prices of wheat and cotton. A large portion of such losses resulted from donations authorized by Congress to the American Red Cross, without reimbursement to the fund, of wheat and cotton acquired in stabilization operations.

⁶ Represents income or minus expenditures.

⁷ Represents cost of commodity-export on program cotton and wheat exclusive of export differential on cotton owned or pooled by CCC.

⁸ Includes \$163.2 million for cotton price adjustment.

⁹ Includes \$163.2 million cost applicable to the cotton price adjustment programs and \$30.5 million in incentive payments under the 1943 ACP program. An item of \$12.1 million of program cost, which cannot be allocated to individual commodities, is included in "Other costs not allocable to specific commodities" below.

¹⁰ Interest computed for each year on the basis of the average rate on the public debt paid by Treasury in that year.

¹¹ Consists of administrative expenses and other general costs or income not distributable by specific commodities.

¹² Includes charged-off accounts and notes receivable of \$1.8 million and the net realized gain on the supply and foreign-purchase programs which are identifiable by broad commodity groupings as follows:

Supply:	Millions
Cotton and linters.....	\$ 1.9
Grains and seeds.....	76.0
Oils (bulk).....	9
Tobacco.....	4.8
General commodities purchase.....	185.8
Processed and packaged commodities.....	39.1
Other.....	3.4
Total.....	305.1

Foreign purchase:	Millions
Cotton.....	5.9
Fats and oils.....	38.9
Foodstuffs.....	5.7
Other.....	2
Total.....	50.3

These programs were separate from the major activity of the Corporation and were undertaken as a means of supplying the requirements of Government agencies, foreign governments, and relief and rehabilitation agencies, and to meet domestic requirements. The gain of \$185.8 million under general commodities purchase resulted from the establishment of sales prices at a level which would prevent losses to the Corporation on the supplying of commodities and products thereof to meet the requirements of the United States armed services, lend-lease participants, foreign governments, relief agencies, etc., during World War II.

¹³ No administrative or other general costs are included for these acreage-allotment payments. The program was conducted as a part of the agricultural conservation program and records of administrative and other nonpayment costs were not maintained separately for acreage-allotment payments as distinguished from payments for conservation practices.

¹⁴ Represents activities to assure production of crops in short supply and assistance to farmers in obtaining equipment and materials necessary to achieve the production required by the Korean mobilization.

¹⁵ Represents receipts from liquidation of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation.

NOTE.—Details may not add to totals shown due to rounding.
February 1954.

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR IN CHINA AND SIBERIA

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, on January 25 I made a statement regarding American servicemen, variously estimated as between 700 and 944, who are being held in slave-labor camps in China and Siberia in direct violation of the Korean truce agreement, which pledged that all prisoners would be returned.

In the interest of continuity, I ask unanimous consent to include in the body of the RECORD certain recent correspondence on this matter which I have received from the Department of State and the Department of Defense.

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

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,

Washington, D. C., February 4, 1954.

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: The Secretary of Defense has directed that I reply to your letter of February 2, requesting information on the 944 servicemen reported as being held as prisoners of war in Korea. In this connection, your remarks on the floor of the Senate, as reported in the January 25 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, have been read with great interest.

It is confirmed that there were 944 of our men concerning whom reports were received which indicated that the Communists possessed knowledge about their fate. Information concerning them originated, among other sources, from prisoner-of-war interrogations, statements of repatriated personnel, Communist radio broadcasts and news reports, and personal letters.

An initial demand for an accounting for these men was presented to the Military Armistice Commission on September 9. The Communist reply of September 21 was regarded by the United Nations Command as totally unsatisfactory and unacceptable; and subsequently, on September 25, November 23, December 10, and January 18, further demands were made. The Communist responses have been uniformly unacceptable.

In many cases, the reported information concerning the men was scanty and inconclusive. It has never been believed, or intended to be implied, that all 944 men were living. The demands presented to the Military Armistice Commission were not for a return of 944 men, but for an accounting for them—to include, of course, the return of all who might still be living.

It must be recognized that there is a diminishing basis for optimism concerning the fate of many of the men. In some cases, conclusive evidence has been obtained which has justified formal findings of death. In other cases, after the expiration of 12 months in a missing-in-action status, presumptive findings of death have been made as provided for in the Missing Persons Act. Other similar findings must be expected. This does not mean, however, that efforts will be slackened to obtain an accounting for these men. Our Government, through the Military Armistice Commission, will continue its negotiations to obtain information which would clarify the status of all the men; and will continue to investigate all sources of information and explore all feasible courses of action.

One course of action which may have occurred to some persons as a possible alternative to the slow and often frustrating attempts to obtain an accounting for these men should be the employment of force.

Aside from the doubtful efficacy of such a course of action, however, it would be altogether inconsistent with the international agreements which brought an end to the shooting war in Korea and which we fervently hope will eventually provide the basis for a durable peace in that land.

As can be seen, the above statement of facts is at variance with the account printed in the December 18 edition of the U. S. News & World Report.

We fully appreciate your interest in this important matter, and assure you that the problem has our continuing, serious attention.

Sincerely yours,
WADE M. FLEISCHER,
Colonel, USAF, Acting Director, Office of Legislative Liaison.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, February 19, 1954.

The Honorable JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: In the absence of Ambassador Dean, I am replying to your letter of February 2, acknowledged by telephone on February 10, concerning reports that American servicemen are being held in slave labor camps in China and Siberia.

To date, on the basis of information available to the Department of State, such reports cannot be verified. However, this matter will continue to receive our most careful attention.

We are, of course, very much concerned about the problem of the American personnel who have been listed as missing in action during the Korean war and about whom there is evidence that they had at one time been in Communist custody. It will continue to be the purpose of the United Nations Command and the United States Government to obtain the return of all United Nations personnel who may still be alive and in Communist custody, and to obtain information concerning other personnel still unaccounted for. I am enclosing a statement outlining the efforts which have been made in this regard.

Sincerely yours,
THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary.

EFFORTS TO SECURE THE RETURN OF AMERICAN PERSONNEL WHO MIGHT STILL BE IN COMMUNIST CUSTODY

The Korean Armistice Agreement provided for the return within 60 days from the effective date of the Armistice of all prisoners of war who desire repatriation. The United Nations Command has made every effort to make sure that all United Nations Command prisoners in Communist custody who wish repatriation are returned.

The United Nations Command has collected information from every known source to make sure that all prisoners were accounted for. It has gathered information from letters written home by prisoners, and by questioning former prisoners, by monitoring Communist radio broadcasts and by examining the actual circumstances of the disappearance of United Nations Command personnel from United Nations Command control.

The careful screening of this information has produced evidence that there might be some United Nations Command personnel in Communist custody who were not returned during the prisoner of war exchange, nor turned over to the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission nor otherwise accounted for by the Communists. While the United Nations Command has not had evidence that can be considered definite proof of the death or survival of the personnel not accounted for, there has been reason to believe that the Communists could furnish further information about these personnel.

A list of approximately 3,400 United Nations personnel carried as missing in action was presented by the United Nations Command to the Communist representatives on the Military Armistice Commission on September 9, 1953 with a demand that the Communists account for them. This list included the names of 944 Americans.

The United Nations Command demanded that the Communists account for all 944 men and that they return all who might still be living. It has not been believed, nor has the United Nations Command ever implied, that all 944 men were living. In many cases the information available about personnel not accounted for has been scanty and inconclusive.

On September 21, 1953, the Communists replied to the United Nations Command demand for an accounting of the missing personnel. They said that many of the men whose names were on the list had never been captured by their forces. They claimed knowledge of approximately 900 United Nations personnel (including only 112 Americans), all of whom the Communists claimed were either deceased, escaped or released at the front.

On September 24 the United Nations Command in a letter to the Communists said that it considered their reply wholly unacceptable. The United Nations Command letter pointed out that by signing the Armistice Agreement the Communists had undertaken a solemn obligation to repatriate or to hand over to the custody of the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission all of the captured persons held by them at the time of the Armistice. In addition it was pointed out that this obligation is binding upon them and applies to all United Nations personnel held in custody.

On November 21 the United Nations Command again protested in the Military Armistice Commission to the Communists that they had still failed to give a satisfactory reply concerning the list of United Nations Command personnel unaccounted for and pointed out that additional evidence provided by three Republic of Korea prisoners of war who had escaped from the Communists corroborated the United Nations Command statements that the Communists were withholding prisoners of war. At that time the United Nations Command demanded that the Communists "hand over to the custody of the Custodian Forces of India all those prisoners that your side still retains."

On December 7, the United Nations representative to the Military Armistice Commission requested the Communist side to agree to an impartial investigation of the evidence given by the three defectors. The Communists rejected this proposal.

On January 18 and January 26, 1954, the United Nations Representative to the Military Armistice Commission again requested the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission to investigate the charge that the Communists were withholding prisoners of war.

In the meantime, further information regarding the fate of those missing in action has been obtained from United Nations Command personnel returned by the Communists. This information has in many cases justified formal findings of death.

It has been suggested that some of our men are being held by the Communists because they are technically qualified specialists. It is doubtful that any of our men are being held for this reason. Examination of the list of those still unaccounted for shows that most of them are enlisted personnel without special technical qualifications.

Although it must be recognized that there is a diminishing basis for optimism concerning the fate of many of these men, it will continue to be the purpose of the United Nations Command and the United States Government to obtain the return of all

United Nations personnel who may still be alive and in Communist custody, and to obtain information concerning other personnel still unaccounted for. All feasible measures are being taken to accomplish this objective and we will continue to investigate every source of information that is available.

PUBLIC SERVICES DIVISION,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
WASHINGTON, D. C., February 10, 1954.

PENALTY ON TOBACCO GROWN OVER ALLOTMENT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on March 1, I introduced for myself and on behalf of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING] and my colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], S. 3050, dealing with the imposition of a penalty on tobacco that is grown over the allotment.

I have received a telegram from Marion Fowler, of the Lake City (S. C.) Tobacco Market, which was addressed to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. It has a bearing upon the bill which has been introduced, and is an expression of views of the tobacco growers in the Lake City area.

I ask unanimous consent to have the telegram printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

LAKE CITY, S. C., March 1, 1954.

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
United States Senate:

Re tel, have contacted number of growers over State belt as well as various interested parties you suggested contacting, and in every case introducing and passage of such bill as Senator CLEMENTS has in mind was favorable. Practice of excessive overplanting tobacco beyond allotment tends to undermine present program and has caused much dissatisfaction in many communities as those farmers living up to allowed acreage requirements feel it unfair other growers plant more than allotment. Increase in penalty rate would certainly help to reduce overplanting and some growers contacted suggested a penalty rate even greater than 50 percent. Without divulging names or details of matter your wire I contacted tobaccoists on each market as well as growers over wide area. Will continue survey and give you further report by letter. Feel sure, and your contacts here agree, such a bill is proper step to correct situation overplanting. If desirous further information or details don't hesitate to call me collect. Kind regards to all of you.

MARION FOWLER,
Lake City Tobacco Market.

THE NEVADA REPUBLICAN CONVEN- TION AND THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Republican Party of Nevada is proud of the accomplishments of this administration.

At the State convention of the Republican Party, held in Las Vegas, Nev., February 5-6, delegates applauded changes made under the leadership of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, and adopted resolutions commending the national administration.

The junior Senator from Nevada had the great privilege and pleasure of attending this convention, participating in

its deliberations, and obtaining at first-hand the views and counsel of the delegates.

These delegates, as are all Nevadans, are fine Americans. They represent the major segments of the Nation's economic life—agriculture, labor, mining and mineral, and chemical-resource development, transportation, education, and important national-defense industries. They are a splendid cross section of America, vitally concerned in America's prosperity and destiny rather than that of distant foreign lands. They are concerned about American living standards, American production, and American investment and development.

The people of Nevada believe that the working men and investors of the United States should be protected against the slave and low-cost labor of Europe, Africa, and Asia.

Where the national administration has affected changes from the warped and misguided policies of the previous administrations the people of Nevada, or at least a very substantial majority of the Nation's sixth largest State, are proud and happy.

Nevada's electorate, it may be recalled, affected a change also in the last presidential election, casting more than 60 percent of the popular vote for President Eisenhower, after they had voted in five previous elections for the Democratic nominee.

CHANGES FROM NEW DEAL COMMENDED

The people of Nevada voted for a change and the Republican State committee, at its recent convention, noted and commended 11 changes that have been accomplished in the first year of President Eisenhower's administration by resolutions unanimously adopted.

By equally unanimous resolutions the Republican State convention called for further changes, all from New Deal policies to Republican policies, and they did this with full expectation that a Republican national administration will bring about these changes.

Foremost among changes from Democrat to Republican policies was, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada, that relating to foreign trade.

Mr. President, the resolution on that subject reads:

Whereas the promotion of world trade should be on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and must be done within the principle long maintained that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to the country on terms which endanger the living standards of the American workingman or the American farmer, or threaten serious injury to domestic industry;

Whereas article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides that "The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect * * * duties, imposts and excises" (tariffs or import fees) and "to regulate foreign commerce"; and

Whereas the Congress transferred the constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade to the executive branch through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended from time to time: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Congress is hereby urged to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce, through the adjustment of duties, imposts and excises, through its agent the

Tariff Commission and allow the Trade Agreements Act—the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act—which transferred such responsibility to the President, to expire in June of 1954.

Mr. President, the sentiment expressed in this fine resolution is the sentiment not only of Nevada Republicans but of citizens and official bodies generally in the West, and I am sure, in many other parts of the Nation.

CALIFORNIA RESOLUTION

Less than a year ago the Legislature of the State of California, by joint resolution expressed similar sentiments. The resolution entitled "Joint resolution concerning the restoration to Congress of the fixing of tariffs" reads as follows:

Whereas it is essential to the protection of the American standard of living and the American way of life that products of foreign countries be admitted to this country only on a basis which will not endanger the living standards of the American workingman and the American farmer and will not threaten serious economic injury to any domestic industry; and

Whereas promotion of world trade by the Government of the United States should adhere to this principle so that the economic status of the American people may be maintained and not reduced to that in the depressed areas of the world where work is performed behind the sweatshops curtain; and

Whereas, while recent imports of live cattle and frozen and canned beef from Mexico, Canada, New Zealand, and other areas have dramatically highlighted the problem with respect to one industry, yet it is a problem affecting all the branches of agriculture, industry, and commercial production; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States abandoned its traditional function of fixing tariffs on foreign commerce entering the United States under the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 to the executive department of the Government, which has carried out policies inconsistent with the welfare of American agriculture, industry, and commerce: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California most respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to return to its traditional method of fixing tariffs based on principles of protection of American agriculture, industry, and commerce, and the standards of living for all American citizens created thereby; and be it further

Resolved, That until Congress so acts, the executive department of the Government exercises its powers to fixing tariffs only in accordance with the traditional principles of American policy as set forth in this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, that is a resolution adopted by the legislature of the great State of California early in this administration, but to date not acted on by the administration.

The junior Senator from Nevada is happy that his party, the Republican Party, and its organization in Nevada, concur so warmly with the resolution adopted by the California Legislature,

and have renewed the appeal to the administration expressed in the earlier California resolution.

California and Nevada are neighbors, and, I may say, good neighbors. Our 2 States have the longest contiguous border of any 2 States in the Nation. We see eye to eye on many of the pressing problems that confront the West as well as other sections of the country, and we see eye to eye on policies looking toward restoring foreign trade to a basis of fair and reasonable competition with American workers and investors.

Mr. President, the Legislature of California petitions the Congress of the United States to return to its traditional method of fixing tariffs based on principles of protection of American agriculture, industry, and commerce.

OUTLAW DISASTROUS TRADE AGREEMENTS

It wants the iniquitous Trade Agreements Act of 1934 which has done so much harm to the Nation and particularly to the West expunged from the statute books.

Mr. President, the Republican Party in Nevada, representing as it does fine Americans in all walks of life, wants the New Deal proforeign trade-away act of 1934 to die on June 12 of this year, its expiration date.

Republicans in Nevada want restored the constitutional responsibility of Congress to regulate foreign trade, the American policy and the historic policy, the traditional Republican policy on foreign trade.

With a Republican administration in power, Mr. President, this change to the American way is far overdue.

Other changes from the system inaugurated by the Democratic Party are also long overdue, and the delegates to the Nevada State Republican Convention dealt with them, too.

They declared by unanimous resolution, for example, "that the policies of the Government of the United States have for a period of years prior to 1953 discriminated against the mining industry of the State of Nevada."

That, of course, is very true. It is true today and doubtless will be true so long as the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 remains in effect and a foreign-minded State Department in administering this act favors foreign mining, mine production, and mine development, to the injury and destruction of the American mining industry.

In addition to asking that the disastrous and destructive Trade Agreements Act of 1934 die on its scheduled execution date, the Nevada Republican Convention called on the Government of the United States to lend its sincere attention to aid the mining industry of Nevada and the Western States.

UNITED STATES MINING DISCRIMINATED AGAINST

In a further resolution the Nevada State Republican Convention urged an expanded stockpiling program giving full preference to domestic producers.

Mr. President, for 20 years it has been the official policy of the Government to discriminate against the American mining industry and to treat it as expendable in deals with foreign nations.

Foreign mines and mineral development and foreign metal production have been encouraged. Domestic mining and metals production have been and are being discouraged, and some industries and enterprises have been destroyed.

State Department diplomats, with no knowledge of minerals or mining, have for 20 years put the American mining industry on a disparity with foreign producers, with other segments of America's economy, and with respect to purchases for our strategic stockpile.

They have disregarded or evaded the Buy American Act and superseded it with their own never legalized policy of "buy foreign."

To cite one example, it has been only since last December that these proforeign statesmen have stopped encouraging the payment of 36½ cents a pound for Chilean copper—6½ cents above the world price and more than America's copper industry was receiving for American copper, produced by Americans in American copper mines.

Nevada Republicans do not appreciate queer deals like that, and they expect a Republican administration to eliminate the proforeign mining and metals policy of the New Deal and substitute for it the time-honored Republican policy of "buy American."

Nevada Republicans are concerned also about the proforeign policies in the case of lead and zinc.

Mr. President, in a recent statement to the press I called attention to the fact that zinc production in Nevada last year slumped 62 percent, or to only 5,900 tons of metal in our once thriving zinc industry.

While this drop in Nevada production was occurring, zinc imports from foreign mines doubled to 230,000 tons.

MINERS VICTIMS OF FOREIGN DUMPING

The junior Senator from Nevada stated then, and he repeats now, that we have conclusive evidence that the greater part of the imports of zinc during 1953 came from stocks which had been accumulated in foreign countries during the period when price ceilings had been fixed as a result of our defense program.

The lead and zinc industry in Nevada and throughout the United States is, in fact, the victim of foreign dumping.

The Legislature of the State of Idaho, at its last session, held during this administration, adopted Senate Joint Memorial No. 7, protesting foreign dumping and policies destructive to the American mining industry. The resolution, addressed to the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior, and others, reads as follows:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, in legislative session, duly and regularly assembled, most respectfully present the following preamble and resolution, to wit:

"Whereas the base mining industry of the United States has suffered serious curtailment, and is threatened with further curtailment, through dumping of lead and zinc from low-wage foreign countries creating an unemployment situation for a large number of the American metal miners; and

"Whereas the domestic lead and zinc miner has suffered from the effects of currency

devaluation and the monopolistic practices of foreign governments in the purchase and sale of metals; and

"Whereas Idaho as well as many other sections of the United States, is in a large measure dependent upon the new wealth created by the mining and processing of these metals for the maintenance of its economy and for the purchasing of commodities needed by Idaho but not produced in Idaho; and

"Whereas unemployment and loss of production caused by dumping from low-wage countries is depriving local, county, and State governments of much needed tax income; and

"Whereas the American taxpayer has been called upon to finance the expansion of foreign production of metals and minerals in competition with home production to the detriment of the development of reserves vitally needed in this country for national security; and

"Whereas propaganda from Washington during recent years has endeavored, without foundation, to place this country in a have-not class, to the end that tariffs on basic commodities, including metals, should be abandoned: Now, therefore, be it jointly

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the 32d session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho (the Governor of the State of Idaho concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized to approve legislation for the stabilizing of the market for metals at prices consistent with the prevailing domestic economic level through the enactment of constructive legislation providing for a sliding scale stabilization import tax. This legislation will promote the development of our natural resources and protect our domestic economy in the interest of national security; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho, be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to send copies of this joint memorial to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson; Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; Howard I. Young, Deputy Administrator, Defense Materials Procurement Agency; J. D. Small, Chairman, Munitions Board; Hon. Henry C. Dworshak, United States Senate; Hon. Herman Welker, United States Senate; Hon. Hamer H. Budge and Hon. Gracie Pfost, United States House of Representatives; Hon. Richard M. Nixon, Vice President of the United States; Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Speaker of the House; Hon. George W. Malone, chairman, Senate Mines Committee, and Hon. A. L. Miller, chairman of House Internal and Insular Affairs Committee."

This senate joint memorial passed the senate on the 21st day of February 1953.

EDSON H. DEAL,
President of the Senate.

HAVE-NOT PROPAGANDA DENOUNCED

Mr. President, I would be remiss if I did not include the splendid resolution adopted during this administration by the legislature of my own State of Nevada, which properly denounces the persistent propaganda from Washington that ours is a have-not nation, and which calls on the administration to promote and protect the natural resources of America.

The resolution, in which I concur completely, reads as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 12

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve legislation designed to provide a stabilized market for the products of domestic mines

Whereas the base metal mining industry of the United States has suffered serious curtailment, and is threatened with further

curtailment, through dumping of lead and zinc from low-wage foreign countries; and

Whereas the domestic lead and zinc miner has suffered from the effects of currency devaluation and the monopolistic practices of foreign governments in the purchase and sale of metals; and

Whereas Nevada, as well as many other sections of the United States, is in a large measure dependent upon the new wealth created by the mining and processing of these metals for the maintenance of its economy and for the purchasing of commodities needed by Nevada but not produced in Nevada; and

Whereas unemployment and loss of production caused by dumping from low-wage countries is depriving local, county, and State governments of much-needed tax income; and

Whereas the American taxpayer has been called upon to finance the expansion of foreign production of metals and minerals in competition with home production to the detriment of the development of reserves vitally needed in this country for national security; and

Whereas propaganda from Washington during recent years has endeavored, without foundation, to place this country in a haven class, to the end that tariffs on basic commodities, including metals, should be abandoned: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to approve legislation for the stabilizing of the market for metals at prices consistent with the prevailing domestic economic level through the enactment of constructive legislation providing for a sliding scale stabilization import tax. This legislation will promote the development of our natural resources and protect our domestic economy in the interest of national security; be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to each member of the Nevada congressional delegation, to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

OPPOSE TRADE ACT EXTENSION

Mr. President, I also wish to include in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, the following resolution proposed during this administration by the Advisory Mining Board of the State of Nevada:

Whereas the mining industry in Nevada has in the past, and is now suffering because of low prices on their minerals which has been brought about by the importation of minerals produced in foreign countries, who have low wages and standards of living; and

Whereas there is now an active campaign sponsored by certain foreign countries and American citizens who consume these minerals, under the slogan "trade, not aid" to convince Congress that we should continue to give foreign aid in the form of free trade rather than direct aid even though our mines close; and

Whereas the means of accomplishing this is through a continuation of so-called reciprocal trade agreements, which past experience has shown to be the cause of unemployment in the mining industry; and

Whereas the political party in power in Nevada has pledged itself to protect American labor and industry from unfair foreign competition by establishing the principle of flexible import fees: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we are opposed to any extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and ask that Congress again assume the responsibility of protecting the American workman and investor against unfair competition from abroad. We do favor the es-

tablishment in this country of a market for goods of foreign nations on the basis of fair and reasonable competition which will protect workers and investors against foreign low wages and low standards of living, and maintain a healthy domestic mining industry. Equalization of the difference between wages and standards of living here and abroad can best be accomplished by the adoption, by Congress, of the flexible import free principle; be it further

Resolved, That the above resolution is a recommendation to Gov. Charles H. Russell, of Nevada, and we ask that he forward a copy of this resolution to Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Senator PATRICK MCCARRAN, and Congressman CLIFTON YOUNG.

CHARLES H. RUSSELL,
Governor.

ROY A. HARDY,
Chairman, Advisory Mining Board.

LOUIS D. CORDON,
Secretary, Nevada Mining Association.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada brings these resolutions to the attention of the Senate with the full hope and expectation that the administration will, during this session of the Congress, give favorable consideration to them.

During the 1952 presidential campaign, it will be recalled, great emphasis was placed on encouragement of American enterprise and cooperation between Federal and State Governments and the Federal Government and other political units.

Furthermore, Mr. President, if the junior Senator from Nevada understood the campaign, one of the aims was to return to responsible government. I should like to point out that in 1934 the Congress of the United States transferred to the Executive its constitutional duty to regulate foreign trade and to adjust excises and fees on imports. In practice such power often has turned out to be in the hands of the Secretary of State.

I wish to call attention also to the fact that the problem is not solely a Western State problem; it is a problem of the textile industry in the New England States, where the present presiding officer of the Senate [Mr. PURCELL] lives, and it is a problem of the Southern and Middle States.

I recall that Governor Kennon, of Louisiana, testified before the Subcommittee on Minerals, Metals, and Fuels, which conducted hearings under Senate Resolution 143 to determine the availability of critical materials to the United States in time of war, and also to investigate into the Nation's expanding economy and security.

Governor Kennon said in part that he believed we should of course import whatever was necessary; but he said, regarding the subject of importing petroleum from the Middle East, an area from which it has been established by the committee that no oil could be imported during world war No. 4, or whatever number it may be accorded in history, that we must have available to us in the Western Hemisphere, and primarily in the United States and adjacent countries, sufficient fuel to enable us to fight in time of war and to live in time of peace.

Governor Kennon said that we pay the present high taxes and high wages to support a great market, the greatest

market the world has ever seen; and then companies and individuals operating in foreign countries, where low wages and low taxes are in effect, send their products into our country and take a part of the American market. He said it was obvious to everyone that if all the materials we needed were suddenly imported and manufactured into finished products, our economy would fall tomorrow; but by having imported materials come into our country a little at a time, something would be paid into the United States Treasury which would in whole or in part make up the difference between wages and taxes in effect in foreign countries where such companies operate, and those in effect in this country.

Governor Kennon finally said he did not believe a quota system would be proper, or that subsidies should be paid. We would have to call whatever was imposed a duty, as the Constitution refers to it, or a tariff, as it is customarily called now. Such a charge should be levied in order to make up the difference between the wages and taxes in effect in this country and those in effect in countries where our chief competition is located. In my opinion, his statement covered the subject in the best way anyone has handled it before the committee.

The professions on the part of Republican candidates gave hope and encouragement to the electorate, and contributed in no small degree, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada, to the happy results of the election.

There were no pledges, to my knowledge, of cooperation with individuals who embrace the philosophies of free trade and one economic world, or of adherence to their global theories, in marked disparity with the expressed wishes of legislative bodies of the various States.

As I stated before, the emphasis was all on closer working relationships with State and other governmental bodies in the interest of relaxing centralized controls and the encouragement of free enterprise.

Today, as under the New Deal and the Fair Deal, the State Department exercises life-or-death control over American industries and resource development through concessions to foreign nations and foreign-trade manipulations.

In no instance, within the knowledge of the junior Senator from Nevada, has the State Department, since the enactment of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, ever officially weighed or acted favorably upon a resolution adopted by the legislature of a State pertaining to protection of American commodities against sweatshop foreign competition.

If the State Department, in its queer dealings and negotiations at Anney, France; Torquay, England; Geneva, Switzerland, or other far-off places where it makes its trade agreements, has ever favored an American industry over a foreign industry wishing to invade or capture the American market, it has escaped my notice. Certainly there has been no such instance in connection with the mining industry, and I have followed that very closely.

It is the belief of the junior Senator from Nevada that the administration will honor its campaign assurances of closer Federal-State relationships and cooperation between the Federal Government and other governmental units. When it does this, the legislative enactments of the sovereign States will have greater weight, and I trust greater weight than the advice and counsels of self-interest freetraders or the fanatical advocates of one economic world.

Dumping policies, encouraged by these global theorists, will be halted and our domestic industries, so vital to our security, will revive.

RESOURCE INDUSTRIES VICTIMS OF DUMPING

The mining industry of the United States as a whole, the wool industry, the oil industry, the coal industry, and scores of other industries are today victims of foreign dumpings encouraged by the proforeign Trade Agreements Act of 1934.

The Republican Party in Nevada and, I am sure, the overwhelming majority of the people of Nevada and of other western States want this act, which has done and is doing irreparable harm to workingmen and investors, to expire.

They want the Republican Party to be Republican.

Mr. President, the Republican Party has performed and is performing like a Republican Party in many fields. Eleven of these fields are listed in resolution No. 1, adopted at the Republican State convention held early this month in Las Vegas, Nev. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

RESOLUTION 1—COMMENDATION OF NATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

Whereas the national administration under the leadership of President Dwight D. Eisenhower has accomplished among other things, the following: (a) The truce in Korea; (b) the elimination of many poor security risks in Government; (c) the reverse of the trend toward limitless expansion of Government; (d) the reduction of taxes wherever possible; (e) the determined policy of dealing with foreign powers and the secession of the policy of containment of the former Democratic administration; (f) the return of responsibility and authority to State and local governments; (g) the removal of price and wage controls, allowing for a competitive system of private enterprise; (h) adjustment in the social-security laws to the benefit of people generally; (i) a general reduction of foreign monetary aid; (j) enactment of a beneficial and practical agricultural program leading to the encouragement of self-reliance of the industry; (k) speedy action in the administration of the drought relief program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the national Republican administration be commended for its accomplishments and for its firm dedication in its new course of action providing for the prosperity and well-being of the American people.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, equal commendation will be given, I am sure, when the Republican administration and the Republican Congress, in which I am proud to serve, adopt the Republican policy of fair treatment to all in-

dustries in the United States, their workmen and investors, halts the bartering away of our wealth and resources, to the advantage of foreign nations, and returns to what I call the American system.

BRICKER AMENDMENT URGED

The Republican Party of Nevada met in a State convention which was called for the purpose of the protection of America and Americans, not only with relation to industry and trade, but also with respect to our constitutional rights. The Republican delegates at Las Vegas adopted unanimously the following resolution:

BRICKER AMENDMENT

Whereas a question has arisen that a law enacted in conformance with the treaty-making powers of the United States Government could violate the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas in order to protect the people of the United States from the loss of their constitutional rights, Senator JOHN W. BRICKER and 62 of his colleagues in the United States Senate have introduced a proposed constitutional amendment restricting treaties and executive agreements from violating the Constitution of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States adopt proper legislation incorporating the intent and purpose of the Bricker amendment.

Mr. President, I think the delegates to that convention will be happy to know that although the Bricker amendment lost by one vote in the Senate of the United States, a motion has now been made to recall it to the floor of the Senate.

NEVADA RESOLUTIONS

The Republican State convention held this month at Las Vegas adopted resolutions which the junior Senator from Nevada is sure deserve the attention of this body and the administration.

I ask unanimous consent to have these resolutions incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

GOLD STANDARD

Whereas the operators of gold-producing mines within the State of Nevada have been adversely affected for a number of years by the policy of the Government of the United States setting a ceiling on the price of gold; and

Whereas the monetary system of the United States is not now backed by gold: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Government of the United States restore the gold standard, and remove restrictions on the purchase, sale, or ownership of gold, and provide for full interchangeability of gold and the dollar at a fixed ratio.

COMMENDATION OF NEVADA STATE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION

Whereas the State of Nevada, under the leadership of Gov. Charles Russell, has grown and prospered; and

Whereas the financially sound program being followed has resulted in the accumulation of the largest surplus in our State treasury in all of our State's history; and

Whereas the people of Nevada are enjoying leadership committed to the best interests of the State of Nevada in its entirety, and not to the special benefit of the few: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this convention commend heartily the present Republican administration of the State of Nevada.

REMOVE GOVERNMENT FROM PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Whereas the Government of the United States has, until the election of the present Republican administration, followed a program of engaging in several phases of business and industry to the detriment of State and Federal tax structures and leading toward socialistic practices: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Federal Government remove itself from those pursuits which are the province of private enterprise.

FOUR-LANE HIGHWAY OVER DONNER SUMMIT

Whereas it is to the best interests and safety of the people of the United States that United States Highway 40, over Donner Summit, be widened to four lanes; and

Whereas the widening of said highway would materially aid the economy of the State of Nevada: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That proper legislation be enacted to ultimately provide a four-lane highway on United States Highway 40 through the critical Donner Summit area.

THE AMERICAN INDIAN

Whereas the American Indian has long been denied his rightful privileges in keeping with his American citizenship; and Whereas the United States Indian Bureau employs more people than the group it seeks to administer; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Indian be placed on a plane of responsibility, with privileges in keeping with his American citizenship, and that the powers of the United States Indian Bureau be reduced until said Bureau is completely abolished.

REPRESENTATIVE YOUNG PRAISED—COMMENDATION OF NEVADA'S REPUBLICAN REPRESENTATION IN WASHINGTON

Whereas Senator GEORGE W. MALONE and Congressman CLIFTON YOUNG have demonstrated their unswerving devotion to the best interests of our Nation and the State of Nevada by vigorously fighting for their beliefs and by constant attention to detail, have exemplified the finest Republican tradition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this convention go on record as commending our outstanding Representatives now serving our State.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the commendation of my colleague in the House of Representatives, the Honorable CLIFTON YOUNG, is most deserved. He has, as the resolution states, given devoted service both to the State of Nevada and to the Nation.

Of course, I am grateful for the kind references to me in the resolution, and I shall always seek to merit them.

The junior Senator from Nevada will always fight vigorously for his beliefs, which are, he might add, uncompromisingly Republican. He will work for Republican principles, confident that Republican principles are, as they have been throughout the 100 years of Republican history, in the best interests of the people, the 48 sovereign States, and our sovereign Nation.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had

agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2326) to amend the Act of August 3, 1950, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions thereof relating to the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

SUBVERSIVES CROSSING THE MEXICAN BORDER

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on yesterday the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] made the charge that approximately 100 subversives were daily crossing the Mexican border into the United States; and in support of this he cited a statement given before a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, which did appear to say that at one time 100 members or former members of the Communist Party had daily crossed the border at El Paso, Tex.

Mr. President, I have been informed by the Commissioner of Immigration that the Senator from New York has not correctly interpreted the statement, and that no subversives are now crossing the Mexican border into the United States, within their knowledge. The Commissioner is preparing a statement which will clear up any incorrect impression left by the testimony cited yesterday by the Senator from New York.

On Monday, I shall present to the Senate the letter and statement from the Commissioner of Immigration; but, Mr. President, I am glad to say at this time that I have been assured that it will be clear that the statement made yesterday by the Senator from New York—namely, that 100 subversives are now coming, each day, into this country, from Mexico—is incorrect.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate take a recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, March 8, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 4 (legislative day of March 1), 1954:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

J. Ernest Wilkins, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor, vice Spencer Miller, Jr.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Ray H. Schoonover, of Wisconsin, to be United States marshal for the western district of Wisconsin, vice John M. Comeford, resigned.

UNITED STATES COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Robert F. A. Studds to be Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for a term of 4 years, effective May 12, 1954.

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be commissioned captain

Walter H. Bainbridge
Carl I. Aslakson
Paul A. Smith

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of major general subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Karl S. Day

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

John D. Macklin
Bertrand T. Fay

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 4, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Thou who art the beneficent and supreme ruler of the universe and the guiding intelligence in the life of men and nations, we rejoice that here in our beloved country Thou hast ordained and established sovereignty by the free will of the people.

Grant that our citizens may always have a lofty conception of the Presidency, rendering unto him who occupies this exalted position that respect, reverence, honor, and encouragement to which his sacred office entitles him.

May all the Members of the Congress, who are joined with the President in the exercise of government, rule in the fear of God and be given that favor and influence with the people they represent, which come from doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with the Lord.

Wilt Thou hear and answer our petitions as we daily pray for our fellow Members who are absent from this Chamber by reason of illness and who need Thy healing ministry.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 355. Joint resolution amending the act approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461-1468), as amended, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following

title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2714. An act to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation.

SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of the Public Works Committee may meet this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION IS BECOMING SERIOUS

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, if anyone still entertains any doubts that we are in the throes of a serious economic situation, I invite him to visit my congressional district. As I go through the district, as I talk to the people, as I observe the increasing rolls of the unemployed, I cannot help but feel uneasy about the future.

Former President Herbert Hoover, who considers himself an expert on economic depressions, recently assured the Nation it can have high confidence that it is not headed into another great depression such as the one of the early 1930's. He referred to the present situation as only a passing dip. When such assurances come from the man whose very name is associated with the "Hoover depression," and whose words still have that familiar ring of prosperity is just around the corner, then it is high time for us to consider this situation a little more seriously.

Mr. Speaker, about a month ago—on February 4, 1954—I called to the attention of this House the unemployment situation in my congressional district. I cited facts and figures about layoffs in the Brooklyn Navy Yard in my district. I told of the closing down of the Naval Clothing Factory and the transfer of the Naval Supply Facilities from Brooklyn to a depot elsewhere. I stressed how the unemployment situation resulting therefrom is having a serious economic strain on the economy of our community. In my appeal for "prompt and forceful action" by the administration, I said:

While the administration is still sitting back taking no measures to deal with this snowballing unemployment situation, the problem is assuming serious dimensions in our local communities. In my district, the effects of the situation are becoming more noticeable with each passing day. Not only is the growing unemployment affecting the workers and their families directly involved, but also those who live in constant fear of an approaching layoff, and it is also having a telling effect on the storekeeper, the small-business man, and the manufacturer whose

volume of business is shrinking. In short, the whole community suffers because of this most infectious disease.

Mr. Speaker, I ask again: What is the administration doing about these people? Does it have any plans to cope with the situation? What steps is it taking to prevent a breakdown of our economic foundations? I am still waiting for a reply to these questions.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that those of us who call attention to this situation and warn of the coming dangers are derided and scorned. "They are trying to talk the country into a depression," charged one administration spokesman. "Folks who are out of jobs these days and who think business is not good are just a bunch of eggheads," said another. This is the way the administration is fighting the current economic recession.

But while they talk of eggheads and dips and seasonal readjustment, unemployment keeps growing and the number of claimants for unemployment compensation increases every week. According to information just released by the United States Department of Labor, more persons claimed unemployment compensation benefit in mid-February of this year than at any time since February 1950. By the middle of February 1954 unemployment insurance claims totaled 2,179,000, or about double the figure of a year ago at this time. The total of such claims for the week ending February 13 was greater by 58,500 over the preceding week, according to the Labor Department.

I am citing these official figures on unemployment compensation because these figures cannot be questioned. Unfortunately, where it concerns statistics dealing with unemployment there are many who question the veracity of these figures given out periodically by the Government. It is claimed that the unemployment statistics are either inaccurate or are several months behind. Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, recently observed on the Senate floor:

There is no question about the fact that unemployment has increased to a serious degree. In fact, if we had accurate figures, which I am satisfied we do not have—because the administration cannot even agree on the base which it should use for measuring unemployment—I think they would show the number of unemployed persons in the United States today to be nearer 4 million than 3 million.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot sit back and simply wait, as has been suggested, for an upturn in the spring or summer. What if the upturn never materializes? What if the situation gets out of hand by then? This course is as dangerous as it is unrealistic.

We cannot turn our heads away from the facts and hope that somehow the annoying unemployment problem will miraculously disappear, when headlines across the Nation continue to paint a grim picture of mounting joblessness in New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Oregon, Washington, California, and other States. It indicates a clear and steady drift toward economic depression.

Now is the time to come forward with an effective Government program to deal with this problem before the drift swells into a deluge and inundates the entire Nation. Such program should include steps to strengthen the unemployment-insurance system, broaden the social-security system, increase the minimum wage, extend tax reduction to the low-income people and the great mass of consumers instead of big business, undertake a huge housing program designed for low- and middle-income families, as well as a large-scale program of public works, new schools, good roads, and similar projects from which the people would benefit.

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of a program that was initiated by men of vision and faith two decades ago under the inspiring leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt. It helped then, it will help now. Let us learn from past experience.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day fixed for the call of the Private Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

ALBERT VINCENT, SR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6033) for the relief of Albert Vincent, Sr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Albert Vincent, Sr., route 1, box 337, St. Martinville, La., the sum of \$336, in full settlement of all claims of said Albert Vincent, Sr., against the United States for regular subsistence pay for the period September 26, 1949, through January 17, 1950, in the adult academic education program through the Iberia Parish School Board in Louisiana: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILHELM ENGELBERT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 153) for the relief of Wilhelm Engelbert.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Wilhelm Engelbert shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FELIX S. SCHORR AND WIFE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 303) for the relief of Felix S. Schorr and his wife, Lilly Elizabeth Schorr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Felix S. Schorr and his wife, Lilly Elizabeth Schorr, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PETER PENOVIC ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1432) for the relief of Peter Penovic, Milos Grachovac, and Nikola Maljkovic.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MICHELE PACCIONE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 666) for the relief of Michele Paccione.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Michele Paccione, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Dominic J. Savino, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KIM MI HAE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 858) for the relief of Kim Mi Hae.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Kim Mi Hae, the Korean fiancée of Walter C. Brown, a citizen of the United States and a veteran of World War II presently serving in the United States Air Force, and that the said Kim Mi Hae shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Kim Mi Hae is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Walter C. Brown, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Kim Mi Hae, she shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be

deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C. title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Kim Mi Hae, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Kim Mi Hae as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee and head tax:

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kim Mi Hae, the fiance of Walter C. Brown, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Kim Mi Hae is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Walter C. Brown and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Kim Mi Hae, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Kim Mi Hae, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Kim Mi Hae as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PETER A. PIROGOV

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1100) for the relief of Peter A. Pirogov.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Peter A. Pirogov shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. In the administration of that act, the said Peter A. Pirogov shall not be regarded as having been at any time prior to the enactment of this act a person within the provisions of section 212 (a) (28) (c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 163).

SEC. 2. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

On line 6, strike out the words "the date of the enactment of this act" and substitute in lieu thereof "February 4, 1949."

On line 10, strike out "(c)" and substitute in lieu thereof "(C)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I am sincerely pleased that the House has seen fit to grant its unanimous consent to the passage of H. R. 1100, a private bill which I introduced, at the request of a representative of one of the executive agencies of our Government, for the relief of Peter A. Pirogov.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall the newspaper headlines of October 20, 1948, which informed us that 2 Soviet officers had fled to American controlled Austria, landing their twin-engine Soviet bomber at a United States Army base near Linz, Austria, on October 9, 1948. This was the first instance where Soviet airmen had had the courage to flee the oppression of their native land to seek freedom elsewhere. The two airmen credited the Voice of America broadcasts as the final inspiration in their determination to escape Russian despotism.

Mr. Pirogov stated at a press interview held at the time of his escape that his personal ideas and ideology were not in agreement with the Communist ideology. He said:

I feel that the Government should answer the needs and desires of the people. * * * I feel that the Soviet Union does not meet the needs and desires of the people.

Mr. Pirogov told the press that he was desirous of obtaining asylum in this country because he believed in freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom to work and to live.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Pirogov has been in this country since February 4, 1949. Since that time, he has given valuable assistance to various agencies of our Government. Since his arrival here he has met and married a very charming young lady, who like himself is a Russian refugee. Approximately a year and a half ago she presented him with twin daughters, born in our land of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Pirogov's statements to the press upon his escape speak for themselves. His conduct since coming to this country has been exemplary. This augurs well for the future. I am confident that he will continue to be an asset to our way of life.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the membership of the House joins with me in extending to Mr. Pirogov and his family a continued happy and successful life in these United States.

PRAMOVIL VACLAV MALY AND JARMILA MALY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3145) for the relief of Pramovil Vaclav Maly and Jarmila Maly.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the aliens Pramovil Vaclav Maly and Jar-

mila Maly shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011, 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1953).

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 8, strike out the words "and head taxes."

On page 1, line 4, strike out "Pramovil" and substitute the name "Pravomil."

On pages 1 and 2, beginning on page 1, line 11, after the words "to deduct two numbers", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the following: "from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Pravomil Vaclav Maly and Jarmila Maly."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PETRA FUMIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3836) for the relief of Petra Fumia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Petra Fumia, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Angelo Ruta, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MADELEINE ALICE AQUARONE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7559) for the relief of Mrs. Madeleine Alice Aquarone.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and nationality laws, section 352 (a) (2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U. S. C. 1484 (a) (2)) shall not apply to Mrs. Madeleine Alice Aquarone, a citizen of the United States, for such time as the employment of her husband, Stanislas Aquarone, by the International Court of Justice at The Hague, The Netherlands, is the reason for her continued residence abroad: *Provided*, That Mrs. Aquarone begins to reside permanently in the United States prior to the expiration of 1 year after the termination of such employment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MATTHEW J. BERCKMAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 827) for the relief of Matthew J. Berckman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Matthew J. Berckman, of Jersey City, N. J., the sum of \$16,119.76, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for furnishing information which led to the discovery, and forfeiture to the United States, of gold bullion, valued at \$171,197.80, about to be shipped unlawfully out of the United States: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES T. DOUDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2634) for the relief of Charles T. Douds.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles T. Douds, Englewood, N. J., the sum of \$12,229.66. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Charles T. Douds against the United States for losses in compensation he sustained, and expenses he incurred, as the result of his removal and separation without pay from his position as regional director, region 2, National Labor Relations Board, effective February 20, 1945. On February 27, 1947, he was restored to his position, after the United States Civil Service Commission, upon appeal from the Board's removal action, had concluded that the evidence on record did not justify his removal and recommended his restoration. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the sum and insert "\$10,777.06."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE JAPHET

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2636) for the relief of George Japhet.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George Japhet, of New York, N. Y., the sum of \$1,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said George Japhet against the United States for reimbursement of collateral furnished upon a surety bond of the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland to the United States given upon the admission of Gabriella Japhet to the United States for medical treatment, which bond was subsequently forfeited: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARTIN G. SCOTT AND HANNA VON GUSMANN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2666) for the relief of Martin G. Scott and Hanna von Gusmann.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Martin G. Scott the sum of \$354.50; and to Hanna von Gusmann the sum of \$776. Such sums are designated in full satisfaction of such employees' claims against the United States for compensation for reasonable and necessary personal property lost while in the course of their duties as a result of war and conditions resulting from war, which claims have been considered and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury upon the recommendations of a Treasury Claim Board: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT F. SUCZEK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4699) for the relief of Robert F. Sucek.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Robert F. Sucek, of 3301 Betty Lane, Lafayette, Calif., be, and he is hereby, relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of \$333.20. Such sum represents overpayment in subsistence allowance made to said Robert F.

Sucek, through an error on the part of the Veterans' Administration.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. COL. RICHARD ORME FLINN, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4735) for the relief of Lt. Col. Richard Orme Flinn, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to relieve Lt. Col. Richard Orme Flinn, Jr., Chaplain Corps, United States Army Reserve, serial No. O-260011, of all liability to refund the sum of \$5,440.80. Such sum represents overpayment of increased rental and subsistence allowances on the account of a dependent child (his ward, Thomas Jack Wheeler) for the period of March 26, 1942, through February 18, 1946.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COL. HENRY M. DENNING ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4996) for the relief of Col. Henry M. Denning, and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That relief is hereby granted the various disbursing officers of the United States or claimants hereinafter mentioned in amounts shown herein, said amounts representing amounts of erroneous payments made by said disbursing officers of public funds for which said officers are accountable or amounts due said claimants as listed in and under the circumstances described in identical letters of the Secretary of the Army to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate.

SEC. 2. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of the following officers and employees of the Army of the United States the amounts set opposite their names: Col. Henry M. Denning, Finance Corps (now retired), \$133.77; Col. C. K. McAllister, Finance Corps, \$39.79; Col. Frank Richards, Finance Corps (now retired), \$34.69; Col. H. R. Cole, Corps of Engineers, \$18.72, the said amounts representing erroneous payments of public funds for which these persons are accountable, resulting from minor errors in determining amounts of pay and allowances due former members of the Civilian Conservation Corps, former officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Army or contractors from whom collection of the overpayments cannot be effected, and which amounts have been disallowed by the Comptroller General of the United States.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Maj. Paul M. Birkeland, Artillery, \$500; 1st Lt. Maurice A. Berg, Air Force, \$108; 2d Lt. Charles Nuckols, Jr., class A agent officer for Lt. Col. Julius S. Eberstein, Finance Corp., \$48.75; 1st Lt. Austin E. Pritchard, Air Force, \$121; 1st Lt. Irwin D. Bingham, Air Force, \$330; 1st Lt. Charles F. Schwep, Signal Corps, \$276; 1st Lt. Henry Fontenot, Ordnance Corps, \$100; Capt. B. D. Grossman, Finance Corps, \$50; 1st Lt. Harold B. Cockrell, Infantry, class A

agent officer for Maj. W. F. Menegus, Finance Corps, #436; W. O. (Jg.) Gregory W. Corken, class B agent officer for Maj. E. A. Ganschow, Finance Corps, #30.26; Capt. Francis S. Chasm, Infantry, #181.36; in full satisfaction of the claim of each such claimant against the United States for a like amount.

Sec. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the PG Publishing Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., #218.40; Cleveland Plain Dealer, Cleveland, Ohio, #206.38; the Indianapolis Star, Indianapolis, Ind., #260.04; the Dispatch Printing Co., Columbus, Ohio, #188.16; the Cincinnati Enquirer, Cincinnati, Ohio, #321.30; Times-Herald, Washington, D. C., #60.90; the Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times Co., Louisville, Ky., #78.75; the Madison Courier, Madison, Ind., #4.50; the Marion Star, Marion, Ohio, #11.76; the Toledo Blade Co., Toledo, Ohio, #50.40; the Columbus Dispatch, Columbus, Ohio, #47.88; the Tribune Co., Chicago, Ill., #138.60; Tribune-Star Publishing Co., Inc., Terre Haute, Ind., #15.12; the New York Sun, Inc., New York, #99.63; the LaPorte Printing Co., LaPorte, Ind., #24.32; the Chicago Daily News, Inc., Chicago, Ill., #69.30; the News-Journal Co., Wilmington, Del., #16.80; the Philadelphia Record Co., Philadelphia, Pa., #63; Indianapolis News Publishing Co., Indianapolis, Ind., #52.48; the New York Times Co., New York, #138.60; Richwood Publishing Co., Richwood, W. Va., #8; Elkins Inter-Mountain Co., Inc., Elkins, W. Va., #8.82; West Virginia Newspaper Publishing Co., Morgantown, W. Va., #16.80; the Athenaeum, Morgantown, W. Va., #6.60; Clarksburg Publishing Co., Clarksburg, W. Va., #12.50; Grant County Press, Petersburg, W. Va., #9.98; Mineral Daily News-Tribune, Kayser, W. Va., #12.60; Advocate Messenger Co., Danville, Ky., #2.40; New York Journal American, New York, N. Y., #45.40; the Newspaper Advertising Service, Madison, Wis., #25.20; the Journal Co., Milwaukee, Wis., #46.20; the Shopper's Guide, J. Schilling and J. Holton, publishers, Baraboo, Wis., #4.95; the Sauk County News, Prairie DuSac, Wis., #5; and the Albert Hand Co., Cape May, N. J., #16.30, which amounts are due the several publishing companies mentioned above for advertising ordered and published for and in the interest of the United States without the prior approval of the Secretary of War as required by Revised Statutes 3828 (44 U. S. C. 324): *Provided*, That no person shall be held pecuniarily liable for any amount on account of the above-mentioned payments.

Sec. 5. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the township of Montgomery, Harlingen, N. J., #199.31, and the township of Hillsborough, Neshanic, N. J., #136.44, which amounts are due to the townships mentioned above for cost and legal fees incurred in the enactment of local ordinances which were enacted at the behest of the military authorities at the Belle Mead Army Service Forces Depot, Somerville, N. J., for reasons of military security: *Provided*, That no persons shall be held pecuniarily liable for any amount on account of the above-mentioned payments.

Sec. 6. That any amounts refunded by any disbursing officers or his heirs in connection with any item of indebtedness in accounts cleared herein and/or any amount otherwise due any disbursing officer or his heirs which was set off against any item of indebtedness in the accounts which are cleared herein, shall be refunded to said disbursing officer or his heirs: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts authorized herein to be credited in the accounts of the disbursing officer shall be charged against any individual other than the various payees.

Sec. 7. That in all cases where disbursing officers' accounts are cleared or relieved under the authority of this or any other act,

such clearance or relief shall be considered and construed as precluding the recovery of any interest charged from said disbursing officer arising from any items so cleared or relieved, whether such interest charges are in connection with judicial proceedings or otherwise.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRY C. BUSH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5765) for the relief of Henry C. Bush and other Foreign Service officers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each of the following officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States the sum designated in full satisfaction of such officer's or employee's claim against the United States for compensation for reasonable and necessary personal property lost while in the course of his duties as a result of war and conditions resulting from war:

Henry C. Bush, \$6,000; Anna Charlton, \$2,656.50; Thomas J. Cory, #85; Edna B. Crilley, #204.50; Robert B. Dreessen, #631; Hubert F. Ferrell, \$1,000; Helene E. Fischer, \$1,000; Christine M. Hardy, #462.50; Clive E. Knowlson, #851; Edwin W. Martin, #2,506.15; Donald B. McCue, \$1,300.98; Evelyn B. Mitchell, #222.50; Josef L. Norris, #141.50; Vincoe M. Paxton, #1,010.50; Bertrand L. Pinsonnault, #73.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 8, after "#73" insert a colon and the following: "George H. Earle, III, #12,830: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF JAMES FRANCIS NICHOLSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6020) for the relief of the estate of James Francis Nicholson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of James Francis Nicholson, the sum of \$2,274, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the amount of the check No. 12,331,785, dated May 10, 1951, which was made payable to James Francis Nicholson on account of war claim due but which, because of his absence from home, was not received by him before his death and was re-

turned to the Treasury for cancellation: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLUMBIA HOSPITAL OF RICHLAND COUNTY, S. C.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6477) for the relief of the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C., the sum of \$18,322.92. Such sum represents reimbursement for the reasonable and necessary expenses incurred by such hospital in providing care and treatment during the period beginning September 18, 1942, and ending October 18, 1952, to one Halsford V. Sharpe, a former prisoner of the United States who is permanently and totally disabled as a result of an injury sustained by him in the course of his arrest on March 7, 1942, by agents of the Alcohol Tax Unit, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Department of the Treasury, and who was placed in such hospital by such agents on such date. The United States, through the Department of Justice, paid all expenses for such care and treatment for the period beginning March 7, 1942, and ending September 17, 1942, during which period the said Halsford V. Sharpe was in the custody of a United States marshal but, on the latter date, the said Halsford V. Sharpe was discharged from such custody and the United States disclaimed further liability in law to pay such expenses.

(b) After reference of the matter to the United States Court of Claims by House Resolution 404, 82d Congress, agreed to on October 4, 1951, such court in the congressional reference case styled Columbia Hospital of Richland County against the United States (Congressional No. 17872, decided July 13, 1953) determined (1) that there was a moral obligation on the part of the United States to compensate the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C., for the reasonable and necessary expenses incurred by such hospital in the care and treatment of the said Halsford V. Sharpe, (2) that the sum of \$18,322.92 is the amount of such expenses for the period beginning September 18, 1942, and ending October 18, 1952, and (3) that the United States should compensate such hospital for all such expenses occurring after the end of such period or, in lieu thereof, should arrange the transfer of the said Halsford V. Sharpe to a Federal institution properly equipped to care for him on a permanent basis.

(c) In accordance with such determination of the court, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare are authorized and directed to make such arrangements as may be necessary and appropriate (1) to effect the transfer of the said Halsford V. Sharpe, on the earliest practicable date, from the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C., to any hospital under the jurisdiction of the Public Health Service, Department of Health,

Education, and Welfare, which is properly equipped to receive and care for the said Halsford V. Sharpe, and (2) to provide care and treatment on a permanent basis for the said Halsford V. Sharpe in such hospital under the jurisdiction of the Public Health Service. The Secretary of the Treasury is further authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C., a sum equal to the amount which shall be certified by such hospital to the United States Court of Claims, and shall be approved and certified by such court to the Secretary of the Treasury, as being the amount of the reasonable and necessary expenses incurred by such hospital in providing for the care and treatment of the said Halsford V. Sharpe during the period beginning October 19, 1952, and ending on the day immediately prior to the date of the transfer of the said Halsford V. Sharpe to the hospital under the jurisdiction of the Public Health Service as provided for in this subsection.

(d) The payments to the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C., of the sums referred to in subsections (a) and (c) and the transfer of the said Halsford V. Sharpe to a hospital under the jurisdiction of the Public Health Service for care and treatment therein on a permanent basis as provided for in subsection (c) shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incurred in connection with the care and treatment of the said Halsford V. Sharpe.

(e) No part of either of the sums appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim or portion thereof settled by the payment of such sum, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIVIO BRIANESCO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6594) for the relief of Livio Brianesco.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Livio Brianesco, Cleveland, Ohio, the sum of \$59.12. Such sum represents the amount of the judgment and costs for which the said Livio Brianesco was held liable on June 1, 1953, in a civil action in the municipal court of Cleveland, as the result of an accident which occurred on West 77th Street, between Madison and Franklin Avenues, in Cleveland on January 29, 1953, and which involved a United States mail truck being driven by the said Livio Brianesco, a letter carrier in the United States Post Office, Cleveland, Ohio. Such sum shall be paid only on condition that the said Livio Brianesco shall use such sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay such judgment and costs in full: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon

conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAURA SMITH MERRITT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7407) for the relief of Mrs. Laura Smith Merritt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Laura Smith Merritt, Camden, Ala., the sum of \$402.63. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of transportation expenses incurred by the said Mrs. Laura Smith Merritt in traveling from Frankfurt, Germany, to Washington, D. C., on October 18 and 19, 1950: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$402.63" and insert: "\$306.08."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT E. LEIBBRAND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5772) for the relief of Robert E. Leibbrand.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Robert E. Leibbrand, Seattle, Wash., is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of \$960. Such sum represents the amount of the class E allotment payments which were erroneously made to Rose Leibbrand, the sister of the said Robert E. Leibbrand, during the period beginning November 1, 1942, and ending October 31, 1945, after the said Robert E. Leibbrand had discontinued such allotment. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this act.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Page 1, line 3, after "Leibbrand" insert "and Rose Leibbrand"; and in the same line strike out the word "is" and insert in lieu thereof "are."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Amend the title so as to read: "For the relief of Robert E. Leibbrand and Rose Leibbrand."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF MRS. MARGARETH WEIGAND

The Clerk called the bill (S. 502) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Margareth Weigand.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President, or the officer or agency designated by him pursuant to the provisions of section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act (U. S. C., title 50, App. sec. 32), shall transfer and deliver to the estate of Mrs. Margareth Weigand the amount payable to her under the Social Security Act as a result of the death of her late son, Kurt F. Weigand, which amount was, in accordance with the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act, vested in or transferred to the Attorney General by vesting order No. 17973.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE L. F. ALLEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1325) for the relief of George L. F. Allen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the two provisos of paragraph 1 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) setting time limits for the initiation and termination of education or training under such part VIII shall not apply to George L. F. Allen, of McAllen, Tex., if he initiates his education or training under such part VIII within 120 days after the date of enactment of this act. Upon the said George L. F. Allen so initiating his education or training under such part VIII, he shall be held and considered to have been eligible for education or training under such part beginning October 17, 1951, the date on which he actually commenced his education or training. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall reimburse the said George L. F. Allen for tuition, subsistence allowances, and other expenses related to his education or training which would have been paid him under paragraphs 5 (a) and 6 (a) of such part VIII if he had been eligible on and after October 17, 1951, and shall make the appropriate deduction of time from the period of eligibility of the said George L. F. Allen.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUERTO RICAN INDIGNATION

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there came to my desk this morning a letter from an old friend in my home town. For himself and the other Puerto Ricans living in our county he spoke out in horrified indignation

over the action of the unfortunate fanatics who endangered the lives of people whom he regarded as friends of mankind. I assured my friend that we here in this great body do not in any degree blame this unfortunate affair on the good people of his native land. It is my privilege to place in the RECORD my friend's letter and my reply:

THE JOURNEYMEN
BARBERS, HAIRDRESSERS,
COSMETOLOGISTS AND PROPRIETORS
INTERNATIONAL UNION OF AMERICA,
LOCAL No. 100,
Galveston, Tex., March 3, 1954.

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CLARK: We are deeply hurt in view of the present headlines; and we, the Puerto Ricans residing in Galveston County, Tex., wish to express to you and your fine colleagues our sincere regrets. We also wish to extend our best wishes for the speedy recovery of those five great Americans who were seriously injured during the foulest attempt made on the lives of the people like you, who are devoting the best years of their lives for the best interests of people all over the world. It is beyond our comprehension how any person or persons could carry out such a foul attempt.

We unanimously recommend that new legislation be passed, providing that whereas any person or persons, making an attempt on the lives of any Member or Members of the Senate or the House of Representatives while in execution of their duties, upon conviction of said offense, shall be sentenced to death. Any other punishment would be inadequate.

We shall be more than glad to cooperate with any agency of the United States Government, at any time, in exposing any Puerto Rican Nationalist or any Communist.

Looking forward to seeing you on your next visit to our great city, I remain, as ever,
Your loyal friend,

JOE
J. E. Casals.

MARCH 4, 1954.

Mr. J. E. CASALS,
Galveston, Tex.:

I am deeply touched by your fine letter of March 3. Please assure all of the Puerto Ricans in our home county that my colleagues and I understand and appreciate their complete loyalty to our mutual country. I am placing your letter in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CLARK W. THOMPSON,
Member of Congress.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. TABER. 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. 24]

Abbutt	Chatham	Fulton
Barrett	Chelf	Gamble
Bentley	Chudoff	Gary
Bolton	Clardy	Granahan
Oliver P.	Davis, Tenn.	Green
Brownson	Dawson, Ill.	Hardy
Buckley	Dingell	Harrison, Va.
Campbell	Elliott	Hart
Carnahan	Fallon	Hollifield
Celler	Forrester	Javits

Jensen	Pillion	Stringfellow
Kearns	Powell	Sutton
Krueger	Reed, Ill.	Taylor
Lanham	Rivers	Tuck
Lantaff	Roberts	Vursell
Miller, N. Y.	Roosevelt	Warburton
Morgan	Shelley	Weichel
Morrison	Sieminski	Winstead
Moulder, Mo.	Smith, Va.	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and seventy-nine Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

FRANKLIN JIM

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1883) for the relief of the legal guardian of Franklin Jim, a minor, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment:

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out "the legal guardian of Franklin Jim, a minor" and insert "Franklin Jim, a."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STEBBINS CONSTRUCTION CO.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1967) for the relief of the Stebbins Construction Co., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out "Federal District Court of" and insert "United States District Court for."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRACEY-WELSH CO., INC.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3275) for the relief of the Bracey-Welsh Co., Inc., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, after "claim", insert "Provided, That no part of the amount appro-

priated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN DISBURSING OFFICERS

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2567) to amend the act of July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493), relating to the relief of certain disbursing officers, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "Army, Navy, and Air Force Departments" and insert "Department of the Army, Department of the Navy, Department of the Air Force, and of the Coast Guard."

Page 2 line 10, strike out "or the Secretary of the Air Force" and insert "the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Secretary of the Treasury."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1955

Mr. CLEVENGER. 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. 8067) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, 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. 8067, with Mr. JOHNSON of California in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COON:
Page 39, line 24, strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$15,000,000."

Page 40, line 1, strike out "\$1,600,000" and insert "\$6,600,000."

Mr. COON. Mr. Chairman, the \$10 million recommended in this bill for the

forest-highway program next year would be used chiefly to pay for contracts already let, with little or no money to spend for new construction. The effect of this would be to practically stop the program.

The \$10 million figure in the present bill represents a cut of 33 percent from the \$15 million originally requested by the Bureau of Public Roads. This amount was reduced in the office of the Secretary of Commerce.

I believe we should spend at least the amount of the Bureau of Public Roads request this year, so I am proposing in my amendment an increase of \$5 million.

In fiscal 1953, \$20 million was authorized by the United States Congress for forest highways. In fiscal 1954, \$22.5 million was authorized, and in fiscal 1955, the authorization is \$22.5 million. This is a total of \$65 million authorized, while the amount actually appropriated so far totals only \$11.6 million. The amount authorized but unappropriated is \$43.4 million.

Eighty-seven percent of the national forests are located in 11 western States. Timber production from these forests is important to the economy of these States, and forest highways are important to timber production, as well as being necessary links in the State highway systems.

I want to point out that the Federal forests are one of the agencies of the Federal Government which pays it own way. Last year revenues from the forests came to \$75 million. Of this, approximately \$18 million went back to the counties in lieu of taxes, and another \$7.5 million was spent on access roads leading into the main roads. This leaves a balance of about \$50 million which went back to the United States Treasury to be spent for other things, such as foreign aid, while forest highways did not even receive the amount authorized for them.

In the case of my own State, Oregon, I understand the Government received \$15.6 millions in timber revenues in 1953, while returning only about \$2.7 millions in forest highway funds.

It is well known that the Federal Government owns better than 53 percent of the land in the 11 western States—Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. This ownership puts the Government in the position of landlord. If this "landlord" is to continue taking revenues from our area, then he must invest the amount required to keep the revenue coming, and he should do his part to pay for the facilities he shares with other users. The forest highway program must be continued if these two purposes are to be served.

I understand that in the 4 western States, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana, there are about 5 billion feet of timber which has been infested with insects. If we have adequate roads, we can salvage that timber. If we do not have the roads soon this infested timber will die and rot. Every dollar spent in the near future on a Federal forest road or trail will return dollars in salvaged timber that would otherwise be wasted.

President Eisenhower said in his state of the Union message that it will be necessary to continue the 2-cent gasoline tax if we are to have the expanded highway program necessary to get a safe and adequate highway system. I cannot see much logic in taxing on the one hand to build roads, and on the other hand spending for other purposes the money our forest roads bring in.

Good forest highways, making possible more timber production at lower cost, will mean greater economic stability for the communities of the West, higher employment, and more prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read some of the questions and answers with reference to this matter found on page 295 of the hearings:

Mr. COON. You say the estimate of \$10 million will be required primarily to liquidate contracts incurred in prior years. Then how much will there be available this year for additional contracts?

In answer to that question Mr. Curtiss said:

Substantially none for new contracts in 1955.

Then I asked the question:

But there will be no new contracts let?

He said:

Not during 1955 under this appropriation.

Then I asked him further:

Then actually what you are doing is completely stopping this program; is that right?

Mr. Curtiss said:

That is approximately it.

Mr. PRESTON said:

You had a little difficulty getting it out.

I believe it would be unfair to our western States, retarding to the development of our timber resources, false economy in the long run, and contrary to the spirit of the President's highway program to appropriate less than the \$15 million requested by the Bureau of Public Roads for forest highways next year.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when the Public Works Committee 2 years ago brought forth a highway authorization bill it proposed that \$575 million be expended for general highway construction. The money was to be divided between primary, secondary, and urban roads. That money it proposed should be divided one-third on the basis of population, one-third on the basis of area, and one-third on the basis of miles of road.

Included in this bill was a provision that \$22,500,000 should be authorized for the construction of Federal forest highways. This \$22,500,000 was authorized and was to be an integral part of the primary highway system of the Nation. This \$22,500,000 was to be divided among the States with this forest land on the basis of 50-50, the States paying the cost of the construction of these highways. This \$22,500,000 was in a way sort of an in lieu payment, in place of the taxes the States lost by the Federal Government's owning so much forest land.

The Forest Service has jurisdiction over 160 million acres of forest land that is owned by the Federal Government. This 160 million acres of forest land constitutes an area approximately as large as the entire State of Texas.

The Public Works Committee, in 1950, asked for \$22,500,000 for forest highways and the Appropriations Committee later approved \$22,500,000. In 1951 the Appropriations Committee reduced the amount to \$20 million. This committee reduced it the next year to \$18 million, last year to \$15 million, and this year to \$10 million.

We think at least \$15 million should be spent on the Federal primary forest highways this year on a 50-50 matching-fund basis. We think we ought to have at least \$15 million for that purpose.

Forest highways are the roads that go from city to city to serve the general traveling public. A forest highway is a primary highway, not secondary, not urban, but a primary highway. The Federal Government contributes some millions, and the State matches those funds.

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

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. Are these forest highways financed in the same way as the Federal-aid highways?

Mr. MACK of Washington. The Federal Government supplies 50 percent of the money and the States match the 50 percent to build the highways. That is my understanding.

Mr. COUDERT. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I think the gentleman may be in error on that. That is why I raised the issue. I have before me the statement of the Director of the Highways Bureau in which he says:

I feel that the forest highways program could be prosecuted more expeditiously if financed in the same way as Federal-aid highways. I plan to explore this matter thoroughly with Commissioner du Pont and the Bureau of the Budget.

It seems to me that if there is in process a program that may lead to a different method of financing these roads, it might be wise to leave this budget estimate alone and not add to it at this time.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman may be right in that statement.

These highways serve the primary road system. In addition these roads enable loggers who buy Government timber to get it out more easily. This places these loggers in competition with other timber buyers, with the result that the Federal Government secures a higher price for its timber. Also, these highways provide firefighting facilities which facilitate getting men and equipment to the scene of a fire. These highways, also make it easier for the Federal Government to log diseased timber or timber damaged by fire.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. In addition, when we do not have funds adequate to build the proper roads inside the forest, when you come to a poor piece of road it closes the

circuit all the way because of that poor piece.

Mr. MACK of Washington. It affects 160 million acres of Government forest land situated in 45 of the 48 States of the Union.

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

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. It is my understanding that these roads will help to salvage some \$25 million worth of blown timber in the gentleman's own area.

Mr. MACK of Washington. We had a forest fire in 1951 in the district of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] that destroyed half a billion feet of timber. The timber damaged by this fire was valued at \$5 million. Today, because of that forest fire, it is worth only \$2 million. Not a stick of that \$2 million worth of damaged timber could have been salvaged except for the Federal forest highways being built in that area.

Mr. HORAN. The reason these are not matching funds is that they are payment in lieu of taxes to the States.

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

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington may be permitted to continue for an additional 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I intend to support this amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington. The question I would like to ask is, Are we not impeding the sustained-yield program in our national forests because of the lack of roads to get into the forest areas? Is that not correct?

Mr. MACK of Washington. We are impeding the primary highway construction of the Nation. We are retarding the salvaging of timber damaged as the result of fires and bug infestation. We are limiting the opportunities of the Forest Service to get into those areas with men and equipment to fight fires. We are hampering the Federal Government in its logging of diseased or bug-infested timber.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman referred to the appropriations in the past of \$22,500,000. Would he mind repeating those figures and bringing them down to the present appropriation?

Mr. MACK of Washington. In 1950 the appropriation for the forest Federal highways was \$22,500,000. In 1951 that was reduced to \$19 million. Last year it was reduced to \$15 million. This year it is being reduced by the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations to \$10 million. In other words, the program is being gradually done away with, although it is a self-supporting program by reason of the savings made by salvaging of the timber.

Mr. GAVIN. I think this restoration of \$5 million by the amendment offered

by the gentleman should be accepted by the House. It is very important.

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

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. CLEVINGER. I just want to correct the last statement. This is the action of the Secretary of Commerce. The committee did nothing with it. This is a budget recommendation.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I recognize that the Budget Bureau has recommended only \$10 million for this year. I understand that the Forest Service asked for \$15 million.

Mr. CLEVINGER. It was not the action of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MACK of Washington. No; the committee is carrying out the instructions of the Budget Director. That is correct.

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

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. SCUDDER. Is it not a fact that the curtailment of the expenditures on our forest highways is curtailing the harvesting of overripe timber and getting it to the mills and from the mills into the markets? The thing that we have been working for, as you well know, is to develop more forest highways because with better highways the Federal Government will receive more stumpage fees for timber which they own and, therefore, it will come back into another pocket of the Federal Government. I believe that for every dollar that we spend for these highways the Federal Government will get back \$5.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman is absolutely correct. If you build forest highways into the timber, it increases the competition among bidders for that timber. The Government, as a result, receives a higher price for its timber; also, the building of these roads facilitates the removal from the forest of overripe timber which otherwise would rot and go to waste.

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

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. I congratulate the gentleman from Washington on the remarks that he is making concerning this amendment. I want to go on record as supporting the amendment of the gentleman from Oregon, the Honorable SAM COON. I appreciate very much hearing the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] in support of this amendment. I am happy to see the interest of the State of Pennsylvania corresponding with the interest of the Far West in this particular matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Who gets the money for the salvaged timber?

Mr. MACK of Washington. The Federal Government gets the money because the Federal Government owns the timber.

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

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. MUMMA. I do not want to strike a discordant note exactly, but there is an alternative proposition to getting these roads built. Is it not a matter of fact or a matter of record that when they let logging contracts they include a proviso—I do not know whether it is done in every case, but it has been done and it is being done.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is talking about roads and trails.

Mr. MUMMA. No. I am talking about roads. There is a big difference.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The Federal forest highway is built to serve the traveling public from town to town.

Mr. MUMMA. I understand, but there can be two interpretations, and one group is talking about roads to get logs out. All these logs are not along the primary highways.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I would say to the gentleman the Federal forest highway, although it is built to serve communities, it does go through the forests. Because of this the loggers build their stub roads to those Federal forest highways. The building of these Federal forest highways on a primary system makes it easier for the logger to get into the timber, and thereby increases the number of bidders for the timber. This results in the Government getting a higher price for its timber.

Mr. MUMMA. That could not be true in all cases.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] has again expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am rising in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON]. My district, which comprises over one-third of the total area of California runs from the Oregon line to and including Death Valley, Calif.; 700 miles down the Sierra Nevada Mountains. That district has more national forests than any other district in the country. It comprises all or part of 11 national forests. There are at least six major highways crossing the Sierra Nevada Mountains, bringing traffic from the East to the West and from the West to the East. Large sections of all of those major highways pass through as much as 50 or 100 miles of national-forest lands. How in the world are the people of my State going to get back and forth across those Sierra Nevada Mountains unless they get some help from the Federal Government in building these national-forest highways which are on the primary system.

A good illustration is Highway No. 40, which is the main road running from Reno, Nev., across Donner Summit into the Sacramento Valley, and from there into San Francisco Bay area. That road is clogged up a great part of the time both in summer and worse in winter because it has never been adequately improved. The Bureau of Public Roads has not had the money under current appropriations to get it done. The amount recommended in this bill is simply the termination of that program. Ten million dollars is just enough to take care of the contracts that are already

under consideration and let, and just a little more. The Bureau of Public Roads asked for \$15 million, which is exactly the amount of money it had last year for this purpose, inadequate certainly, but at least the same as we had last year. The Bureau of the Budget, I understand, cut them back \$5 million. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON] has offered an amendment which would put into this bill an additional \$5 million, making the amount equal to the amount of money requested by the Bureau of Public Roads, and the same amount granted in the appropriation last year for this same purpose. I hope that the Committee will see fit to restore these funds, for all the reasons that have been mentioned.

In my State we had practically a civil war over on the coast area, in the district represented by the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER], when load limitations for trucks went on those State highways, and they were forced to pull off their trucks. That is where these roads get into trouble with the lumber industry. They will simply not hold up under that traffic. The load limitations force the lumber trucks off the roads.

With the Federal Government in my State owning 46 percent of the total land area of California, and over 70 percent of my district—in some counties over 90 percent in my district in Federal ownership—it seems to me we are not asking very much of the Federal Government when we ask that they step up as a property owner and help to build some of these roads through the national forest areas.

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

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Is it not true there are large stands of timber in these forest holdings which are not accessible because of the lack of roads to reach them?

Mr. ENGLE. Not only that, but they are not accessible because after the logging companies, from their private roads, get on the main stem, they find inadequate road conditions, load limits on the bridges, and that sort of thing.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Is it not true also that good forest cutting practice requires that a lot of timber that cannot now be reached ought to be cut before it spoils?

Mr. ENGLE. We are losing 2 billion feet of timber a year to what I call the Insect Logging Co., that is the timber in our national forests that is eaten up by bugs, and falls due to being overripe. It is a waste of good national resources.

But whatever may be done about that we have a right to point out that the Federal Government as a proprietor, as the owner of 70 percent of the land in the Sierra Nevada region should step up and put up just a little amount of money, and this is a pittance, to build these main roads through the national forest areas.

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

Mr. Chairman, we in Oregon are vitally interested in this problem. Over 52 percent of the lands of Oregon belong to the Federal Government, and some 14 percent of the moneys that come in on these roads from the Federal Treasury goes for these highways running through the Oregon forests.

There are three types of forest land that are benefited in this appropriation: One is the forest timber that has been knocked down by wind and that sort of thing; second is the forest timber that has been stricken with infestation; the third is that injured by fire. These three categories of timber have great value if harvested immediately, but unless they are gotten out in a short time after these troubles take place they are lost.

It is true that these roads about which we are talking here are not the access roads that go back into the deep forests, but they are the trunkline roads that go through the forests which must be used to market this timber.

Last year we allowed \$15 million, for these roads, this year practically nothing. It is true there is \$10 million appropriated in this bill for this purpose, but it is only to meet outstanding commitments and obligations; as I understand absolutely, not \$1 for new construction. It seems to me it is penny-wise and pound foolish for the Federal Government which owns these lands—a big investment of the Federal Government alone—not to provide a minimum appropriation for this purpose to preserve and market our timber.

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

Mr. ANGELL. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Just one question: Is this request within the amount allowed by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. ANGELL. No; the Bureau of the Budget recommended only \$10 million.

Mr. RABAUT. So this is above the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. ANGELL. The Forestry Service recommended \$15 million. That was the amount allowed last year.

I hope this Committee will restore the \$5 million in order not to help the people of Oregon but to help the Federal Government itself which owns this great investment.

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

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

Mr. GAVIN. At times I do not always agree with my friends from the great Northwest, but this is one time that I certainly agree with them in this amendment offered here today. I merely want to observe that I cannot at times understand the thinking of the House. We spend hundreds of millions of dollars all over the world and the membership votes it through with but little or no debate. However, when it comes to our own backyard, I mean the development of our great national forests for the welfare of the people of America, we certainly scrutinize all details. Now, here is a \$5 million item which would

be a contribution to the development of these great forest areas. I sincerely hope that the Members of the House will approach this matter today with the thought that here is something that concerns their own backyard. This amendment should be adopted overwhelmingly.

Mr. ANGELL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution; he is absolutely right.

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

Mr. ANGELL. My time has about expired.

(On request of Mr. DEMPSEY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ANGELL was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico, who is very familiar with all of these problems.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am very happy to support the amendment providing \$5 million additional. The committee, of which the gentleman from Oregon is a member, the Public Works Committee, had this matter under consideration and went into every phase of it. I think he is more familiar with the situation than most Members of the House. A great many people feel that a pine tree when it grows up just stands there until somebody cuts it down, that it does not deteriorate. A tree matures or gets ripe just like fruit gets ripe or wheat gets ripe and unless you harvest it at that time you are going to lose the tree. It is not an economy move to take \$5 million in a proposition of this kind. Our Public Works Committee recommended \$22,500,000. We did the same thing 2 years ago, but at that time the appropriations committee cut it to \$15 million. Now they have cut it to \$10 million and I assume next year they will cut it to \$5 million; at the same time the people of the United States wonder what is happening to our national resources. We are just not protecting them.

It is a cold, hard fact that curtailment of this appropriation is costing the people of the United States many times what has been cut out of the amount originally authorized. Conservative estimates are that the annual loss to the Government in unharvested timber—which has deteriorated and become worthless—is far in excess of \$20 million. Many times that amount is lost to the ravages of forest fires because lack of proper access roads hamper the fire-fighters. Added to that is the incalculable loss due to destruction of watersheds in the national forests, particularly in the semiarid States where water is their veritable lifeblood.

No, this constant whittling down of forest highways appropriations is the farthest thing imaginable from sound economy.

Mr. ANGELL. Under this bill we are not getting a dime this year for these roads except to take care of the commitments heretofore incurred, not one single penny for future construction of

roads in this great forest area. Last year \$15 million were appropriated for these roads. The Public Works Committee with jurisdiction over roads, of which I am a member, authorized \$22,500,000. I most strongly urge that the motion of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON], be adopted to increase this item \$5 million, which is the amount appropriated last fiscal year which will provide only \$5 million for new construction.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I must oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon. Much as I like him, much as I would like to contribute to his happiness and to the happiness of his constituents, despite the fact that the eloquence of the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] brought tears to my eyes about the plight of those unhappy people struggling across the Sierra Nevada Mountains, despite all of those considerations, the rest of us on this side of the Committee are opposed to this amendment. We are opposed to it for the simple reason that we believe in sustaining the administration's very sound position in seeking to keep down expenditures and to minimize to the greatest extent possible additions to the national debt. If we increase this \$10 million allowed by the Bureau of the Budget by an additional \$5 million, we will simply be contributing an additional \$5 million to the deficit for 1955. We will be increasing the debt and to that extent adding to inflation. After the stirring speech of the ranking member of the minority here yesterday, my colleague from New York [Mr. ROONEY], who struggled so hard to save the taxpayers \$17 million, I would expect the minority members of the Committee likewise to oppose this amendment, they now having become exponents of economy and sound fiscal policy.

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

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. When the House, as it does, approves the proposal to build the St. Lawrence Seaway and obligates the Government to the extent of \$106 million, will that not exceed the debt limit and put us into deficit financing?

Mr. COUDERT. I am not aware that the St. Lawrence Seaway is in this bill. Whatever we do with the St. Lawrence Seaway, the fact will still remain an additional \$5 million added to this bill over and above the Bureau of the Budget figures will increase the deficit for 1955 by just that amount. I trust that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] will stand with us on this and that the committee may be united in its opposition to this amendment, not that we do not like forests. Of course, we could spend fifty or one hundred million dollars, and I wish we had a billion dollars to spend on them.

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

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

Mr. ROONEY. I must say that the argument of my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON], was quite compelling. The gentleman from New York knows what went on in committee with regard to this. The gentleman from New York, the present speaker, offered to increase the amount by a half million dollars. It was refused by the gentleman from Oregon. That is the way the record stands.

Mr. COUDERT. I think the committee would settle for a half million dollars because we like the gentleman from Oregon so much. But I do not believe he would settle for that.

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

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I just want to observe that if the gentleman from California brought tears to the gentleman from New York, he is doing very well.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I was informed yesterday by the chairman of the Roads Committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR], that we are spending scores of millions of dollars in Europe for the construction of highways under those gift programs. Does not the gentleman from New York believe that it would be better to spend \$5 million upon American highways in the United States rather than scores of millions of dollars in this giveaway foreign-aid program for roads in foreign countries?

Mr. COUDERT. I think that is a very good question, and I would like to answer it.

I would like to say to the gentleman from Washington that he is entirely right. Unhappily, under our present appropriating process, there is no connection between the two, and the right hand knoweth not what the left hand doeth. If we vote \$5 million here today, next week and next month we will vote for roads all over the world. Therefore, I say, Mr. Chairman, if we really want to relate like things to like and if we really want to establish a sound fiscal system for the Government of the United States, then for heaven's sake let us persuade the Committee on Rules to report out my H. R. 2 that ties expenditures to taxation and receipts and puts the House in a position of having to determine in fact whether it is going to give highways to Washington and other States that need them or whether it is going to spend money to build roads in Yucatan or Iran or anywhere else. Without that your question would always be relevant but meaningless in practice.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to take but a minute or two to make some comments with regard to the budget-balancing abracadabra which is happening here on the other side of the aisle. It is really quite amazing and amusing. In this morning's paper a headline reads "House Slashes Subsidy Funds for Airlines." Why, I was under the impression, Mr.

Chairman, and I was here all day yesterday, that the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle added \$17 million to this bill for airline subsidies. That is not a slash in my book. That is a plain plush addition of \$17 million of the taxpayers' money.

Now they are confronted with a real problem. It all emanates from the generosity of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON], and there are very few of the members of the majority side who care to vote against the \$5 million amendment of the genial and distinguished gentleman from Oregon.

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

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

Mr. COUDERT. I simply want to observe, as all Members of the House observe, that, persuasive as the gentleman from New York may be, whichever side he happens to take for the moment, he did not succeed in fooling the House yesterday and evidently did not succeed in fooling the gentlemen of the press. My compliments to them.

Mr. ROONEY. Surely the gentleman from New York does not mean to imply that I fooled him and the subcommittee and the full 50-member Committee on Appropriations when all, including the gentleman from New York, were unanimous in arriving at the figure of \$23 million for the airline subsidy money, a cut of \$50 million. I wonder what later happened to change their minds about it and caused them to come on the floor without ever bringing the subject before the full committee and have the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVELAND] offer an amendment to his own bill to add \$17 million of the taxpayers' money. Now, if the gentlemen could figure some way of taking five of those \$17 million in airline subsidies and giving them to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON] and his associates for their forest highways, I might be agreeable to go along.

Mr. COUDERT. Will the gentleman support my bill H. R. 2, which will tie expenditures to revenues and compel the House to make a choice?

Mr. ROONEY. No; I do not agree with the gentleman from New York in regard to H. R. 2, and I daresay that not too many of his colleagues on his side of the aisle agree with the provisions of H. R. 2, either. After all, if it was the right thing to do—and I understand that this is a Republican House, and that is the party of the gentleman, and the gentleman's party is in control of the committees of the House—why do they not report out the gentleman's bill, H. R. 2, and let us take a look at it?

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is really gratifying to see how economy-minded my very good friend from New York, whom I greatly admire, has become in the last several weeks. It is really a creditable performance on economy he is turning in.

Mr. ROONEY. I think the learned gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. I think the fact that he has been so closely associated with the

gentleman from New York that it is contagious, and they are both becoming economy minded, in this particular instance.

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

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

Mr. COUDERT. May I remind the gentleman that my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and I are divided by a river, and it is a very sharp division—the East River in New York.

Mr. GAVIN. I assume from what the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] stated and from what the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] stated that there may be a river between them in their respective districts, but they are both agreed on opposition to this proposed amendment, and that is what I am concerned about.

Let us examine this Forest Service situation and our national forests. It is really interesting. I might say it is the only branch of the Federal Government that I know of that is turning in a profit. They actually took in about \$12 million more last year than they expended.

In the discussion we had the other day on the legislation relative to exchange of land in the national forests, as to why they have not increased their activities on sustained-yield programs in the national forests, it was evident that they could not increase their programs because of lack of roads in the forests.

If one branch of the Government can show a profit of \$12 million, it certainly is an outstanding performance. It would be creditable if other branches of the Government could emulate that performance. If they can show a greater result by allocating an additional \$5 million to this program, I think this amendment should be adopted.

In my honest opinion, it is a wise investment of the American taxpayers' dollars. My record has been well known on economy ever since I have been here. But this is one program where I do not feel that economy is wise, nor is the cut justified. I do not think the appropriation should be cut back from \$22,500,000 in a couple of years to \$10 million. This is a drastic cut. We are spending hundreds of millions of dollars all over the world; however, when it comes to our own backyard, our own people, our great national forests that are operated profitably and used by hundreds of thousands of people for recreation and other purposes, cuts are made that make forest programs ineffective.

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

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

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman understand that President Eisenhower does not want this \$5 million added to the bill, that his Bureau of the Budget and his Secretary of Commerce submitted a request in the amount of \$10 million, and that that is all they say they want and can use for forest highways?

Mr. GAVIN. We are in disagreement. That is why we are debating it today. In the final analysis, we are the ones

that are going to determine whether the Bureau of the Budget is going to reach conclusions on this program or whether the duly elected representatives of the people are going to reach those conclusions as to what these programs should be.

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

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. Is it not a fact that no matter what we appropriate and no matter how much we appropriate, if the Bureau of the Budget does not authorize the agency to spend the funds, they will not be spent, and therefore even if we give them 15 or 20 or 50 million dollars, if the Bureau of the Budget says \$10 million is all they need this year, that is all that is going to be spent?

Mr. GAVIN. If we appropriate the money to them and then the Bureau of the Budget does not permit them to use it, it is up to us again to take the matter up with the Bureau of the Budget to ascertain reason why. We will get into that later, but I assume from what the gentleman is saying that you are going to vote for the amendment, is that correct?

Mr. COUDERT. No, I am not.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. SULLIVAN: On page 26, line 3, change the period to a comma and insert "of which \$10,000 shall be used to renew the compilation of statistics on stocks of coffee on hand."

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment, providing for a very modest sum in the appropriation for the Census Bureau to be earmarked for the compilation of statistics, is intended to give to the American Government and to the American people the true facts on the stocks of coffee on hand in the United States. We know that the coffee crop in Brazil was damaged badly last year. We know that there will be, if present rates of consumption of coffee continue, some degree of shortage in the United States. We can expect that coffee prices will continue to go up under those circumstances.

However, we have every right to expect that coffee prices will not go up in anticipation of shortages. That is what happened late last year and earlier this year. From the best information I can obtain, there have been no shortages of coffee in the United States. Over a period of years we have imported more coffee than we have consumed. Yet the price has been shooting up in the grocery stores and every week we are told that another 5-cent-a-pound increase is imminent.

What are the facts about coffee supply—about stocks of coffee on hand? Frankly, we just do not seem to know, at least not accurately. Apparently the only way we can find out, through our investigating committees, is by the subpena process. That is ridiculous when

we are dealing with a commodity so generally used in the American household—so much enjoyed by the American public.

The Census Bureau did keep statistics on the volume of coffee stocks during the war and for a short period in the late 1940's. It does not keep them at this time. My amendment, earmarking \$10,000 of the appropriation for the Bureau of the Census, would enable the Bureau to renew the compilation of statistics on stocks of coffee on hand. If we are going to prevent speculative price increases resulting from hoarding on the part of some big operators or manipulation, we have got to know how much coffee there is in the United States. The Census Bureau can determine that for us if we give it the funds it needs for this simple operation. If as a result of having this information we can save the housewife an unnecessary increase of as little as 1 cent a pound in the price of coffee, then we are saving the amount of this appropriation many hundreds of times over in the cost of living for the American consumer and in the cost of Government, too, and without asking for any additional money. We must remember that coffee makes up all by itself 1 percent of the Consumers' Price Index. Therefore, it is no minor item in the cost of living formula. And we all know how wages and many other costs are tied to the Consumer Price Index.

If we had had this information—the accurate information—on stocks of coffee on hand last November, I can tell you honestly, Mr. Chairman, that the American housewives would not have been victimized as they were by the tremendous increase in coffee prices on a speculative basis in anticipation of shortages due some time this year. We would have known that there was more coffee in the United States than we were consuming. We would have known that there was no excuse for the price increases which took place. As it was, we did not know what the true facts were, and committees of the House and Senate are still trying to find out, and the more they look into the matter the more they find that speculation was at the heart of the tremendous price increases of the last 5 months.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that any Member who is really concerned about the price of such an important item in the consumers' price index, who is concerned about letters he is receiving from housewives in his district about coffee prices, support this amendment as an effective means of getting the facts on the record, so that we are protected in the future against unnecessary increases in the price of coffee. Think of it, Mr. Chairman, for only \$10,000 we should be able to know, and not have to guess about the volume of coffee stocks on hand in the United States, and we can know then whether any increase in coffee prices is justified by supply factors, or merely by greed. The people are demanding that we do something about coffee prices, and here is an effective means of taking realistic action. I hope the committee will see fit to accept the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. ROONEY. If I correctly understand the gentlewoman's amendment, it would not add 1 nickel to the bill; is that correct?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The gentleman is correct. I am not asking for additional money to be appropriated.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentlewoman's amendment merely allocates \$10,000 of the total in this bill for the Bureau of the Census to go into this matter of coffee, which is a subject of very much concern to the American housewife today.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. I commend the distinguished and very able gentlewoman from Missouri for offering this amendment, and I assure her that we shall support it.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I wanted to inquire of the lady whether or not it would be possible for the Bureau to use this money for this purpose without the amendment which she has offered?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The authority was vested in the Administrator away back in the 80th Congress, Public Law 671, but they kept those records only during wartime. When I called them about it earlier this year they said that because of lack of money they could not continue to keep them.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. The point I am making is this. Could they not, without this amendment, use the money already allocated to them for this purpose, without having it earmarked specifically for this purpose?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The answer is that the appropriation last year was not large enough to continue these records so they did not compile the statistics. If it were indicated to them that we want those figures, that it is the intention of the Congress to have those figures, then they will use the fund to provide them out of their general appropriation.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I thank the lady for the explanation.

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

May I say that the committee on this side has no objection to this amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that the amendment is entirely satisfactory to the minority members of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUSBEY: On page 47, line 16, strike out "\$75,814,000" and insert "\$55,814,000."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, this seems to be the day for adopting amendments on an appropriation bill, and I hope that my amendment will not be the first to be defeated. It should be passed for these reasons:

First of all, it is a step toward economy. It is a very—shall I say in the words of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], in referring to some cuts—modest cut? It cuts only \$20 million out of the fund for the United States information program. It is a modest cut, because I was afraid the membership of the House would not go along with me if I offered an amendment to cut the fund by a considerable amount—which should be done. For that reason, I offered an amendment for just a very, very modest cut.

Why should this agency be cut? Frankly, notwithstanding the fact that the Appropriations Committee, in the 1954 appropriation bill, gave the agency almost blanket authority to discharge any employee, this agency has done less than any agency in Government to get rid of the old Barrett-Acheson-Truman holdovers, who are in key positions—all the policymaking positions. A new director, Mr. Theodore Streibert of New York, was appointed after Mr. Johnson resigned. As far as I know, Mr. Streibert is a very honorable gentleman. He has had a very distinguished career in the field of radio and television with the Mutual Broadcasting System; but I challenge anyone to show me one single qualification Mr. Streibert possesses for handling an ideological program such as the Voice of America.

The personnel down there is the same old personnel, and they are still running the show. This I will prove later.

On two occasions—in 1952 and 1953—I took the floor of the House to expose one of the leading Communists of the United States, Mr. Bertram Wolfe, who had been the chief of the ideological section of the Voice of America in New York for 4½ years. First of all, I have his Form 57, which is his application for a position in the Voice of America; and I called to the attention of Mr. Streibert, and also to Mr. Philip Young, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, the fact that Wolfe had falsified his application for employment in the Government. Before my time runs out, let me say that I hope every Member of this House will read my extension of remarks on this matter. Because it would take me some 40 minutes to explain this entire picture, I intend to extend my remarks. You will find that my remarks expose this whole matter of Bertram Wolfe.

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

Mr. BUSBEY. It is always a pleasure to yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the gentleman knows that this man is no longer on the payroll?

Mr. BUSBEY. I know he is no longer on the payroll. I have tried to get Mr. Streibert to fire Wolfe ever since he has been in office. My reasons will be found in my extension of remarks. Last week, just before this appropriation bill was reported, Wolfe was permitted to resign. Mr. Streibert should have fired him. I do not think the man would be off the payroll even at this date, if Mr. Streibert had not known that I was going to bring this matter before the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Has the gentleman any assurances he will not be put back?

Mr. BUSBEY. No, and that is what irks me considerably. Hundreds and hundreds of such employees have been permitted to resign when they should have been fired. Now, Mr. Wolfe told them he disavowed communism in 1929, but my remarks will show that he was an active Communist up until at least 1941.

There is one more thing I desire to bring out. When some former Communist, such as Elizabeth Bentley, Louis Budenz, Ben Gitlow, and others, have broken from the Communist Party, they have come forward and given the agencies of Government and the committees of Congress the benefit of the knowledge and information they gained during their many years of work inside the Communist Party. I defy anyone to show me where they have had one iota of help from Bertram Wolfe.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Mr. Chairman, the present organizational structure of the United States Information Agency is essentially a product of the key figures and planners of the program under the Democratic administration. Thus, it becomes an instrument for vindicating the Barrett-created empire and protecting the positions and promotions of the key holdovers from the Barrett era.

In a sense, the new director, Theodore Streibert, was forced by the shortage of time to adopt this creation of the holdovers. The interval between his appointment to the directorship in August, and the announcement of the new organization in October and November 1953, did not permit more than cursory analysis of the entire organization.

The shortage of time figured also in the reduction in force of personnel between August and December 31, 1953. Streibert had a mandate to clear out key holdovers from the misguided Barrett regime. Yet, in the final analysis, it was the key holdovers who set up the reduction-in-force program, and recommended the release of certain personnel under the mandate of Public Law 207. Streibert was completely dependent on the holdovers for advice in the reduction in force, which had been underway when he took over, and which was greatly accelerated from the day he took office.

Under those circumstances, it is only natural that the holdovers should protect their own interests.

Nowhere is this better illustrated than in the International Press Service of USIA. Not one of the top leaders of IPS was affected by the reduction-in-force. Some 80 or 90 employees were cut off the IPS roster of 441 employees. Yet none of the top leaders, or any of the Grade 14 and 15 employees, were dropped nor declassified between August and December 1953.

Even though the IPS roster had been cut to nearly the level of November 1950,

it retained nearly twice as many Grade 14 and 15 employees as had been on the rolls before the wild organizational and expansion spree got under way under Barrett in 1950.

Out of the total of 19 grade 14's and 15's, 14 were ex-OWI personnel. One of the Grade 15's had been the Special Assistant to Barrett and ex-Senator Benton in the OWI and post-OWI days. The top man in the International Press Service was an acknowledged life-long Democrat, appointed to his position during the confused transitional period of the ill-fated Robert Johnson regime.

Most of the grade 14 and 15 personnel were either without Civil Service permanent status, or else were recently promoted during the dying days of the Democratic administration. Four of the seven Grade 15's were promoted between September 1952 and February 1953. Nine of the 14 Grade 14's were promoted during this same period.

Three of the grade 15's could have been released under Public Law 207. At least five of the grade 14's could have been dropped by the same law. The remainder could have been reduced to lesser grades commensurate with their abilities, either through reorganization or a combination of reorganization and reduction of the grade 15 and 14 positions. This was not done, however, and the result has been a general debasement of grade 15 and 14 duties and responsibilities in a greatly compressed organization.

Grade 15's and 14's are performing duties once performed by personnel from one to two grades lower, under the standards prevailing in 1950. Some, like the newly appointed Chief of the Far Eastern Branch, have had no previous experience in the specialized fields which they head.

Thus the present organizational structure has been predicated for the most part on the perpetuation of personalities and their promotions. It retains as much as possible of the numerous management and policy empires which grew up like Topsy during the Barrett period of over-expansion and over-grading. This is true on an Agency-wide basis, as well as on the various media and service levels.

What this amounts to, in substance, is that it now costs much more to operate a program which today is less in some respects than the level of 1950. This is particularly true in the case of the International Press Service.

The various components of the International Press Service have been known by many different names since October of 1950, but the fact remains that the products have changed little if any. Yet the output as a whole has declined.

That the production level of the International Press Service has declined is not surprising. October of 1950 represented a key month in the determination of field demand and domestic servicing functions. It was a peak month in the Korean war. The demands from the field, in terms of quantity, represented the capacity of foreign press and publication outlets to absorb materials from International Press Service. Anything beyond the peak level of October

was excess, a glut on the USIS distribution points overseas, which piled up unseen and unused in warehouses until Congressional investigating teams unearthed the surpluses in 1951-52.

Under pressure of the congressional investigations, the information program was reorganized in 1951-52 to give greater emphasis on regional requirements and demand. The reorganization, however, merely compounded the error. It was built on the greatly overstaffed and overgraded organization which had been built up subsequent to November 1950 to turn out voluminous quantities of state-side-created anti-Communist propaganda materials. The empire builders of the Barrett regime simply pyramided an even greater top-heavy organizational structure on top of the grossly overstaffed domestic servicing functions. Each media and servicing function acquired even greater autonomy, with all of the separate management and policy facilities that go with such autonomy.

Close overall operational control declined as media autonomy increased. No strong central office nor personality controlled the field program. Radio, press and publications, and management functions were competing with each other for their share of the time and funds of the overseas program. The USIS field post office in Washington, which should have played the dominant role in establishing the field requirements and coordinating the output, was relegated to the sidelines in the struggle of the radio, press, and management functions for power. Even the Director and Deputy Director of the Agency lost control of the operations of the contending forces. This was borne out time and again in congressional inquiries of the Agency heads.

This lack of control by the Agency heads was attributable, in great measure, to the caliber of the Agency heads, but underlying their own difficulties was an organizational deficiency which was not of their own creation. Dr. Compton, the successor of Barrett, inherited an organizational structure which was designed by his predecessor and was put into operation by leaders recruited under the Barrett regime.

Mr. Streibert inherited the same organization, with the modifications engineered by the same Barrett holdovers during Dr. Johnson's short tenure.

Key personnel, who fully expected to be axed after the inauguration, stayed on to become influential advisers to Johnson. In their possession was the blacklist of personnel whom Barrett has frequently termed "malcontents," and other derogatory labels were applied to persons who had dared to question the policies of his regime. Some of the names of these employees undoubtedly cropped up in a 207 letter when the holdovers could find no way to dismiss them through regular procedures. Some minor employees with good records and civil service status, who had voted the Republican ticket, were cast adrift under the cloud of the 207 letter. They were speeded on their way by New Deal incompetents who had been the most vociferous anti-Republicans.

Those persons who were excluded from the 207 law were sidetracked from reduction-in-force processes through manipulation of the reduction-in-force lists.

In summary, the reorganization has bolstered the status of the hard core of the holdovers, and placed a few Streibert appointees at the top. Whether these few top appointees can prevail against the consolidated position of the holdovers in the face of blanket approval of the program from the White House is extremely doubtful. At this late date they enter the program as defenders. This is reflected in Streibert's statements, and is personified so well in the case of the newly appointed Chief of the International Press Service, Harlan Logan.

Logan took office on January 1, 1954. The reorganization had been completed a month or two earlier, and the justifications of the program and its budget for presentation to Congress in February were well along toward completion. He will be defending an operation and leadership which is little changed from what it was prior to the Presidential election of 1952.

What is the answer to all of this?

Either complete abolishment of the program and a new start, or else a far-reaching efficiency and management study by persons who are influenced by the need, instead of perpetuation of the past.

Whatever the method, the pending transfer of the Voice of America from New York to Washington provides the ideal setting for a thorough revamping of the program. Here is the opportunity to consolidate the numerous overlapping management and policy functions of the several media and services.

The reorganization should center on dividing the Agency into three distinct functions; namely, operations, policy, and management.

Under operations would be placed the complete control of the media servicing the field operations. Media servicing would be made subordinate to field operations.

Policy would be comprised of a small and select staff to advise the Agency Director and the Field Operations Chief.

Management would pull together all of the administrative support functions—budget, personnel, finance, and contract functions—and establish them as a supporting facility for operations, but answerable to the Director of the Agency.

The principal objective of this management, or analyzation division would be to relieve the Field Director of as much policy and administrative responsibilities as possible and to free him for direct day-to-day implementation and control of the informational policies. At his fingertips would be the media services for employment as he saw fit through USIS posts and radio broadcasting facilities. He would be relieved of the purely technical aspects of radio facilities and the mechanics of media transmission in order to concentrate on editorial content and interpretation of policy.

This same separation of editorial and psychological operations from purely management functions would also be

reflected in the individual media functions. Only skeleton administrative staffs would remain in the media services after consolidation in the central management office.

To provide greater attention to the editorial aspects of media and to enable appropriate emphasis and coordination, the media would be divided into fast media and slow media. Under fast media would be radio programing, press, and possibly pictorial functions.

The publications, motion pictures, and general visuals functions which comprise long-range implementation of informational and educational themes would be placed under slow media.

This is a general breakdown of the proposed reorganization of USIA. The detail, of which there would be considerable, would be met with a great deal of resistance because it would effect extensive budget and personnel cuts. But from it would come program coordination which has never been achieved in all of the previous reorganizations.

Mr. Chairman, the United States Information Agency was established during the past year for the express purpose of combatting international communism and to give to the countries of the world a true picture of the United States and its aims, insofar as its aims affect our world position. The Director of the USIA has proposed a budget for the next year of approximately \$89 million. Such diverse subjects as press services, motion-picture services, operation of information centers, maintenance of overseas missions, radio broadcasting, and overhead are provided for in this budget. If this amount of money, or even 10 times this amount of money, gave promise of stopping or slowing down the processes of international communism, the Members of this body would grant the funds without further debate. But the truth is that our information programs overseas are still giving little, if any, positive evidence of accomplishing the basic mission.

In the justification for this budget, the following sentence appears:

Over two-thirds of the United States Information Service budget for fiscal 1955 will be expended to confound communism in Eastern Germany and to prevent its entrenchment in the hearts and habits of the enslaved population.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the fantastic number of refugees pouring into Western Germany from the East—not only from Eastern Germany, but from the other satellite countries—is clear evidence that communism has failed to find a place in the "hearts and habits of the enslaved population." Let us look into this budget in some detail.

A very great amount of money—some \$6½ million—has been earmarked for the operation of packaging centers and program services in Cairo, Manila, Munich, in Washington, and elsewhere. Of this amount, \$71,000 is provided for Washington—the lowest amount of any of the centers—and yet, it is Washington which is responsible for doing the job.

A qualified committee, headed by Mr. C. D. Jackson, recommended months ago that radio broadcasts to the Soviet Union should be limited to straight news

and explanatory commentaries. Despite this, the Voice of America continues to insist upon program content other than news and commentary, to the detriment of our political aims. While much is made, in the justification for this budget, of the Radio RIAS in Berlin, and particularly of the role of that broadcasting station in maintaining a climate of defiance to the Soviet masters in East Germany; the Americans in charge of the broadcasting station did not hesitate to hire 3 recent employees of the Communist Party just prior to the uprising of last June. Indeed, one man, Eberhardt Schultze, had been a high official of the German Communist Party who spent much of the Hitler period in Moscow. In charge of the so-called East German programs, which are supposed to defeat the effects of Communist propaganda in that country, the man selected for the job was Heinz Frenzel, who, until a year ago, was chief of the district press office of the East German Communist Party in the State of Thuringia. Another commentator selected for a key position in the American broadcasting station in Berlin, Martin Kohl, is also reported to be a former member of the East German Communist Party.

As further evidence of the reluctance of the USIA to divorce itself from personnel presently or recently associated with the International Communist conspiracy, I would like to call your attention to the following:

Mr. Chairman, I can think of no single piece of proposed legislation which would have more far-reaching benefits to the Nation than the President's recommendation that a citizen of the United States, who is convicted in the courts of hereafter conspiring to advocate the overthrow of this Government by force or violence, be treated as having, by such act, renounced his allegiance to the United States and forfeited his United States citizenship.

The very future of our Nation and Government, and the legislative processes which are manifested in this Congress of the United States depend on curbing the doctrine of overthrow of the constitutional government of the United States by minority through armed revolt. Current history has been filled with too many instances of successful capture of governments by minority armed revolt for us to treat the phrase lightly, as was once the custom.

The groundwork for successful armed revolt is laid by just such infiltrations as have been uncovered and highlighted many times in less than a decade. Armed overthrow of the Government and abolishment of every vestige of the Constitution, including the very political-parliamentary system of which the Democratic and Republican Parties are a part, is the aim of Communists, Left-Wing Revolutionary Socialists, and a whole host of liberals, some of whom dwell in the not-too-well-defined realm of internationalism.

Let us not confuse honest social progressiveness, and international cooperation, with the type of liberalism and internationalism which would destroy the very foundations of our constitutional

government. The latter philosophy abandons the very religious, political, and social traditions on which the Constitution was founded.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly endorse the President's appeal for the legal weapons to combat the alien philosophy of overthrow of the Government by violence. I might even suggest that the proposed new legislation include some appropriate clause applicable to Government officials who knowingly shelter and defend employees who do, or have admittedly, advocated the overthrow of the United States by armed violence.

Perhaps with some such clause it might be possible to remove from office, or deny future positions of trust to, persons in the United States Information program responsible for the employment of Bertram D. Wolfe, Chief of the Ideological Advisory Staff of the Voice of America.

Bertram Wolfe, from 1919 to at least 1941, advocated, and was affiliated with at least a half dozen revolutionary Socialist and Communist organizations, including the official Communist Party, which advocated overthrow and destruction of the constitutional government by armed violence.

On July 5, 1952, and August 3, 1953, here in this Chamber, I have called attention to Bertram Wolfe's long Communist record and anti-American philosophy, and suggested that a man with his background must certainly have falsified his application for employment with the Voice of America in 1950-51.

Shortly after the adjournment of Congress last August, I confirmed my suspicion that Mr. Wolfe lied in his answer to the question in his Civil Service Commission job application, which reads: "Do you advocate or have you ever advocated, or are you now or have you ever been a member of any organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence?"

Bertram Wolfe boldly admitted that he did advocate just such a philosophy of armed violence, but only until 1929.

Now the truth is that Bertram Wolfe was the leading American teacher of the Marxist-Leninist theory of overthrow of the constitutional Government by violence from 1919 to at least 1941—first, with the Revolutionary Socialists in 1919, then with the American and Mexican Communist Parties from 1919 to 1929, and then with the Jay Lovestone Communist "splinter" organizations from 1929 to 1941. This is documented by Wolfe himself in his many writings and reports on his activities in the Lovestone official publications.

The post-1929 period, which Wolfe excluded from the view of his employers and the Civil Service Commission is his 12-year association with the following Lovestoneite Communist organizations:

Communist Party of the U. S. A., majority group, 1929 to 1932.

Communist Party of the U. S. A., opposition, 1932 to 1937.

Independent Communist Labor League of America, 1937 to 1938.

Independent Labor League of America, 1938 to 1941.

These are the semiunderground Communist organizations which Wolfe excluded from his civil-service application in 1950, and from a Civil Service Review Board in 1952. Under pressure caused by my recent revelations, and questioning by officials of USIA, Wolfe finally acknowledged for the first time, on August 25, 1953, that he retained his basic sympathy for communism until 1939, when his thinking finally underwent a change.

I will prove later in a review of Wolfe's writings and affiliations with the Lovestoneite Communists that even this belated admission of Communist sympathies after 1929 is a gross misrepresentation of his post-1929 activities, but first let us consider for a moment why Wolfe falsely stated to the Civil Service Commission that his advocacy of violent armed overthrow of the United States Government ended in 1929.

For nearly a decade Wolfe had capitalized on the legend that he had resigned from the Communist Party in 1929 and renounced Communism thereafter. As America went through successive stages of anti-Hitlerism and anti-Stalinism, Wolfe's writings on the latter subject developed an additional legend, that he was strongly anti-Communist.

Actually Wolfe did not resign from the Communist Party nor renounce communism in 1929. He and the rest of the Lovestoneites were expelled from their party positions and membership because of their zealous communism and ultra-Marxist-Leninist line of revolutionary international socialism-communism.

From 1929 to 1941, Wolfe and the Lovestoneites fought an international conflict with the Kremlin for control of Communism, and for immediate armed overthrow, not only of the American Government, but of all other governments founded on the principle of the constitutional-parliamentary system. The Lovestoneites wanted immediate destruction of all vestiges of national patriotism and the establishment of socialist federation governed by the philosophy of Karl Marx.

If there be among us any who have any doubts as to what would happen to our religious, political, and labor institutions, as well as countless other American traditions, I refer them to the manifesto of the left-wing revolutionary Socialists, which Wolfe, as a council member of that group, helped draft in 1919. This was the organization which collaborated with Lenin in 1919 to create the Communist International and the first American Communist Party. The story of the left-wing Socialists, their manifesto, and its offspring, the Communist Party, is presented in detail in the pamphlet *Organized Communism in the United States*, published in 1953 by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The record of Wolfe's key role in the revolutionary Socialist-Communist organizations, as well as documented evidence of Wolfe's 1929-to-1941 leadership in the Lovestone Communists, was brought to the attention of Mr. Theodore Streibert, Director of the International Information Agency, parent organization of the Voice of America.

Mr. Streibert's response, I am sorry to report, has been to turn heaven and earth to condone Wolfe's falsification of his civil-service application form, and to defend him as a loyal American engaged in a fight against international communism.

Mr. Chairman, what manner of reasoning have our Government leaders adopted, which pictures a man as a loyal American who, for at least 22 years, and right up to the time he was 45 years old, advocated and engaged in an international conspiracy to overthrow and destroy the very foundations of our Government?

This line of reasoning Mr. Streibert has followed in his defense of Wolfe, is a reflection, I think, of an information program which, for the past several years, has emphasized anticommunism without a clear realization of the fundamental alien Marxist philosophies which gave birth to communism. I think, too, that Mr. Streibert's reaction highlights the lack of understanding of, or lack of conviction in, the distinctive and revered features of the American system.

Even allowing for a possible renunciation of communism, which certainly is not evident in Bertram Wolfe's case, I cannot reconcile the appointment of such an admitted enemy of our American traditions to the key ideological policy post in the Voice of America.

To defend Wolfe's falsifications and to retain this alien philosopher in a position in which he has influenced the press, radio, and publication output of America's information and public relations, is beyond belief.

Perhaps a few persons in top positions in Government fear embarrassment over disclosure of their ignorance and negligence in employing Bertram Wolfe. But, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to destroy the Communist menace and weed out the persons who seek to overthrow and destroy the Government by armed violence, then we must start with persons, like Wolfe, who formulated the doctrine and put it into practice.

President Eisenhower came into the White House with a mandate from the people to clean up the mess in Washington. Certainly no man is more above reproach nor more sincere in his intention to preserve American heritages and to give us and the world a positive program based on those heritages.

Bertram Wolfe is the very symbol of the deep-rooted philosophies and personalities which the President inherited and which have defied his first year's efforts to unravel. Even men like Streibert, whom Eisenhower entrusted to the cleanup task, have succumbed to the insidious influence of the holdovers. Streibert failed to use the mandate given him by Congress in August to weed out Wolfe or the inestimable number of confederates and sympathizers in the agency.

From my study of the Wolfe case, I am convinced that there are countless numbers of disciples of Wolfe and the Lovestone Communists in Government today. They have not been touched by the many programs directed toward eradication of official Communist Party members from Government. In fact, the very emphasis on anti-Stalinism and

anti-"totalitarian" communism has provided the very avenue for their infiltration of Government, and non-Government organizations, by these Lovestone Communists. These original Communists—the Lovestoneites—were fighting Stalin and his diversion from the most radical International Revolutionary Socialist-Communist doctrine long before America's awakening to the menace of Stalin Russia.

But the Lovestoneites have been fighting Stalin and Stalin Russia as a political adversary in the world of communism, and not as an ally in the American ideological struggle against the overthrow and destruction of the Judo-Greco-Christian society's traditions.

Allow me now, Mr. Chairman, to highlight the philosophy and activities of the Lovestone Communists up to the time of their disbandment in 1941. It is a factual study assembled from writings of the Lovestoneites and contemporary works on international socialism-communism. Every thoughtful American, no matter what his religious or political or labor affiliation may be, should acquaint himself with the activities of this group; for it was from this group that bolshevism and communism were spawned, and it is this group which played a key role in the formation of foreign policies, which have neither defeated communism as a political-military-economic organization, nor obstructed the spread of communism-revolutionary socialism as an ideology.

Returning once again to a breakdown of the many millions of dollars requested by the United States Information Agency, I direct your attention to the fact that, despite recommendations by the President's own Committee of Inquiry, and by the Senate Subcommittee on Overseas Information Programs to the contrary, it is proposed that we spend \$970,000 in the next year for the maintenance of a newspaper in West Germany called the *Neuzeitung*. All experts who have surveyed the situation in Germany are agreed that this is a useless expenditure, in view of the existence of German anti-Communist newspapers which are finding their way behind the Iron Curtain. In short, we are proposing here to continue, and compound, an error of the past, namely, the continuation of the most extensive and most expensive information program in the world in Germany, where communism has never gained a foothold in the more than a century since Marx proposed his revolutionary theories in that country.

The personnel requirements are estimated at approximately 900 Americans and more than 5,000 indigenous personnel in Europe. On a world-wide basis, USIA presently has 255 posts located in 85 countries. I submit that the wise course of action, at this time, is to reduce the size of USIA substantially, thus giving authority to its director to rid himself of ineffectives, and to prove the ability of the agency to meet and defeat international communism in those areas where the agency now operates. Once they have demonstrated their ability, it would be possible for the Congress gradually to increase the amount of money

available to USIA, but only on a basis of proven performance. Such performance is not now satisfactory, and has not been in the past.

USIA, instead of implementing United States policy, is apparently setting itself up as another diplomatic service. On the record—and it is a record which they have submitted to this Congress in justification for the present budget request—USIA is becoming another State Department. They have asked for diplomatic passports. They are unable to reduce personnel requirements below 11,500 persons. No cognizance has been taken of the existence of other information services sponsored by private funds, such as Radio Free Europe, Radio Free Asia. No notice whatever is taken of the anti-Communist services of the other free governments, such as the British Empire, operating in the same areas. In Manila, for example—certainly the very heart of the free world in Asia, and with a magnificent record of the Philippines' fight against communism—we are presently operating a \$400,000 printing plant. We are asked to provide \$2½ million for a production center in Paris—primarily to produce films which could be produced cheaper and better right here—which would provide handouts for news centers which have their own news-gathering facilities and are staffed by enormous numbers of Americans who compound a situation of confusion that is already chaotic.

We have increased, in this budget, the amounts of money for other motion-picture productions to a total of nearly \$7 million. This, despite the availability of pro-American motion pictures, without cost to the Government, from private industry and from the motion-picture industry itself.

In the past 5 years, the American taxpayer has paid out one-half billion dollars for global-information programs and, in those 5 years, communism has won the battle on all propaganda fronts. USIA operates information centers throughout the world, which receive daily handouts prepared in the United States at one of the production centers which, if used at all, would be questionable, but which, by their disuse and misuse, are downright extravagance.

As another example, take the matter of travel in Germany. It is difficult to see how the 173 Americans, assigned to Public Affairs of the High Commissioner's office, could expend an estimated \$239,952 for travel. It is equally difficult to understand how 5 Americans and 669 Germans are required for the *Neuzeitung* newspaper, while only 1 American and 7 Germans are provided for the publication of what is supposed to be our principal cultural publication (the magazine *Der Monat*); not even why 13 Americans and 622 Germans are required for the operation of radio programs in Germany. In its continued justification for this enormous budget, USIA claims, "especially in the film, pamphlet, and library fields, are aimed at the refugee camps in West Germany, breeding places for malcontents and socially and economically unstable elements." I am glad to see this, because it was reported by

congressional committees a year ago that, in these refugee camps, no effort was being made by the United States Government to indoctrinate and orientate refugees. However, I question whether United States personnel and money can do a better job among these refugees than the vigorous West Germans themselves, who have integrated the one-half million refugees in their economy in the past year. This seems to me to be the most effective anti-Communist propaganda effort.

Mr. Chairman, I could take the rest of my time here today to invite the attention of my colleagues in the House to case after case in the proposed budget even more glaring than those which I have cited today. It should not be necessary for me to do this, and it would not be necessary had this budget been carefully examined by the director of USIA himself. I feel sure that had he done so and not accepted the estimates of the Truman-Acheson appointed subordinates in his office, he himself, would have arrived at a figure at least 30 percent under that which he proposed. I say again that if the caliber of personnel in USIA were commensurate with the amount of funds for which they asked, and if the work of USIA reflected true value for each tax dollar so carelessly allocated, no Member of the Congress would fail to give his wholehearted support to such requests. The fact that we do not have an effective overseas program is demonstrated by the success of the Soviet international propaganda effort in the Far East, in Italy, and in the satellite countries of western Europe. It is not enough merely to irritate the Communist conspiracy in our approach to the program of international information; it is not enough to devote millions of dollars to this effort. What is needed is a program and a policy directly implementing United States policies, and loyal to the present administration and its aims and purposes abroad. In the International Press Service—a key agency with many high-ranking and high-salaried employees—12 of the 14 branch chiefs and assistants are nonveteran holdovers of the old Office of War Information. It should be self-evident that examples like these are of themselves enough to make us pause in approving this budget. There are presently 973 employees in the Voice of America in New York City. It must be assumed that most of these fall into the category which I have just described. How can we possibly expect these people without experience in information media—other than the OWI—to carry out the present policy of this Government? How can we expect these people, reared in an era of boondoggling and give-away foreign-aid programs to prepare a budget aimed at the effective reduction of costs? Last, but most important, how can we expect these people, with their left-wing slant (and left-wing appointed), effectively to oppose international communism? The answer is self-evident, and it lies in a here-and-now reduction of taxpayers' dollars to a point where those people who line up on March 15th to pay for this international effort have some assurance that their

dollars are indeed to protect and further the interests of the United States.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. Chairman, sometimes I think we are unable to see the forest for the trees.

We are in a cold war, a new type of war, but it is no less venomous, no less deadly, than a shooting war. We have been in that cold war for 7 years and there is nothing to indicate we are approaching the end.

In this war, propaganda has been one of the principal weapons used. It is one of the principal weapons available. I do not have to tell any Member of this House that the Communists have used propaganda to great advantage. They have used it with such telling effect that a great many of the so-called neutral peoples of the world today do not know whether we are right or whether the Reds are right.

You can never have a better commentary on the effectiveness of propaganda than that. We know who is right but our propaganda has not convinced others. Now it is proposed that we, to all effects and purposes, abandon our propaganda efforts, close down shop, and abandon any effective efforts to tell our story to the world. That is what this amendment would do.

Look around a little; make some inquiry; try to find out just what has been done by the information services before you take such a foolish step. You will find when you do that the information services are among our main defenses today. They are America's counterweapons to the Red propaganda that has been used with such telling effect during these past 7 years that we have been engaged in a cold war.

Of course, we do not agree with all the things the information services have done. They have done some foolish things. But I do not believe in shooting a horse just because he stumbles once or twice. We still can get a lot of work out of that horse. We still need him. We need the information services. We need them on a much bigger scale than they can operate under this bill that is before us now.

The facts are that the Reds are spending many dollars for every dollar that we spend in propaganda, yet ours has been very effective. The information services are doing a lot of good. I have seen their work; I have seen some of the effects of it.

Last fall, I was privileged to participate in an inspection trip of several different Government installations in Western Europe as a member of the Appropriations Committee. In the course of this trip, I observed a number of the operations of the United States Information Agency and the effect on these operations of the deep cuts made last summer in the appropriations for the overseas information program.

There is no question these contractions worked serious hardship on some of the Agency's operations. For example, the reduction in funds caused the elimination of some essential personnel, forcing the Agency to adopt an un-

economic level of operations in some phases of its work.

Therefore, from my own observations, I would say that the increased funds being requested by the President are necessary if the Agency is to operate at a minimum reasonable level of operations. In no sense can this be labeled a request for an expanded program.

Critics will ask, of course, can we appropriate the funds requested with the confidence that they will be spent effectively? From personal observation, again, I would say, yes, emphatically.

I have found it interesting, for example, to observe the contrast between the effectiveness of American and Soviet information activities in Austria. In Vienna, the Soviets have a very elaborate information center on which they spend an estimated \$25 million annually. This is many times the amount the United States has to spend on its center in Vienna. Yet, by actual count, the Reds have an average of 400 visitors to their information center daily, in contrast to our average of 3,000.

And on visits to both these centers, I was amazed at the enthusiastic quest for information at the American center, contrasted with the indifference of groups who wander in and out of the Soviet center.

Another operation which impressed me was the Voice of America's radio center at Munich, Germany. This center originates programs and also relays VOA short-wave broadcasts coming from the United States. It has a key role in that part of our whole broadcasting effort aimed at the captive peoples behind the iron curtain.

The Munich center is a good example of the important recent trend in our world-wide radio operations toward locally broadcast programs. In these radio operations, we are relying less and less on long-distance short-wave broadcasts which are relatively difficult to receive. Instead, we are placing more and more programs on local stations or networks abroad or broadcasting or relaying programs from stations of our own located close to the potential audience. In this way, we are able to reach many more people than by short-wave transmission alone.

The operations of the Munich center were recently strengthened by the addition of a powerful new million-watt transmitter, one of three placed in operation around the world by VOA last summer. These transmitters are the most powerful in the world. They help greatly to overcome Soviet jamming, and reach audiences that formerly were out of range.

The new Munich transmitter, interestingly enough, is on the same wavelength as the most powerful Soviet station in Moscow. Its operation has driven the output of this Soviet station back to about 200 miles from Moscow. As a result, if the Russians try to jam our incoming signal, they only succeed in jamming their own broadcasts in the area as well.

I was also very much impressed by the local broadcasting we are doing in Austria over the Red-White-Red network. The programs of this network are popu-

lar in Austria. It also helps meet the daily need for information of captive peoples behind the curtain.

Having observed our broadcasting operations at Munich and in Austria, I was particularly interested in an item which appeared recently in the press regarding the effectiveness of our broadcasts to some of the Iron Curtain countries.

An independent study has just been completed of the reactions of 110 young refugees to western radio programs. In this study, it was found that the most popular western station was the Voice of America. Second, was the British Broadcasting Corp., and, third, Radio Free Europe. These young refugees, interviewed over a year period, comprised 13 nationalities and had escaped from 8 different countries.

Thus, my confidence in our overseas information program derives partially from these recent personal observations of several of its operations.

I would not venture to suggest, however, that you support the President's request merely on the basis of these observations, for there have been important changes in the whole information program in the past several months which you must also take into account.

You will recall that the deep cuts made in the 1954 appropriation for this program were justified largely on the grounds that the program was badly in need of a thorough shakeup.

The past 6 months have brought such a shakeup. Substantial changes have been made in both the organization and methods of administration of the program:

All nonmilitary overseas information programs have now been consolidated in the new United States Information Agency.

The new Agency has been given a new mission and concept of operation by the President upon the advice of the National Security Council. This new mission stresses the interests and goals we share with other peoples. In carrying out this mission, emphasis is placed on objective, factual news reporting. Both the new mission and the emphasis on factual reporting have received considerable acclaim in the editorial pages of the American press.

Better coordination of our information programs with the other policies and actions of our Government has been achieved through the establishment of the Operations Coordinating Board—a unit of the National Security Council.

In its operations, the information program is now concentrating on fewer objectives in each country abroad. By this means, better use is being made of the resources available to the program.

A number of steps have been taken to achieve the decentralization of overseas operations called for by the Congress and other groups over the past several years.

The Director has also reported that the authority granted him by the Congress in the current fiscal year to remove incompetent employees in some categories has been used to improve the overall efficiency of the Agency. Likewise, according to the Director, all persons

deemed security risks have been removed.

Several new executives—many of them from private industry—have been brought into the top staff of the Agency.

Increased emphasis has been placed on bringing the skills and resources of private groups into our whole overseas information effort.

This is an impressive list of changes. These changes have gone a long way toward meeting the major criticisms which have been made against the program.

In this connection, I would like to commend to your attention the recent comments of two important groups which have been critical of the program in the past—the Hickenlooper committee and the United States Advisory Commission on Information, made up of a number of distinguished private citizens.

Appraising the first 6 months' operations of the new United States Information Agency, the Hickenlooper committee said this in its final report, dated February 1954:

There has been improvement in the operation of the information program during the past 6 months. * * * Many shortcomings remain and there is, as there always will be, room for improvement. It does appear, however, that a solid foundation for further progress has been laid. Many new policies have been initiated during the past 6 months and these should bear fruit as they take firmer hold and permeate the entire organization.

In a report also published this month, covering the same period of operations, the United States Advisory Commission on Information said this:

In our judgment the new agency is off to a good start. * * * While it is altogether too early to judge the results of its work, yet its efforts reflect an honest and intelligent effort to comply with the wishes of the new administration and of the 83d Congress for a bold, new type of program. For this effort we feel it deserves, for the time being at least, the sympathetic support of the executive and legislative branches of our Government, private industry, and the general public.

Considering these facts, I feel that even those who have been most severely critical of this program in the past can support with confidence the comparatively modest increase being requested by the President.

Certainly the amount being requested is not too great considering the magnitude of the problems we face overseas.

There is little question that these overseas information programs are essential to our national security. We cannot possibly do without them so long as Communist imperialism stalks the earth and continues to menace peace and freedom everywhere.

The menace from Communist propaganda is fully as great as from their armies.

The Communist imperialists have used propaganda as a tool of conquest with telling effect.

And they have succeeded in convincing millions of people in many parts of the world that we, the Americans, are bent on imperialist aggression.

Therefore, it is not enough in the world today for us merely to do the right thing. We must also convince others we are doing right—convince them that our actions help them achieve their legitimate goals and that we do not threaten them in any way.

And we must accomplish this difficult job of persuasion in the face of a Soviet propaganda machine which presses on relentlessly and tirelessly—sowing hatred, suspicion, and distrust—seeking to tear down everything we have sought to build, seeking to twist the face of a friend so it appears as the face of an aggressor.

This Soviet propaganda machine has enormous proportions. There is no way of getting an accurate estimate of how much the Soviet and its satellites spend on external propaganda. However, the most recent estimates are that on both internal and external propaganda the Soviet Union spent \$1,160,000,000 on direct propaganda activities in 1953. Communist China budgeted an even larger amount for propaganda in 1953—\$1,400,000,000. Certainly, it is obvious that on activities comparable to those conducted by the United States Information Agency the Communist nations are spending many times the \$89 million requested in the President's budget. I, for one, feel that compared with what these amounts must be, the funds requested by the President for the program of the United States Information Agency appear relatively insignificant.

Yet, if the cause of freedom is to triumph, we must succeed in thwarting the aims of this enormous Communist propaganda machine. Let us not overlook the fact that it is possible to lose the war against communism—even if not another shot is fired, not another bomb dropped, not another human being sacrificed in the agony of battle.

In summary, then, I have cited four major reasons why I believe that the Members of this distinguished body should support the comparatively modest increase in funds for the overseas information program requested by the President:

First. Considering the heavy cuts in the 1954 appropriation for the information program, the President's request in effect is not for a true increase, but merely for the restoration of a minimum reasonable level of appropriations.

Second. From my own personal observations of certain USIA operations, I am convinced that the overseas information program by and large is an effective operation meriting the support of this Congress.

Third. Important changes have been made in the program during the past several months which have met nearly all of the criticisms made in the past. Therefore, I believe that even those who have been most critical of the program in the past can now support the President's request with confidence.

Fourth. The global problems we face, and the enormous propaganda machine of the Communists, demand from us an adequate overseas information effort.

Therefore, we must demonstrate that we can face the facts. If we are to win the struggle being waged today for the

minds of men, we must be sure we provide the tools they need to those who fight our battles. We are getting results. We must have these results. It would be a serious mistake to make the cut that is proposed here.

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

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

Mr. BUSBEY. I agree with the gentleman that it is a very important branch of our psychological warfare, but the personnel that has been held over from the prior administration is still there. It is not effective any more. I think the thing to be done is to cut the whole agency by 75 percent of personnel and build it up with the right kind of personnel and give them twice as much money.

Mr. SIKES. Is the gentleman aggrieved simply because his party has not been able to fire everybody acquired from the previous administration? Is that the gentleman's only quarrel with the program?

Mr. BUSBEY. No. It is the caliber of personnel acquired.

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

Mr. Chairman, the pending proposed action of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY], would not only be foolish, but dangerous; dangerous at a time when international tensions are what they are, when we are spending as much as we are for arms and defense against communism all over the world, and at a time when the Soviet Union is spending sums far in excess of this for their vicious untruthful propaganda activities. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is not a member of this subcommittee. Consequently, he did not attend the hearings and listen to the agency's justifications. We know of his record as a hunter of known Communists. He mentioned one here on the floor who Mr. TABER says is no longer connected with the agency.

No Member of this House has been more vigorous in his efforts to have Communists and people who are real security risks summarily thrown out of the Government than the present speaker, the gentleman from New York.

Adoption of the pending amendment would utterly devastate this vitally important program. I have been, I think, as critical of the operation of this program over the years as any Member of the House. Members will recall that one time this agency presented to the subcommittee a supplemental request for \$97.5 million, and the committee unanimously, and the House agreed with us, cut \$90 million out of that request. At that time I was the chairman.

I want the best information agency we can get. I do not believe in their going into frills and activities which are not directed against communism and the Iron Curtain. I do not believe that they should spend a couple of hundred thousand dollars of the taxpayers' money to tell the American public how good they are. That was proposed in this budget, but the committee unanimously cut it out. Why, they are busy down there day after day getting out press releases, telling about this new person added to the

agency and the transfer of this other one. We could save many dollars in stencils and mimeograph paper by discontinuing such nonsense. The time and effort to compose these releases should be directed toward piercing the Iron Curtain. But because I disagree with this activity is no reason to utterly cripple a vital program.

The committee has already taken substantial action in regard to this agency's request when they cut some \$13 million from the amount of the budget estimate. To now reduce the amount further by \$20 million, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] proposes, would be utterly dangerous and unwarranted. I trust the pending amendment will be rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois; one of the few times that I think I have ever opposed an amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. We generally are in accord.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to say now that I am not familiar with the particular case that the gentleman from Illinois has discussed. However, I am seriously concerned with the cut that he has suggested.

As the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has said, I have been one of the severe critics of the United States Information Agency and in the past have taken the floor to support substantial cuts, to remove what we felt were unnecessary activities in this agency. But to further cut this program at this time would be taking away from this administration the opportunity to have a proper information service throughout the world.

I wish each Member of the House could have heard the presentation made to our committee by the new Director of the United States Information Service, Mr. Streibert. I am sure that everyone here would have been impressed, as were the members of our committee, that here we had a man to head up this organization qualified to do it from experience in the past in private industry. Mr. Streibert was before the committee for 4 days. Here is a man, the head of a new agency, who was able to come in and present himself practically all the testimony before our committee. He has shown himself well advised as to what was going on.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield for a question.

Mr. BUSBEY. I am not disputing the fact that Mr. Streibert is a radio man from the mechanical standpoint, but will the gentleman enlighten the Members as to what qualifications or experience he has had in dealing with the subject of communism? The only reason for spending all this money is to stop and contain communism.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Streibert has had experience in the radio field, the information field, and in administration. You can get any number of people who are investigators of communism, you can get writers who can write, but in

this agency in the past the trouble has been that we have had people who were not familiar with administration, how to run an agency, who were not familiar with the operation of large radio operations. The gentleman has seen the waste, and so have I.

The President himself has taken an interest in the United States Information Service by his reorganization plan. We have gone under the President's request with the bill we have brought to you. We think we have taken out some matters that should not have been in, of which the gentleman from New York spoke, such as propagandizing in this country. If we are going in this cold war to meet the Communist threat to the world, we cannot cut this program any further than it has been cut. I will say to the House as I did a year ago, when this agency begins to supply the kind of information service I know the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] wants and the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] and the Members of this House, I for one will vote to increase these appropriations as they make their proof.

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

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

Mr. COUDERT. I take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman on his fine statement and to express my agreement with it and my opposition to this amendment. I happen to have known Mr. Streibert for a good many years. He is a gentleman of the highest character, great ability, and broad experience. If anybody can carry this agency to a successful conclusion he is the man.

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

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

Mr. ROONEY. I thoroughly agree with what has been said here in opposition to the pending amendment by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT]. I believe Mr. Streibert is a highly intelligent, capable gentleman trying to do a good job. I disagree with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] with regard to him. I do not know how many times the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] has met him, but he appeared before this committee for 4 or 5 full days, from early in the morning until late in the evening, and every member of the committee had a chance to observe the sort of gentleman he is.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] has expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I refer the attention of the gentleman to page

385 of the hearings where the gentleman himself [Mr. Bow] stated:

So that I may be sure I am right on this, the office which Mr. Washburn fills is new to the Service; Mr. Dickey is new, Mr. Withrow, Mr. Smith, Mr. Logan, Mr. Cook, and Mr. Berding, are all new?

Is the gentleman bringing out the fact that the new top executives in this agency are all new people and are not continuations of old personnel?

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman. Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. I hope the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] will read my extension of remarks in the RECORD about the replacement of personnel, and then he will be convinced that less of the old personnel have been replaced in this agency than in any other agency of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amount which the committee is allowing for this particular type of work. I think our efforts to get behind the Iron Curtain are excellent, and while they are getting results, I think we ought to support these efforts and support them very enthusiastically. There is one part of the program, however, which does not meet my approval. I think it is wrong. I have taken this matter up with the State Department. Thus far, I have gotten rather meager results. I refer to the arrangements which we have in many instances to permit foreign legations in the United States to propagandize our people in return for which we hope to get a peep at what is going on behind the Iron Curtain. I think that this arrangement to let these people use our facilities for communism is all wrong. For instance, up until last December, I believe it was, we allowed the Rumanian Legation to publicize what was called the Rumanian News, a propaganda magazine, in the United States. These people had the right under a reciprocal arrangement to release as many copies of this publication and as often as they wanted to, as I understand it, throughout the United States to propagandize our people. It was pure and simple communistic propaganda given to our people for the purpose of converting them to the cause of communism. I am glad to say that the Department of State, when this matter was called to its attention, acted quickly and stopped this publication. I understood then that the Rumanian News was the last publication of that sort which was being permitted to be circulated in the United States. I rather breathed a sigh of relief and thought, "Well, this thing is all over." The other day, however, Mr. Chairman, I was given a copy of a booklet that is called the New Hungary.

New Hungary is a publication printed by the Legation here in Washington from the Iron Curtain country of Hungary. It is spread throughout the United States by use of our mail. It is

being mailed out to my district in Louisiana. It is being mailed out to your districts. It is being mailed largely to libraries and organizations. I think that it is a reprehensible situation that allows these Iron Curtain countries to publicize their Communist propaganda and to use our United States mails, to carry at less than cost this propaganda. Therefore, we are subsidizing the distribution of this publication and permitting it to be sent to our people to read so that they may be converted, if they are so deluded and misguided and benighted as to become Communists. Then, Mr. Chairman, we set up three great committees in the Congress of the United States. Do I have to name them? Everybody knows the names of these three great committees. We have a committee in the House of Representatives. I am proud of the fact that I voted to organize that committee originally when it was created. We have these committees set up here for the purpose of running down those people who believe in communism. We have, on the other hand, an arrangement under which we agree to carry Iron Curtain communistic propaganda publications printed and edited by the legations here in Washington and send it throughout the country for the express objective of creating communism in our land. I do not think anybody can exactly harmonize that situation. You cannot say in one breath that we want to locate these people who fight our Government, and we want to turn the searchlight of publicity on them, and that we want to put them into jail and yet at the same time we subsidize the carrying of their publications throughout the United States of America.

I am against this arrangement just as violently as a man can be against communism. I think it should be stopped, and I so told the State Department, and I have letters in my office defending this program, from the State Department—not from the leftover members in the State Department, but the Assistant Secretary of State who is there at this hour, functioning, defending that type of practice.

I do not think any Member of the House of Representatives is going to defend that type of practice of permitting those people to communize the people of the United States by using our mails as a subsidy for their propaganda.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] has expired.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I will not take the entire 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that while I agree with what I think is the major sentiment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY], namely, that the VOA program should be hard hitting and anti-Communist, I regret to say that I disagree with the gentleman's amendment to cut the appropriation. I think the program is becoming more anti-Communist, and getting away from the neutral position in which it has been. Undoubtedly, there is room for improvement. But the top men of the VOA are

good and dedicated men, and they mean to formulate a program to oppose the vicious lies of the Communists. If we are going to oppose the Communist line, we must have an effective anti-Communist line. Some people disdain the term "anti-Communist." But communism is essentially evil. One cannot disdain being "antievil."

I have had the privilege of associating myself with the gentleman from Illinois in hearings before our special committee to investigate the Soviet seizure of the Baltics and he and others have brought out some hard-hitting anti-Communist facts. These hearings have been used over the Voice of America, and at least 14 times Red radios from Moscow and elsewhere behind the Iron Curtain have hit back at us, indicating that we are drawing some blood. The Voice of America has cooperated with us very well, having beamed our hearing each day. The proof that the VOA has been effective with our hearings is the vicious Communist counterattack.

One further thing I would like to point out is some of the printed type of Soviet propaganda that we must hit at. I have in my hand a Soviet textbook for school-children printed in Moscow to be used in the captive nations, to educate the children of the captive nations. Here is a little pamphlet to the same effect. This textbook is designed to educate the children in the captive nations along the Communist line. This literature is spread into the captive nations by the millions and we must counteract it with literature of the free world. Otherwise, the new generation growing up in the captive nations will be fanatical Communists anxious to fight the West.

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

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I wish to assure the gentleman from Wisconsin I do not want to destroy anything in the information program that is doing a good job. I want to strengthen that. I just want to get rid of the other part of the program that is not doing as good a job as some people around the country think they are doing. If they are given a little cut we might get rid of some of those people and be able to hire some people who are better qualified to make the program more effective. I am not against the program.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I am happy to have the gentleman's statement that he is not against the program.

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

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. It seems that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] wants to strengthen the activity by cutting it to the extent of \$20 million. It reminds me of the way President Eisenhower strengthened the Air Force; he took \$5 billion away from them.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I will say to the gentleman from New York, I would rather have no program than a bad program or a neutral program. I think we should have a hard-hitting,

anti-Communist program. I think we are moving in that direction, and the faster we do it the better.

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

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Will the gentleman agree that the agency which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] was talking about a few minutes ago, when he was referring to the State Department USIS, now is separated from that agency, and is not the one he was referring to?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I so understood. I did not think it referred to the Voice of America in any respect whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, as one Member I must vigorously protest the sharp cut made in the appropriation for the United States Information Agency, over \$13 million under the budget estimate. At a time when it is estimated that the Communists are spending the equivalent of \$1,500,000,000 in this very field and when we are locked in a mortal struggle with them in Europe, Asia, and the Americas it seems inconceivable that we would not go all out in our own education and information program. All the arguments which have heretofore been made against this agency have now been answered. It has a directive from no less than the National Security Council, it is magnificently staffed, it has trimmed its employees by one-third, its scripts and presentation are hard hitting, factual and direct. Now that the agency has been reorganized and consolidated, answering all the complaints of before, we must back it in a full program. This is an essential third of the fight against communism, the other two parts being military and economic. To say that the amount granted is the same as last year is not an answer because last year the program was in reorganization and was still being held down as a changeover from the previous administration and in view of a major move from New York to Washington and other factors. I recognize the situation before the House and shall do all I can to get this amount materially increased in the other body and in conference.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question in my mind but what the Voice of America today is a very much better instrument than it was a year ago, 2 years ago, or 3 years ago. I think, however, that we still overestimate its value. I was talking to a refugee from behind the Iron Curtain just a short time ago, and I asked him about the effectiveness of the Voice of America behind the Iron Curtain. He said: "You know, those of us who do listen to it cannot help but get smiles on our faces when we hear the

Americans talk about how bad communism is, because we have it, we live under it, we know how dastardly it is, we are slaves of it; and it is rather ironical to have a country like America tell us how bad it is." Still I feel that the Voice of America should carry on, but I think that it will be ineffective and it will fail in its purpose if we do not implement what we hope to carry out by the Voice of America.

What we intend to do by the Voice of America is to discourage those people behind the Iron Curtain from accepting the doctrine of communism, to run away from communism, desert if they possibly can; and they are not deserting necessarily because they listen to the Voice of America but because they despise communism; and they are deserting by the hundreds every day. The point I am making is that when they carry out our suggestion and desert communism and come over to our side there is no provision or security for them. I would like to give you the story of three young men who were fliers, crack fliers, expert fliers in their respective countries dominated by the Communists. They came over to the United States of America at our suggestion hoping that they could join the United States Air Force and help fight godless communism throughout the world. When they came over to America they were interrogated for hours and weeks and months, and when the various agencies of our Government got all the information from them they could they were cast out into the street. In other words they could not become members of the United States Air Force or any air force for that matter to fight for their homeland.

I think there are two agencies of our Government that should work hand in hand: No. 1, the Voice of America should be continued, but we should implement the Voice of America and do something and carry through when these people follow our suggestion and desert. I would like to say in that respect that when we passed the mutual security bill some time ago, I think it was about 3 years ago, this Congress in its wisdom provided \$100 million which is already appropriated, to take care of these people who desert from behind the Iron Curtain and give them an opportunity to do something respectable, to fight back for their homelands.

Much to my regret, not one dime of that \$100 million that this Congress in its wisdom and far in advance of those in charge of our security has been spent. This Congress provided \$100 million to take care of those people who came from behind the Iron Curtain, but not a dollar of that money has been used for that purpose.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that this spending of \$78 million or \$79 million for the Voice of America asking these people to desert and come over to our side—and they are doing it in droves—will do no good unless we also get these people in charge of our security and our defense to use the \$100 million that this Congress in its wisdom provided to take care of those people so that they could take jobs, be responsible, and have jobs of responsibility, and, most of all, be given

the opportunity to fight back for their homeland. This thing is going to boom-erang because we are getting so many refugees now that they are beginning to ask questions. I might mention the Czech flier who escaped some months ago. He is now in the United States of America. After he has given all the information to the various agencies of our Government that he possibly could he has been refused entry into the United States Air Force and is now simply cast upon the streets, looking for a place to hang his hat. There are thousands of refugees in the same hopeless predicament. Those boys are going to begin to ask questions. They are going to begin to say: "Well, did we do the right thing? Over there we were fliers, we were lieutenants, and even if we were slaves, at least we had jobs, whereas here in the United States of America, where we hoped that we may get some opportunity to fight back for our homeland, that opportunity is denied us."

I say to you that unless we make provision for those people who escape as the result of our propaganda we should cut out the propaganda because, in my judgment, it is not right to ask people to expose themselves and then deny them an opportunity to fight for their homeland.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who know the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] realize that he is just as heartily in favor of this program as anyone can be. All he is trying to do is to call to the attention of the House and to some of those who have been trying to carry it on is to suggest that we get more competent individuals to handle it. That when an individual has been shown to be a Red or perhaps if he is just pink, he be removed from the service so a better, more competent man may take over.

In the last few days we have seen plenty in the papers about a statement which came from the President, suggesting that while he as much as anyone would fight communism as vigorously as anyone no matter where it cropped up, he wanted witnesses in congressional hearings treated courteously. We had a statement from a Member of the other body, whose home is in Wisconsin, in reference to how we should go about exposing communism and Communists. He insists that he treats witnesses fairly, though he may have made a mistake a few days ago. Of course, while some of us think that the gentleman from Wisconsin may have been a little hasty in expressing his opinion the other day—we all know the bitter opposition to his actions, since he is doing a worthwhile job which no one else seemed as capable of doing—we know the Army was absolutely wrong in following the course which it did with reference to the individual the gentleman from Wisconsin was talking about. The President so states.

To show that the Army like some of the rest of us can be off on the wrong foot, let me call your attention to this little book. And what happened to it. Here it is. It is John Roy Carlson's

Under Cover. Now that was put out in 1943 and it names and charges 41 Members of the House as well as 20 Members of the Senate with subversive activities. There were 4 Members of the House from Michigan named in the group.

What does it do? What was its purpose? Well, it just tries to tell the people of the country that there were subversives among Members of the House, naming them. It was a deliberate lying attempt to destroy politically, to liquidate, if you please, conservative Members of Congress. Let me give you a sample of the logic of John Roy Carlson.

Let me quote from page 200 about one Member of the House. He said there were four from Michigan. Here is an example. This is what he wrote about Mr. DONDERO, the gentleman from Detroit. If there ever was a man in the House who was and is after Communists all the time it is and was the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]. No more able, patriotic Member ever came to Congress. What did Carlson and his gang have against him? Why did they cite him as subversive? Referring to a certain published article here is what Carlson—and that is but one of the several aliases he used—Carlson wrote:

And one by Congressman GEORGE A. DONDERO, is titled "United States Never Was a Democracy."

Most people know it is not—we know that it is a representative republic.

What do you know about that? The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] said that this was a republican form of government, as did Benjamin Franklin, yet he is cited by this author as being subversive and his accurate description of our form of government is the proof. What nonsense.

Who put it out? Who gave circulation to this book with its vile, evil, false charges? This is what I am getting at and this is the point I am trying to make. The Army bought copies of the book with its false charges and gave copies to men in the service.

I wrote The Adjutant General on September 14, 1943, and I asked him how many of these books were purchased by the Army with tax dollars and sent out by the Army and whether there was any truth to the report made by a nationally known commentator that 5,000 had been purchased and distributed to forces overseas. He said there was not any truth to that.

But here is what he also wrote me:

This is in further reply to your letter of September 14, 1943, inquiring as to the accuracy of the allegation that the Army has purchased 5,000 copies of the book, Under Cover, for distribution to our soldiers.

Reports from the field just now available to me reveal that, in response to requests emanating from among some 5,500,000 soldiers, a total of 363 copies of this book has been purchased for post libraries from appropriated and nonappropriated funds, and that 107 additional copies are on order.

That was a total of 470 copies of this lying book carrying false charges of a lack of loyalty of 61 Members of Congress that the Army as early as 1943 was buying and making available to the servicemen—false charges which it was

thought might make the fighting men think they were not being supported by the folks at home.

Why did the Army do it? The Army did not do it. It was the act of some—to be charitable—nitwit who wanted to stir up trouble.

Let me read you what Judge Barnes said in Chicago when the house that published Under Cover was sued for libel:

The charges in the book—in the first place, the book is over 500 pages of twaddle—just twaddle, with a few outrageous charges—wholly unfounded charges, of which any citizen—any loyal citizen may very properly complain.

And they charge—I think they charge plaintiff—this book charges the plaintiff with being disloyal, being a Nazi agent, being an enemy of the United States, and being anti-Semitic. And I didn't hear any evidence of the truth of those charges. It wasn't attempted to show that he was a Nazi agent. It wasn't attempted to show that he was an enemy of the country. It was attempted to show that he was anti-Semitic. I didn't see any evidence of that fact.

I think that book was written by a wholly irresponsible person who was willing to say anything for money. I wouldn't believe him on oath, now or at any time hereafter.

I think that book was published by a publisher who was willing to publish anything for money. That is what I think about it. I don't think they made any adequate investigation of the author of that book. If they had they would not publish it unless they cared more for the almighty dollar than they care for human decency. That is the way I feel about it.

And, John Roy Carlson last week was lecturing in Detroit still going around peddling his poison. My point is that we better hunt Communists and communism wherever we find them, even though they may be in the Republican Party. Certainly no executive department—should be a "city of refuge" for either—The President so says and our Wisconsin friend intends—if I understand him—intends to hunt them out—maybe he was a little rough the other day, but, would our leftwing Communists complain so long as they do not want the job, unless of course they prefer they remain hidden.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be reread.

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

There was no objection.
(The Clerk again read the amendment.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

The amendment was rejected.
Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RABAUT: At page 52, after line 19, add the following new section:

"SEC. 604. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any officer or employee of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs

of the Department of State who, for the purposes of the act of August 2, 1939, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1181), shall not be included within the construction of the term 'officer' or 'employee.'

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill; that it changes existing law and requires new and additional duties.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to be heard?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I cite volume VII, Cannon's Precedents, section 1663 and section 1670:

1. Denial of use of an appropriation for payment of salaries of employees of the Department of Agriculture who forecast the price of agricultural products was construed as a proper limitation and in order on an appropriation bill.

The Chairman at that time, March 2, 1928, Allen T. Treadway, of Massachusetts, relied on prior decisions of Chairmen of the Committee of the Whole, Mr. Graham, of Illinois, in 1924, and Mr. Longworth, of Ohio, in 1923, and held such a limitation proper and not subject to point of order.

2. An amendment forbidding payment of salary authorized by law from any part of an appropriation to a designated individual was held to be a limitation and in order on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard?

Mr. TABER. I do, Mr. Chairman. This amendment, Mr. Chairman, refers to the so-called Hatch Act, section 1181, of title V of the Code. It reads as follows:

For the purposes of this section the term "officer" or "employee" shall not be construed to include (1) the President and Vice President of the United States; (2) persons whose compensation is paid from the appropriation for the Office of the President (3) heads and assistant heads of executive departments; (4) officers who are appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who determine policies to be pursued by the United States in its relations with foreign powers or in the nationwide administration of Federal laws. The provisions of the second sentence of this subsection shall not apply to the employees of the Alaska Railroad.

This provision in effect brings about the prohibition of payments to these employees who are not determined to be officers or employees within the provisions of this paragraph of section 118. It requires a determination on the part of some officer before the thing can be effective. For that reason, it requires additional duties to be performed by some officer before it can be effective. Therefore, it is subject to the rule that it requires additional duties, and it is an attempt on the part of the amendment to change and enlarge the provisions of that section.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to be heard further?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, in House Report No. 1365, 82d Congress, relative to H. R. 5678, the McCarran-Walter bill, it is stated on page 36:

The Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, section 104, creates a new organizational setup within the Department of State to administer the issuance of passports and visas. There will be a responsible authority

in the Department of State of rank and power corresponding to the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover—
and the Central Intelligence Agency—

Mr. Dulles—
all of whom are to collaborate in the interests of national security.

Is it the contention of anybody here that we would want, for instance, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover going around the country making political speeches?

The CHAIRMAN. That is just an observation. It does not go to the point of order.

Mr. RABAUT. I know; but I have raised the point of order, Mr. Chairman, and I would like a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

This amendment in brief provides that no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any officer or employee of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs who shall not be included within the construction of the term "officer" or "employee."

It appears to the Chair that the contention of those who make the point of order is answered by this provision in Hinds' Precedents, volume IV, section 3954:

A provision that no part of an appropriation for pay of retired Army officers should go to one receiving pay for services as a civil employee was held to be a limitation.

Likewise we have a similar expression in Cannon's Precedents, volume VII, section 1651, which contains the provision that no part of an appropriation shall be allotted to a beneficiary failing to comply with certain requirements. That provision was held in order as a proper limitation on an appropriation bill. With those two precedents the Chair is constrained to overrule the point of order, and the Chair so rules.

The point of order is overruled.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment to make clear the intent of Congress when it established the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs through the passage of H. R. 5678, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, Public Law 414. There is nothing punitive about this amendment. It in no way refers to prior political activities of the individuals concerned. The State Department has vacillated in its reasoning, but steadily held the conclusion that the Director of the Bureau is not subject to the prohibition against political activity contained in the Hatch Act. The Civil Service Commission has at least informally indicated to the contrary. Such confusion about the nature of this important office should be cleared up. House Report 1365 of the 82d Congress on the bill H. R. 5678 described this authority in the Department of State as having rank and power corresponding to the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Central Intelligence Agency. I am sure no Member of the

House would deem it proper for FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, or the CIA Director, Allen Dulles, to go charging about the country making political speeches in the manner of Mr. McLeod. My amendment makes it perfectly clear that Congress intended these two officials to be in the same category in this respect. Politics is not and should not be the province of these officers to whom we have entrusted the guardianship of the national security. For this reason I present my amendment and hope the House will support it.

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

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.
Mr. JUDD. May I ask if the gentleman made a speech similar to this when the former administrator of the ECA, Mr. Averell Harriman, went about the country making violently partisan political speeches?

Mr. RABAUT. Perhaps it was the prerogative of the gentleman from Minnesota to make a speech at that time.

Mr. JUDD. I would just like to know whether the gentleman from Michigan was as disturbed then about improper political activity by these officers, as he is now?

Mr. RABAUT. I said that I am not making a political football out of this. I will ask the gentleman, does he think it would be a proper thing if J. Edgar Hoover went running around the country making political speeches?

Mr. JUDD. No, I am talking about Averell Harriman.

Mr. RABAUT. That is not the point that I am making here.

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

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.
Mr. PRICE. I think the gentleman might point out that Mr. McLeod and Mr. Averell Harriman did not hold similar positions.

Mr. JUDD. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. PRICE. There is no comparison in the positions.

Mr. JUDD. The position of Averell Harriman is a far more important position and he is sent around the world as the representative of the United States, and yet he made, for example, at Houston, Tex., a violently partisan attack.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. McLeod was a security officer in the Department of State. He was in charge of personnel. I think it would not be fitting in his job to participate in partisan politics.

Mr. JUDD. Do you think it was fitting that Mr. Harriman should do what he did?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I would say to the gentleman your amendment does not limit the boy wonder from Minnesota from going around making speeches, the present ECA administrator who is making partisan speeches. He has the same job. This is an entirely different situation.

Mr. RABAUT. My amendment deals with security officers of the United States, and I do not think there is any-

body in the House of Representatives who ought to be opposed to it.

At this time I should like to read the Hatch Act provision—Title 5, United States Code, section 1181:

For the purposes of this section the term "officer" or "employee" shall not be construed to include (1) the President and Vice President of the United States; (2) persons whose compensation is paid from the appropriation for the office of the President; (3) heads and assistant heads of executive departments; (4) officers who are appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who determine policies to be pursued by the United States in its relations with foreign powers or in the nationwide administration of Federal laws.

This is a clear case. I hope the House will not ascribe a political purpose to this, but look at it from the angle from which it deserves to be looked at, and vote for the amendment.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I do not think it need take very long to state the position of the committee on this amendment. I am pretty sure that every Member of the House understands the character of this amendment, the purpose of this amendment and what is back of it. It is nothing more nor less than another attempt, purely partisan attempt, by the gentlemen on the other side to discredit the State Department, presently under a Republican President and a Republican Secretary of State. There is nothing else to it than that.

Last year these gentlemen attacked and knocked out of a bill, this bill, a provision that they themselves had incorporated for the benefit of Democratic Secretaries of State, to-wit: the power to fire. As soon as we get a Republican President and a Republican Secretary of State, we get the ripper tactics to knock out the very provision that was put in for the benefit of Democratic Secretaries; but it is too good for a Republican Secretary.

Now we have this very curious situation here where there is a ruling as to a relatively minor official of the State Department by the responsible heads—presumably the Secretary himself—that this individual is not subject to the limitations of the Hatch Act. So here comes one of our Members, a Democratic Member, and seeks to reverse, by the action of this House, the administrative determination of that Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, are we going to undertake to manage the State Department, and on our side of the aisle are we going to permit the Democratic minority to manage the State Department while we are sitting in majority on this side? Oh, no, Mr. Chairman. This amendment must be knocked out. It is purely partisan. There is no purpose in it except to injure and discredit the State Department. There is no merit to it. It should be voted down.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] is completely misinterpreting the intent of this amendment. I am sure you will agree with that from his opening statement,

where he said that this is an attempt on the part of the Democrats to discredit the State Department under the present administration. All of the attempted discrediting of the State Department that I have noticed lately has not come from the Democrats. According to the press those people who made Dulles break down and tears come to his eyes during his report on the Berlin Conference were not Democrats. Now about the gentleman from Minnesota comparing this situation to Mr. Averell Harriman—and let me state right here that I am not a great admirer of Mr. Harriman, but the circumstances are not comparable, because Mr. Harriman was holding the position that Mr. Stassen now holds and I do not think there is anyone on this side of the House who wants to gag Mr. Stassen. He is in a position of Cabinet rank and he has a perfect right, as I see it, to go around making any kind of political speech he wants and to defend himself against attacks which are made against him not by Democrats, if you please, but by people who are supposed to be of the same political party that he is.

But the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan is aimed at doing what needs to be done, I do not care whether it is a Republican administration or a Democratic administration, security officers should be kept from engaging in politics, and I think it especially needs to be done, since it has been proved conclusively that some of them did not tell the truth, will not tell the truth, and do not know the truth when they see it.

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

Mr. Chairman, it would have been much better if the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] had confined himself to the amendment and not extended his remarks to the full extent that he did. I am going to talk on the broader implications involved in the gentleman's remarks rather than discuss the amendment itself.

I happen to occupy a position of leadership in the Democratic Party. For 10 out of the last 13 years I was the majority leader of this House, and now I am the Democratic whip. I have attended many important conferences during the past year. I have seen no Democrat who criticized or embarrassed Secretary Dulles or President Eisenhower. We have discussed merits but never engaged in personalities.

I was present at the meeting that took place when Secretary Dulles returned from his hard ordeal in Berlin. I could visualize what he had gone through by asking myself: "JOHN McCORMACK, suppose you were Secretary of State; what would have been your thoughts? What would have been the ordeal you went through, knowing the situation of the world as it is today?"

There were no Democrats who criticized Secretary Dulles, I am informing the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT]—and I am not attributing his remarks to any other one of my Republican friends, I want that distinctly understood—this is the time to withhold

many words. There is the courage of action, but there is also the courage of silence. Sometimes it takes a lot of courage to be silent, and this is the time when we should stop, look, and listen, and ponder long before we make intemperate attacks upon either of the great political parties as such.

I have not seen any Democrat make any critical statement about Secretary Dulles in relation to the Berlin conference. I made a few guarded remarks yesterday, but no criticism. I felt that under the circumstances he did the best he could, not what he wanted to do, but under the circumstances he did the best he could so far as the Berlin conference is concerned; that he was faced with a probable blowup unless he agreed to the Geneva conference. I could see that. He had the situation in Indochina confronting him as well as other countries; and also the division of public opinion in other countries friendly to us, in some of which the Communist forces are very strong. I could see all of that. I did not necessarily have to agree with the Secretary to refrain from criticizing him and making his job more onerous.

So when the statement is made, and I assume it does not represent the Republican view, that the Democrats are trying to injure the State Department because of the offering of this amendment by the gentleman from Michigan, that statement is completely inconsistent with the facts.

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

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

Mr. COUDERT. If the gentleman is so well satisfied with the Secretary of State—

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not say that, did I? Do not put into my mouth words I did not say.

Mr. COUDERT. Well, I was merely attempting to construe what the gentleman meant.

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not say I was satisfied with him. Do not put into my mouth words. The gentleman is raising another question he did not raise previously because the gentleman is trying to raise the question whether or not I am satisfied. I am not talking on the question of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. I specifically say I am not dissatisfied yet.

Mr. COUDERT. If the gentleman is not dissatisfied with the conduct of foreign affairs by the Secretary of State—

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not say that. I said I am not dissatisfied yet with the Secretary of State. The gentleman says "conduct of foreign affairs." Do not put into my mouth words I did not say. My friend from New York is very adroit, and the gentleman from Massachusetts may be lacking in mental ability, but the gentleman from Massachusetts is capable of understanding some things the gentleman from New York says; furthermore to a slight extent the gentleman from Massachusetts can penetrate his mind.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, but we have been at this a considerable time and there are three other matters we want to dispose of. I am going to make a suggestion.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I am not going to object.

Mr. McCORMACK. I withdraw my request, Mr. Chairman, because I have said all I intended to say and I think a prolongation of it would not be for the best interests of the situation because the gentleman from New York is trying to be, kindly and friendly to say the least, provocative.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. TABER. Is it an amendment to the pending amendment?

Mr. ROONEY. Oh, no. It is another amendment.

Mr. TABER. I only asked unanimous consent with reference to this particular amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object in order to make a statement, and I am certainly not going to object, I note at the desk there are 3 amendments. It occurred to me that after we have disposed of the pending amendment we could have a limitation of 30 minutes, which will give 5 minutes to a side on each of the amendments, then we can dispose of this matter.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I want 5 minutes to ask certain questions in reference to the interpretation of some language in the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Then it would have to be 35 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder just exactly what will be in the minds of the Members as they approach this vote. This is a proposed limitation on an appropriation bill which would prevent the payment of salary to the holder of a certain position who is legally in office.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I do not think that is true.

Mr. TABER. I am sorry if the gentleman thinks so. I think he ought to read it.

Mr. RABAUT. The amendment simply says that he comes under the Hatch Act.

Mr. TABER. Well, if that is it, the point of order should have been sustained.

Mr. RABAUT. It was not sustained, and it is so.

Mr. TABER. If it is so, the gentleman is now admitting that his amendment is entirely out of order.

Mr. RABAUT. No; I am not admitting my amendment is entirely out of order.

Mr. TABER. Well, I do not see any other possible construction.

Mr. RABAUT. The only thing it does is stop him from making speeches. It lets him hold his position as a security officer.

Mr. TABER. Now, let me tell you what this does. This stops the payment of any wage or salary of any officer or employe of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs who, for the purpose of this act, shall not be included within the construction of the term "officer" or "employee." I do not know what else you call it. Anyway, by this kind of an amendment, if it prevails, you stop the payment of the salary out of this appropriation. Such an amendment, if it changed the Hatch Act, would be out of order, and it would not be proper. The officer who is legally installed could go to the Court of Claims and collect his salary. That is how good this amendment is. I do not believe that the House of Representatives wants to indulge in that kind of legislation. I hope that this amendment will be defeated. I believe also that the Secretary of State, having given a particular construction as to what the meaning of the language was as to this Department, should be sustained by the House.

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

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

Mr. MORANO. As a matter of fact, the amendment does not mean anything because if the Secretary of State again decided that this man was in a position that did not come under the Hatch Act, he could continue to work and draw his pay just the same.

Mr. TABER. Right.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. CLEVINGER and Mr. RABAUT.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 61, noes 84.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this bill and all amendments thereto be limited to 35 minutes, that 5 minutes be allowed to the gentleman from Minnesota

[Mr. JUDD], and that 5-minute statements be allowed, 1 for and 1 against, on amendments that may be offered.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to address several questions to the chairman or other members of the subcommittee regarding certain things in the committee report. On page 19 of the report, in the long paragraph on the lower half of the page, there are 6 or 7 committee recommendations which appear to be intended as limitations, as I read them.

For example, down in the middle of the paragraph it is stated:

For the Office of Private Cooperation the committee recommends the same amount as was actually expended in fiscal year 1953, which was \$99,727.

Actually, the Office of Private Cooperation will have used by the end of the current 1954 fiscal year approximately \$182,000, and requested \$250,000 for 1955.

This office of the United States Information Agency carries on, I think, one of its most useful functions. It has been able, as Mr. Streibert explained on page 571 of the hearings, to get over 800 foundations, organizations, groups, and businesses to cooperate in telling our story abroad.

It seems to me that if the subcommittee wants to cut it down, it ought to write the limitation into the bill itself, and say that not more than \$99,000 shall be used for this particular office. Then we who believe the amount should be increased could offer an amendment to change that limitation. I do not know why the committee report carries a recommendation that only the amount used in 1953 be allowed, and not the amount used in 1954, which was almost doubled because the office had improved and properly expanded its activities and gotten a remarkable response from private agencies to do the job of telling America's story abroad. They can do it without the stigma and handicap of being Government propaganda.

What I would like to find out is, What is the force, legal and otherwise, of this irregular way of legislating? Are these recommendations binding upon the Administrator of this agency? Would there be reprisals against him by the subcommittee if he did not follow them because he felt that in order to carry out the main purposes of the agency, he had to deviate from the recommendations? Does the Administrator have his hands tied within his own agency by recommendations in a committee report?

Mr. CLEVINGER. It is a committee recommendation and the committee would expect weight to be given to its recommendations.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I cannot understand the distinguished chairman of the committee making a remark like that here

on the floor of the House after the committee was in full agreement on this. The language of the report is directive, not a recommendation. There was no objection to the action of the committee by anyone with regard to this. If I recall correctly, this is the matter in which they sought a very substantial increase in funds in order to have people traveling all over the country.

Mr. JUDD. I still would like to know: Is it your judgment then that this recommendation of the subcommittee is binding on the Administrator of the agency, and that he cannot exceed this figure?

Mr. ROONEY. It most certainly is.

Mr. JUDD. Then suppose the will of the House is not in accord with the will of the subcommittee and the House would like to change that recommendation? How can one offer an amendment to a committee report? You see the House is prevented by this subcommittee procedure from working its own will. If the limitations were in the bill itself, one could offer an amendment to change the figures on this item and others like "a total of \$40,000 is recommended for the Office of the General Counsel." Actually, we would save money by having all contracts reviewed by legal counsel. Many had mistakes that could have been prevented thereby. Why not let the Administrator correct this weakness by enlarging his legal staff budget to about \$70,000, as requested?

But the recommendation is in a committee report and I am helpless to do anything about it. If it is binding, it ought to be in the law and if it is not in the law, then it ought not to be considered binding, and that ought to be understood here and now.

Mr. CLEVENGER. May I point out to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] that in a representative government it is inherent that some of these powers would be delegated, and we do the best we can when we go into the committee room to find out what they are doing with the money and how judiciously they are spending it. That is one of the prices we have to pay for a representative government.

Mr. JUDD. I do not think that quite answers my question. I cannot see why, if the committee was in complete agreement on this and felt that there ought to be this limitation, you did not write it in the text of the bill. There are other such limitations in the bill.

Mr. CLEVENGER. We try to leave a little "give and take" in a bill, and not make it too restrictive.

Mr. JUDD. This ought to be spelled out definitely one way or the other because it does not seem to me that these committee reports ought to be considered binding, and yet we are unable to amend them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAGEN of California: On page 21, line 13, after "General", strike out "\$39,000,000" and insert "\$39,697,000."

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I am sure you are all familiar with the problem of wetbacks after the discussion we had the other day. One aspect of the wetback, so-called illegal Mexican problem, is the question of the proper appropriation for the border patrol and the Immigration and Naturalization Service. If we really are trying to solve the problem of illegal entrants, we have to provide the Service with sufficient money to be able to police the border and to pick up the illegal entrants once they get into this country. I am not on the Committee on Appropriations and, therefore, I am not too familiar with the budget, but I am hitting an aspect of the appropriation which is wholly clear. I read the committee report and I closely read the hearings on this particular subject. At page 183 of the report relating to the Justice Department, I find this statement by an officer of the Service, Mr. Habberton:

A cutback of \$697,000 is scheduled in items covering alien travel, contractual detention, hospitalization, and food for aliens. If the ratio between deportations overseas and those to adjacent countries remains about the same in 1955 as in the fiscal year 1953, this cutback should have no material detrimental effect upon activity looking to deportations to countries other than Mexico. However, it does mean that funds will not be available for airlift, trainlift, or buslift of Mexican aliens. Also, depending upon developments, the Service may be financially unable to accept custody of all aliens picked up by local law-enforcement officers in the lower California and Texas areas.

The fact is that the Service is grossly understaffed in this matter of enforcement of our immigration laws as they concern Mexican aliens.

I have in my hand a clipping from the Fresno Bee of February 24, which is as follows:

WETBACK ISSUE IN FRESNO COUNTY STIRS DISPUTE

FRESNO.—Fresno County supervisors angrily rejected a statement by the Immigration Service that it can make no additional efforts to drive out invading swarms of wetbacks.

And the county board resolved to appeal to its Congressmen for stronger control at the Nation's southern border so that Mexican nationals will be halted from coming in, rather than be rounded up after making good their entry.

Board Chairman Sidney Cruff had demanded of the Immigration and Naturalization Service that it send additional agents to clear out wetbacks because the Mexicans are replacing domestic farm labor and causing employment and relief burdens.

SITUATIONS ARE SIMILAR

Bruce G. Barber, head of the Service's San Francisco district, replied in a letter:

"We are continually receiving reports of situations similar to that existing in Fresno County, not only from law-enforcement agencies, welfare departments, and other public officials, but from individuals from many areas of the San Francisco district."

Barber said his office, which patrols all California counties north of Kern, as well as the States of Utah and Nevada, had asked its Washington, D. C., headquarters for additional help, but none could be supplied because of budget limitations.

The district director also said that no more border patrolmen could be dispatched to the Fresno area because that would work

hardships on other parts of northern California.

LIMITED JAIL FACILITIES

Barber said the Service's operations in the Fresno area were hampered by limited jail facilities, making it necessary to deport aliens by buses the same day they were arrested.

Cruff and other supervisors declared that if the border control were tightened, fewer officers would be needed in interior California.

And Cruff asserted Barber's remarks about the Fresno jail were completely false. Cruff claimed the local immigration officer, Leonard Adams, says the jail facilities do not hinder alien roundups.

The supervisors voted unanimously to raise the charge of the Government for housing Federal prisoners, such as wetbacks, from the present \$1.10 a day to a new rate of \$1.50 a day.

In reply to that the local head of the service said they just did not have the agents. The local law-enforcement agencies have to do a good part of this job of policing this problem of illegals crossing the border. They make the arrests, and they make temporary detentions, and unless you provide the wherewithal for reimbursing the local agencies for boarding these people, they are not going to do it. I say to my Republican colleagues your reported concern with the wetback problem in discussing House Joint Resolution 355 will be revealed as sheer hypocrisy if you fail to vote for my amendment.

In one of my counties they had to build an extension on the jail to hold these alien Mexicans. If sufficient funds are not forthcoming to reimburse the local agencies of government for their part in this program, you are going to have the country overrun with illegal Mexican workers. It is not just a problem of putting the local people out of employment. We have never, until the advent of alien Mexican labor, in my part of the country, had a rural narcotic problem. Yet today you can pick up any paper, any day, and read of numerous arrests for the sale or use of narcotics. I understand that Mexico is the prime source of heroin in this country. It would be ridiculous to assume that these illegal Mexicans are not carrying the narcotics, and that we need to enforce our immigration and naturalization laws with respect to them.

Not only that, they bring a whole train of moral and criminal problems with them. Our jails are crowded with the results of their activities. All I am asking is the restoration to this budget of \$697,000, which will permit the counties to continue their participation in this program of rounding up and deporting these illegal entrants. Without this \$697,000 addition, the policing of wetbacks will be severely handicapped. To my Republican colleagues who have a wetback problem which they recognize I say you cannot, in good conscience, fail to give your local people the monetary assistance reflected in my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN] has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday before the vote on the \$17 million Clevenger amendment the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] advised the House that the payments of subsidy moneys to the airlines are not something that the Committee on Appropriations is to decide. He said they are "in the law as an obligation upon the Congress to pay."

In this regard, I call the Members' attention to the following extract from opinion May 13, 1953, by James P. Radigan, Jr., Chief, American Law Division, Library of Congress:

Under the proposed reorganization plan, would the Civil Aeronautics Board have authority to obligate the funds for subsidies without action directly by Congress?

If by "without action directly by Congress" you mean without previous authorization and appropriation, the answer is no. Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the United States Constitution provides: "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law." This clause is a restriction upon the disbursing authority of the executive department, and means simply that no money can be paid out of the Treasury unless it has been appropriated by an act of Congress. (*Cincinnati Soap Co. v. United States* (1937) 301 U. S. 308.) No officer, however high, not even the President, is empowered to pay debts of the United States generally, when presented to them. (*Reeside v. Walker* (1950) 11 How. 272.) There is, however, under the present law (which would be true under the proposed reorganization plan) no method of controlling the amount allocated for individual subsidies except to the extent that the totals must not exceed appropriations. Under the present law, the cost of air mail transportation service and the amount of subsidies are consolidated and the rate of compensation is fixed by the Civil Aeronautics Board which the Postmaster General is obligated to pay from the appropriations for air mail transportation services. Under the proposed reorganization plan it would appear necessary to limit payments from the appropriation for air mail transportation services payable by the Postmaster General to the amount fixed by the Civil Aeronautics Board as the rate of compensation for these services. The payment of subsidies under the proposed reorganization plan would be made by the Civil Aeronautics Board from appropriations made therefor. It is not possible under the Constitution for any public officer or department to obligate the United States to pay any moneys whatsoever except pursuant to statutory authorization.

It is for Congress, proceeding under the Constitution, to say what amount may be drawn from the Treasury in pursuance of an appropriation, and if an officer, upon his own responsibility, and without the authority of Congress, assumes to bind the Government, by express or implied, contract, to pay a sum in excess of that limited by Congress for the purposes of such a contract, the contract is nullity, so far as the Government is concerned, and no legal obligation arises upon its part to meet its provision. (*Hooe v. United States* (1910) 218 U. S. 322.)

From a practical point of view no air mail carrier or other air carrier would have a claim, other than moral, against the United States for any promised subsidies which had not been specifically authorized by statute and which had not been specifically allocated from funds previously appropriated. Con-

gress has power to recognize moral obligations. (*Marion & Eye Valley Railroad Co. v. United States* (1926) 270 U. S. 280.)

Mr. Chairman, I also wish to call attention in this regard to the following memorandum addressed to Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, under date May 19, 1953:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
AMERICAN LAW DIVISION,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1953.

To: Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY.

(Attention: Mr. Marvin.)

Subject: Power of the Civil Aeronautics Board to obligate the United States for subsidy payments under the proposed reorganization plan and under S. 1360 of the 83d Congress.

Assuming, arguendo, that the proposed reorganization plan is valid, then the power of the Board to obligate the United States for subsidy payments would emanate from section 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 998; U. S. C. 49: 486). The pertinent part of this section, with respect to subsidies as distinguished from compensation for airmail transportation service after the effectuation of the division of the function under the proposed reorganization plan, would be: "and, [the need] together with all other revenue of the air carrier, to enable such air carrier under honest, economical, and efficient management, to maintain and continue the development of air transportation to the extent and of the character and quality required for the commerce of the United States, the postal service, and the national defense." The authority thus granted by section 406 (b) to consider the foregoing factor in the fixing of airmail transportation compensation is a rather nebulous basis upon which to predicate a reorganization plan under which an obligatory contract for the payment of subsidies may be made.

But even if it were sufficient authority to support obligatory contracts for the payment of subsidies, such contracts would be subject to the limitations of Revised Statutes 3678 (U. S. C. 31: 665), the first subsection of which reads: "No officer or employee of the United States shall make or authorize an expenditure from or create or authorize an obligation under any appropriation or fund in excess of the amount available therein; nor shall any such officer or employee involve the Government in any contract or other obligation, for the payment of money for any purpose, in advance of appropriations made for such purpose, unless such contract or obligation is authorized by law." If sections 483, 486, and 493 of title 39 of the United States Code, which generally authorize the Postmaster General to contract for carrying the mails, yield to this provision, as originally enacted, limiting expenditures so that appropriation is necessary for the employment of extra carriers, etc. (39 Op. Atty. Gen. 157), may it be logically contended that the general and indefinite terms of section 486 (b), pertaining to the consideration of the need for subsidies, would be outside the purview of such section? It is the settled and recognized policy of Congress to keep all of the Departments of the Government, in the matter of incurring obligations for expenditures, within the appropriations annually made for conducting its affairs. (*Sutton v. U. S.* (1921) 256 U. S. 575).

The contracts likewise would be subject to the provisions of the act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 764; U. S. C. 31: 627) which provides: "No act of Congress hereafter passed shall be construed to make an appropriation out of the Treasury of the United States, or to authorize the execution of a contract involving the payment of money in excess

of appropriations made by law, unless such act shall in specific terms declare an appropriation to be made or that a contract may be executed." As those dealing with the Government must be held to have notice of these limitations upon authority (see *Sutton v. U. S.*, supra), any contention that the grants or subsidies are not within the ambit of the limitations of this section is very tenuous.

If the power of the Postmaster General "to establish post offices" does not authorize him to bind the United States by a lease for a post-office building, there being no appropriation therefor (*Chase v. U. S.* (1894) (155 U. S. 489)), a fortiori the Civil Aeronautics Board may not bind the United States by a contract for the grant of subsidies in excess of appropriations. If, as stated in 6 Op. Atty. Gen. 28, one appropriation does not necessarily involve the undertaking of the Congress to make further appropriations, and does not of itself empower the President to engage the Government beyond the specified sum, it is impossible to support the allegation that the Civil Aeronautics Board may bind the Government to pay grants of subsidies made by it in excess of appropriations. The general public system for the appropriation and disbursement of public moneys is permanent, and unless charges are within the objects for which an appropriation is made they cannot be applied to that appropriation (28 Op. Atty. Gen. 634).

The foregoing observations, with references to limitations on the authority of the Civil Aeronautics Board to obligate the United States for subsidy payments beyond the amount appropriated and available, would likewise be applicable to the Board if S. 1360 were passed. There would be, however, the additional specific restriction of the bill found on page 5, lines 2-6, which reads: "Payments under this subsection [subsidies for essential aircraft operation] shall be made by the Board out of sums appropriated to the Board for such purpose, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection." This wording of S. 1360 also has the additional advantage over the proposed reorganization plan in that it grants a clear authorization for appropriations for subsidies as such, which is not found in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, supra, the foundation for the payment of subsidies under the proposed reorganization plan.

Continuing, Mr. Chairman, the following telegram represents the feelings of most of the taxpayers' organizations in the State of New York:

ALBANY, N. Y., March 4, 1954.

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY,
House Office Building:

As representative taxpayers, New York, we strongly oppose Clevenger amendment now pending before House to perpetuate Civil Aeronautics Board subsidies at present rate for total \$48 million for next 8 months. Since House already appropriated \$60 million for service air mail pay, what purpose do subsidies serve? Largest recipients have been getting subsidies from taxpayers' money for 16 years. When do we wean them?

GARTH A. SHOEMAKER,
President, Citizens Public Expenditure Survey, Inc.

In fairness to Pan American World Airways System which was referred to many times in the course of the hearings held by the subcommittee on the appropriation requests of the Civil Aeronautics Board, I am including without comment a letter and attached memoran-

dum received from that company. They read as follows:

PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., March 1, 1954.
Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROONEY: During the recent hearings of the Appropriations Subcommittee concerned with Commerce Department appropriations, you asked several questions of the Civil Aeronautics Board as they affected Pan American World Airways.

In the interest of clarifying any misunderstandings which may still exist, we take the liberty of making available to you the attached memorandum.

Sincerely,

ROGER B. DOULENS.

COMMENTS RELATING TO HEARINGS ON COMMERCE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS FOR YEAR 1955 BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 83d CONGRESS, 2d SESSION

Pages 608-610: "Reason for increased subsidy in spite of increased net revenues of international airlines."

Mr. ROONEY points out that in the year 1953 revenues for international carriers increased over 1952 and net operating income increased to \$24,250,000 in 1953 as compared to \$8,633,000 in 1952 and raises a question as to why subsidies increased in the fiscal year 1953 as opposed to the year 1952 by some \$5 million. The following items account for this increase.

1. On January 1, 1953, the Latin American division of Pan American Airways was placed on a prospective mail rate as opposed to past period mail rates. Under this change in status the return on investment in the last half of fiscal year 1953 was increased from 7 to 10 percent. On a full-year basis such a change would amount to approximately \$2,200,000 based on the Latin American division's investment for this period of approximately \$35 million. The Board's staff in preparing the estimates for the fiscal year 1953 must have assumed that the Latin American division's rate would be effective for the full year and made provision for \$13 million of total mail pay for the fiscal year as opposed to \$10 million for fiscal year 1952—\$3 million.

2. Although the two carriers, Northwest and Pan American operating in the trans-Pacific area were on final rates in the years 1952 and 1953, the level of operations for the Korean airlift was reduced as compared to the year 1952 and the profits in reduction in mail pay from the airlift operation were correspondingly reduced, thus increasing the mail pay requirements of the two American trans-Pacific carriers by some \$821,000.

3. In the fiscal year 1953 the appropriations for mail pay required for States-Alaska operations were increased over 1952 by approximately \$1,450,000. This increase is applied to all three carriers—Pan American, Alaska Airlines, and Pacific-Northern—reflects the cost of subsidization of competition over this route as contemplated in the Board's orders authorizing Alaska Airlines and Pacific-Northern to operate over this route. This competition was authorized not on the basis of need for additional service but for national defense purposes—\$1,443,000.

4. The provision for mail pay for intra-Alaska operations which might be characterized as regional or local services reflects an increase in requirements in the fiscal year 1953 over fiscal 1952 of \$1,215,000. In these operations there was little or no expansion in traffic volume which could be available to offset increasing costs due to

inflation in labor, materials, and cost of aircraft.

5. The comparative figures to which Mr. ROONEY referred relating to international airlines, as appearing in the American Aviation Daily of December 24, 1953, cover only operations of the trunkline carriers and stub-end operations of domestic carriers. None of the States-Alaska (except Pan American's operations), intra-Alaska, or Hawaiian operations were included in the figures to which he referred.

6. Of the total trunk carriers (11 airline operations which are ratemaking entities) included in the CAB statement of subsidy and mail pay for the year 1952, page 597 of the hearing records, 7 in the fiscal year 1952 were operating on temporary rates and were in review periods and the provision for return on investment would be at a 7-percent level rather than a 10-percent level.

7. We have estimated that the investments for these trunkline carriers and the stub-end domestic operations totaled approximately \$200 million in the year 1953 and that the \$24,250,000 of operating profits in the year 1953 would represent a return on investment after taxes of approximately 5.8 percent, which is substantially below what might be considered a reasonable return. If we assume an investment in the year 1952 of \$180 million, the \$8,633,000 considered as operating profit referred to by Mr. ROONEY would represent a return after taxes of approximately 2.3 percent.

Page 615: "Comparison of passenger fare and mail pay on New York-Paris route."

1. The first-class passenger fare to Paris is \$394.60 which stated in terms of fare per passenger ton-mile is \$1.01. This compares with the compensatory rate per ton-mile for United States mail pay which is received by Pan American on the Atlantic of 85 cents. The passenger weight is computed at 215 pounds per passenger. The sack of mail at the same weight, or 215 pounds, would pay \$330.77 as fare, as compared with the passenger fare of \$394.60. Mr. Kennedy in his article indicates the sack of mail pays \$1,578. This figure is determined by dividing the total amount of mail pay for subsidy received by the total number of United States mail ton-miles, which is patently incorrect. On October 1, 1953, through Executive Order No. 10 a separation was made between mail pay and subsidy. The subsidy element which the airline receives is not mail pay but is a subsidy to the entire airline operation and is comparable to the subsidy which a shipping line receives as an operating subsidy. Even though in the past mail pay included a subsidy amount, the subsidy should not be interpreted as being applicable only to mail but to the entire operation. Services which are operated under certificates authorized by the Civil Aeronautics Board are to carry out the objectives of the Civil Aeronautics Act which include the encouragement and development of an air-transportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the postal service and the national defense. On many routes of a national-interest character the Board in authorizing services was fully cognizant of the fact that service mail pay could never support the operation of these routes and the subsidy element of mail pay was provided in order to carry out the objectives of the Civil Aeronautics Act including commerce.

Page 628: "Difficulty of collating divisional awards."

The divisional breakdown of Pan American's financial reports creates no problem in reconciling reported divisional figures with figures published in the annual reports. The reports to the Board are basically the same figures which are used to prepare published reports. There may be some slight change in the classifications in published figures.

However, there are no changes in basic figures.

Page 630: "Computed basis of certain distributed costs."

Realistness of allocated figures.

Page 630: "Allocation of invested capital." Taxes.

Page 632: "Interdivisional transactions."

Page 633: "Possibility of arbitrary shifts of expenses."

All of the questions raised in connection with the above subjects have to do with the question of whether because of the divisional breakdown of Pan American's reports and divisional breakdown of areas for ratemaking purposes, there is a possibility that Pan American can obtain through duplication of expenses more mail pay than it should receive. Mr. Roth has pointed out the safeguards which the CAB uses to insure that there are no duplications between divisions. He also points out the advantages which the divisional reports make available to the CAB staff in providing economic yardsticks and comparisons in various areas of the world with competitive United States flag services. If the entire Pan American operation were to be thrown into a single ratemaking entity, there would be no basis for comparing results with other American-flag carriers.

Under the recent Supreme Court decision in which excessive profits in one division of a company may be used to offset deficiencies in mail pay in other divisions, the problem inherent in ratemaking by divisions, i. e., the possibility of shifting of expenses and revenues, etc., between divisions, becomes moot, since it is impossible to earn amounts in excess of a reasonable rate of return if the offset theory is applied. This philosophy applies so long as any division of Pan American is open from the standpoint of subsidy rate. In the Atlantic the Pan American and TWA mail rates are open from 1946 to the end of 1952, and under the Court's ruling, any excessive earnings of any division are available to offset mail-pay needs in the Atlantic.

With regard to possibility of arbitrary shift of expenses between divisions, which was suggested by Mr. ROONEY, a review of the record in Pan American's Atlantic Rate case should convince him on this score. The CAB, after careful investigation, has not challenged any of the allocations made by Pan American of either revenues or expenses. On the other hand, it has challenged TWA's allocations between its domestic and international operations to the extent of some \$3,330,000. (See Bureau Counsel's exhibit No. 259 in the Atlantic rate case.)

Pages 634-635: "Airline subsidiaries."

This section of the hearing record raises the question of whether expenses of Pan American may be increased because of relationships with affiliated companies. The CAB has reviewed Pan American's transactions with affiliated and associated companies in the Latin American Rate case covering the period 1948 through 1951 and in the Atlantic case covering the period 1946 through 1952, has found the exchange of expenses and revenues to be entirely appropriate, no adjustments having been made for improper charges. In a previous Latin American Rate case covering the years 1944 and 1945 the Civil Aeronautics Board did make some substantial disallowances in expense charges received by Pan American for the use of joint facilities of Panair do Brasil. However, even in this case the charges made were in accordance with a joint facility contract which was dictated by the Civil Aeronautics Board itself. This is the only case in which actual disallowances were made on the basis of improper inter-company charges.

The fact of the matter is that in most cases Pan American through its relationship

with its affiliated companies obtains a definite expense advantage. There are a few examples which follow:

1. In the year 1952 of the \$705,000 of expenses incurred by Pan American's system purchasing office, over \$450,000 was defrayed by commissions charged to affiliated and associated companies for services rendered for their account.

2. The system shipping department costs were \$109,000. This entire amount was defrayed by commissions earned on shipping for affiliated and associated companies and a profit was realized of approximately \$9,000.

3. Pan American maintains a United States sales office organization with some 25 offices throughout the United States and acts as general agent for many of its affiliated and associated companies. On all sales made for these companies Pan American receives a commission of 10 percent on sales. In the year 1952 these commissions amounted to approximately \$730,000.

4. In many instances the affiliated companies provided joint facilities to Pan American at a much less cost than if Pan American itself were to provide the facilities now supplied by the affiliates. In many instances insofar as communications companies are concerned and investments therein, these facilities are not only facilities for Pan American but are facilities available for all carriers located in the areas including not only other American-flag carriers but foreign flag carriers.

5. The affiliated and associated companies have created a market for the sale of Pan American's obsolete aircraft. These sales in the past have been fully reviewed and approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board. The prices at which the sales were made were as high as would have been realized if sales had been made to others in the open market. Substantial profits realized from such sales have been used to reduce Pan American's mail-pay requirements.

6. With regard to the question of miscellaneous income from investments and the allocation of such income between divisions, it should be pointed out that under the 1945 Atlantic Division Rate case and several other cases under consideration at that time, the CAB decided that profits from investments in other carriers and from operations of Government contracts would not be considered in the determination of mail pay, and in the past Pan American has considered such income as nondivisional. These investments in airlines and applicable to Government contracts have been eliminated in determining the investment base for carriers. In recent rate cases, however, the CAB has changed its position and now contends that any excess earnings on these investments should be offset against mail-pay subsidy requirements. For the future, no matter whether a system rate or a divisional rate is fixed for Pan American's operations, it would be necessary for the CAB to carefully analyze both earnings and investments in these activities to determine whether or not excess earnings are available to offset mail-pay requirements. In the presently pending Atlantic Rate proceeding this entire problem has been exhaustively reviewed by the CAB staff, and the final result of the staff's investigation will only be known at the conclusion of this case.

7. With regard to investments listed by Pan American having to do with country clubs, these are the purchase of country-club stock required in connection with memberships in these clubs and are not an indication that Pan American is operating country clubs.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. In the opinion of the committee, at least those on this side of the aisle, and I hope we are joined by those on the other side, \$39 million is ample for the functions to

be performed by this agency. Let me call the attention of the Members to page 9 of the report which deals with this matter. The total amount is \$39 million, which is the amount requested by the agency, and approved by the budget. The committee did not reduce this amount 1 cent. It is the full budget estimate, in other words. An examination of the decreases proposed to be made by the agency as the result of the decrease in the amount in the preceding year showed that there would be some decrease in the total number of the border patrol. However, the committee has disposed of that in the report by requiring that the reduction from the preceding year be made in administration and not in the border patrol, because the reduction from the preceding year amounts only to one-half of 1 percent so that by reducing their administrative costs one-half of 1 percent the agency will be able to continue the maintenance of the border patrol which is 18 more than the average number of employees in the fiscal year 1953.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if we are going to try to keep expenditures down and limit budget deficits and the national debt we have got to go along with the Budget Bureau and the administration in these matters.

I hope the House will vote down the amendment.

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

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

Mr. ROONEY. Since the gentleman solicited my idea with regard to the pending amendment I must say to him that I intend to support the amendment. I deplore the fact that President Eisenhower and Attorney General Brownell in their budget request cut \$3,250,000 from the Immigration and Naturalization Service. I am willing to give many millions of dollars in excess of the amount of this budget estimate to close our borders against wetbacks, Communists, narcotic smugglers, and all these other people who are walking across the border at will every day.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested. I thought we were seeing a new model of the gentleman from New York when he made his opening speech on this bill. I thought he had become a great economizer but it now appears that he wants to be a great economizer on one item and is for spending on every other item.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I say to the gentleman that with regard to this particular matter I am not here in the form of a new model. I have been for properly policing the borders and interested in the Mexican wetback problem for years. The gentleman well knows that I am for saving money where money can be saved. There are many items in this bill in which I agree with the action of the majority members of the committee in cutting funds; but I am not entirely in accord with them on their bill and I am not against every provision in the bill. I reserve the right to express myself

with reference to each particular item. This is one in which I disagree. And here is what the American Legion said to our committee on this subject:

WITNESS: CLARENCE H. OLSON, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. CLEVENGER. You may proceed, Mr. Olson.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I would like to read this statement if I may. It is a short statement.

The American Legion is proud of its record in the field of Americanism for more than a third of a century. I am personally privileged in having the opportunity to come before your committee for the second time in support of adequate funds for the Justice Department so that the Immigration and Naturalization Service may be given the tools with which it can discharge its responsibilities under the law.

The American Legion is grateful to your committee for permitting us to discuss this matter with you at this time.

When I testified before your committee last year (p. 238 of the hearings before your committee) I told you that the information leading up to the development of my testimony came from within our organization and not from an agency of the Federal Government. I wish to reiterate that statement in connection with the testimony I offer here today.

It is interesting to look back a year, to page 226 of the hearings on the Department of Justice, and to note there was some conflict between the assurances of the Attorney General that funds were adequate, and our apprehension that additional funds would be needed to properly carry out the program laid down for the Immigration and Naturalization Service. It is also interesting to note that scarcely 7 weeks after the beginning of the 1954 fiscal year the Attorney General, following a personal inspection of the United States-Mexican border, according to the Washington Post of August 19, 1953, was much concerned over the increase in the number of people illegally crossing over from Mexico into the United States. According to the Washington Post the Attorney General said the problem was still in an "incipient" stage.

Of course, we realize that you gentlemen of the Congress have to rely on the facts as they are given to you by responsible authorities in Government and that your actions are guided by them. We are not critical of this committee for having failed to appropriate the funds but we do criticize the Attorney General's office for having failed to ask you for the amount necessary to appreciably strengthen the Immigration Service's weak position along our Southwest border.

More recently, the magazine section of the New York Times of January 31, 1954, had a very interesting article on the wetback situation entitled, "Two Every Minute Across the Border," which was written by Mr. Gladwin Hill, of the Los Angeles-New York Times Bureau. I do not include the article because of its volume but wish to quote from it for the purpose of emphasizing several points that will follow:

"Most wetbacks have to pause at least briefly in the valley to work and get a little money before pushing northward. One objective of the patrol is to nail them before they can get social-security cards. The law does not deny cards even to illegal aliens and, once in hand, they become quasi-passports.

"The cat-and-mouse game would be comic if it were not for its evil ramifications. Because of their numbers, the wetbacks make a mockery of border supervision, transforming the line into a gateway through which foreigners of any sort can infiltrate. The wetbacks bring all kinds of contraband with

them, from drugs and parrots to venereal disease. Their direct social cost in Imperial County alone, counting everything from jailing to hospitalization for tuberculosis, has been reckoned at several hundred thousand dollars a year."

We are not here as fiscal or immigration experts. We will not say how much money is needed for the job—that is up to the Attorney General—but it strikes us as being peculiar that 1955 fund requests are even less than 1954 (p. 818, Federal Budget). We ask ourselves, What has happened to the concern of the Attorney General as expressed last August? Or, what new plan has been devised to more than offset the money and personnel decreases? Surely, the Attorney General would not be satisfied with a continuance of the rather ineffective job being done by his Department along the Mexican border.

In closing we point to the following extract from a joint release by State, Justice, and Labor dated January 15, 1954:

"The border patrol has therefore been instructed to redouble its efforts to prevent the illegal entry of Mexican aliens and their employment."

In great emergency such as war, conflagration, or flood, men can and are expected to redouble their efforts for a short span but cannot be expected to meet such tests for a year at a time. Reserves and more personnel are the answers to such demands. To provide that, the Department must have the funds or weaken the line at other points.

We have attached a copy of St. Louis national convention resolution No. 396 which is my Legion authority to appear today. If you are interested in resolutions pertaining to social security, narcotics, and other matters mentioned herein, I will be glad to provide them.

"1953 NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, ST. LOUIS, MO., AUGUST 31 TO SEPTEMBER 3, 1953

"Resolution No. 396.

"Committee: Americanism.

"Subject: To prevent illegal entrance at the Mexican border.

"Whereas the safety, security, and welfare of the Nation is the primary objective of the American Legion, which objective is impossible of attainment without enforcement of the immigration laws; and

"Whereas aliens are entering the United States illegally from Mexico in a mass migration that has reached proportions out of control of the presently constituted authorities; and

"Whereas the border States are being overrun with this invasion of aliens, which is encroaching upon the interior States in ever-increasing numbers, in defiance of the laws of the United States and in numbers which cannot be computed but may be estimated by the fact that over 400,000 such aliens were apprehended in southern California alone during the 12 months ending July 1, 1953, and

"Whereas this army of invading aliens is bringing with it poverty, disease, and crime, is loading our relief rolls, filling our public hospitals, crowding our jails with aliens having no claim to our bounty, and is displacing domestic labor, depressing wage scales and living standards, raising serious police and health problems, and creating widespread distress and unhappiness in the homes of our people by these results; and

"Whereas the breach in our defenses which is opened by the illegal entry of this horde of aliens affords a means of unregulated and uncontrolled entry into our country of unlimited numbers of hostile aliens bent upon our subversion and destruction: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the American Legion in national convention assembled at St. Louis,

Mo., August 31 to September 3, 1953, call upon the President to use means at his command or to request the Congress to authorize measures to deal with this unprecedented menace to our Government, welfare and prosperity."

Mr. OLSON. I am prepared to answer questions, sir.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Thank you for your statement, Mr. Olson.

ANALYSIS OF WETBACK PROBLEM

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to commend you and the national legislative commission of the American Legion for taking this interest in the wetback problem which to me has been a very serious one over a number of years now. When I was chairman of this committee this committee reported a bill which would have put several hundred more border patrolmen on the Mexican border. I hope the present Attorney General will do something about it. Mr. Brownell presently deplors the situation but has no suggestion to rectify it at the moment, or at the time of his testimony, not a word as to what to do about it. Instead of doing something about it he reduces the amount of appropriations which he requests here for the Immigration and Naturalization Service by three and a quarter millions.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLEVINGER. I might say, also, there was under consideration extension of this contract labor agreement between the United States and Mexico. I do not know whether it resulted in renegotiation or not, that is, where they brought them over under contract. The wetback was just surplusage of labor. Do you know whether we have renewed that agreement or whether it is terminated?

Mr. OLSON. According to the reference I made here to the joint release by the State, Justice, and Labor Departments on January 15, they were looking forward to the possibility of such an agreement. Something now seems to have erupted between Mexico and the United States.

Mr. CLEVINGER. It expired?

Mr. OLSON. That is correct, as I understand it, and there has been some difficulty in their attempt to renegotiate an agreement something like they had before.

Of course, in our opinion that may not be the answer. It may help the situation. We believe that the only way, if we are going to try to prevent these people from coming over, is to stop them at the source or at the line. I realize, too, that it would be difficult to have a skirmish line extended from California to Brownsville, Tex. We have to apprehend those who slip by the so-called screen.

Mr. CLEVINGER. I might say to you it is a concern of mine that we stop ship jumping and border crossing at any point and not just from Mexico.

Mr. OLSON. We have concentrated on this thing alone because of the text of the resolution. We appreciate that you have the same situation in the coastal States of this country. You have probably a bad situation in Florida. I think along the Canadian border it may not be as bad because of the stricter application of their own laws. We are not talking only of this Mexican border but that seems to be the sore point in the whole situation.

Mr. CLEVINGER. There is a big flow of marijuana from Mexico but other narcotics come from other countries in greater quantities.

Mr. OLSON. People who want to plant their saboteurs and subversives here naturally would look to that area. I would if I were trying to infiltrate people into this country.

Mr. ROONEY. Are you familiar with a report gotten out a couple of months ago entitled "What Price Wetbacks" which contains many photographs depicting this deplorable problem?

Mr. OLSON. No, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. It was published by the American GI Forum in southeastern Texas in cooperation with the Texas State Federation of Labor. I commend it to you for your reading.

Mr. OLSON. Thank you very much.

USE OF CHEAP LABOR ALONG BORDER

Mr. ROONEY. This is an economic problem, and the farmers along the Texas border will not pay the American minimum wage required by law to hire Americans. They hire these wetbacks at coolie wages, as little as \$2 for a 10-hour day, with the result that our immigration laws are flouted. The immigration inspector along that border is treated with contempt by every farmer who uses wetback labor, and most of them do, including many placed very high in the State of Texas.

Mr. OLSON. I am not positive, but either the magazine article of the New York Times to which I referred or the joint release by the three departments touches on that. It suggests that possibly this cheap labor does take away jobs from our own people.

Mr. ROONEY. Not only that, this illegal labor takes away approximately, if I remember the figure, \$30 million a year. The money paid as coolie wages is not spent in the United States on our side of the border. It is sent to Mexico and constitutes the third largest source of income to Mexico, exceeded only by tourism and the mining industry. The outfit that does the biggest business along the border is the United States post office where the wetbacks buy money orders to send their wages back into Mexico. So that it harms the small-business man, the drugstore, the restaurant, and other such small businesses. All the money goes to the other side of the border. I commend that for your reading.

Mr. OLSON. Thank you very much. I believe Mr. Bow, acting chairman last year, indicated that the Appropriations Committee sort of frowned on these luxurious airplane rides to return these people back to Mexico who were apprehended and they were going to try to work out other plans for returning of these jumpers. I suppose that would permit them to use it elsewhere. We of the Legion, it may seem funny to you that we are interested in a proposition of this kind, but there are those—

Mr. ROONEY. You should be interested.

Mr. OLSON. But there are those other factors that come into it.

Mr. ROONEY. I say that as one who sometimes disagrees with the Legion.

Mr. OLSON. Thank you very much.

Mr. COUDERT. Let me remind the membership again that this bill will provide 18 more members of the border patrol than they had in 1953.

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

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. HOSMER. This approach is still a further continuation of unilateral dealing with this problem from one side of the border, and it is not a problem that can be dealt with from one side of the border only; it is necessary to have active cooperation of the Mexican Government to handle both the wetback problem and the narcotics problem. The only way to do it is to use the method we used in combating the foot-and-mouth disease, a joint Mexican-American commission. The flow of narcotics across the border can only be controlled through some such joint action. There is legislation which will come before the House to provide some such method of taking care of the entire problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired; all time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAGEN of California) there were—ayes 25, noes 66.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 45, in lines 11 and 12, strike out the words "without regard to the civil-service and classification laws."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this is the same language to which I directed a point of order on yesterday but was overruled by the Chair. I do not want to in anywise injure this proposed legislation; however, I want to protect two situations. One is the civil service. I want to make sure neither is violated. The other is veterans' preference.

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House suggested that there is a law already on the statute books that does provide for the employment of certain individuals who can speak foreign languages that is so helpful in carrying out the purpose of this particular section of the bill. Then it appears there should not be the necessity of inserting this language in the bill. As I stated, I do not want in any way to injure the legislation, but I do have a letter from the American Legion legislative representatives stating that in the Mutual Security Act of 1953 there was similar language but somehow, in some way, that language was abused.

I also call attention to the fact that there is no explanation in your report with regard to the use of this money excepting, we are told, it is used to carry out this particular section of the bill.

Now, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee 3 or 4 questions. What limitation is intended under the exception granted by the language of this bill? Just to what do you limit it?

Mr. TABER. The language here would permit only persons on a temporary basis, who received total compensation not to exceed \$120,000, to be employed without regard to the civil-service laws.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Whom does the gentleman have in mind? What persons does he have in mind?

Mr. TABER. The temporary employment of people, that is all. This law is effective in here and continues effective only if it is carried from year to year in an appropriation act. That is the way the language of the authorizing act read.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does the gentleman have a limit on the number of aliens? If not, there should be a limit.

Mr. TABER. Not on the number of aliens; no. They have to have aliens in connection with this program, they have to have people who can translate the broadcasts that we want to put out and deliver. We cannot get Americans who are qualified to do this sort of thing in the number that is required. They have to go over there sometimes and get some-

body to come in here. Under the civil-service laws they would not be allowed to employ them if we did not have this authority. I think all of these things are minor; on the other hand, they are very important to the successful operation of the program.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does the gentleman think that the language of this bill will in anywise include employees within the United States; those employed in the information agencies generally?

Mr. TABER. Not where regularly employed. It cannot permit people who are regularly employed on a fixed salary except aliens who have to be employed for the purpose of translation or broadcasting.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The thing in which I am particularly interested at this time is that we do not use this language in any way in violation of the Veterans' Preference Act, for one thing.

Mr. TABER. It could not be used in that way, because you would not find aliens who are veterans who would be entitled to any preference.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I would not want to see it used in violation of the civil-service law unless there is an emergency where it is absolutely necessary.

Mr. TABER. It is nothing but temporary employment of somebody whom they want to do some particular job.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the statements that have been made by the members of this committee and the assurance I have received that there will be no violations of the civil-service act, rules, and regulations, and in further consideration that the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 will not be bypassed or violated, I shall not press for the adoption of my amendment. I am enclosing herewith as a part of my statement a letter I have received from Mr. Miles B. Kennedy, director of the American Legion, wherein he expresses the interest of the American Legion in this section of the bill:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., March 2, 1954.

HON. EDWARD H. REES,
House of Representatives,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REES: Referring to H. R. 8067, same being a bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, my attention has been directed to the language appearing on page 45, lines 11, 12, and 13, under title IV, United States Information Agency. The American Legion objects to the same.

The Mutual Security Act of 1953 (Public Law 118, 83d Cong., H. R. 5710, sec. 706 (a)) contained somewhat similar language and the agency immediately construed the act to release them from any adherence to veteran's preference; the Civil Service Commission concurred with their construction and refused to accept any appeals from veterans who were separated under authority of this section. There was a time limitation upon the authority to so reduce personnel and without Civil Service Commission assistance it was impossible for the Legion or the veteran to ascertain if the agency even acted within the time allowed, or if the veteran came within the 10-percent figure which was also included in the act as a maximum number to be so reduced.

It is felt that if the wording of H. R. 8067, as mentioned, is not changed or stricken, it will result in a similar situation with reference to veterans' preference in appointment, and also any rights veterans may have under the reemployment phase of veterans' preference. This type of legislation not only on its face results in a partial abolition of veterans' preference, but allows the possibility of a wholesale disregard behind closed doors so to speak, and if not objected to here, the idea will tend to spread among the opponents of veterans' preference.

The American Legion would appreciate it very much if you will make it a point to look into the purpose of the language appearing in H. R. 8067, page 45, lines 11, 12, and 13, with a view to having same stricken or deleted when this measure is before the House today, Tuesday, March 2, thereby forestalling any attempt to bypass the provisions of the Veterans Preference Act of 1944, as amended.

Thanking you for your courtesy and cooperation in this connection, I am

Sincerely yours,

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first, in reference to what the gentleman from Kansas said as to the violation of the civil-service law, I can assure him that there is no desire to violate the civil-service law. I should like to bring to the attention of the committee the justification for this language which was submitted to our committee by the information agency as the reason why this is necessary.

Language is rooted in Public Law 402, the Smith-Mundt law, which requires appropriation language to set authority for employment of persons on a temporary basis and aliens for the special needs of the Agency.

The unusual skills required by the United States Information Agency are not contained within regular staffing patterns.

For example, the Agency needs persons who can review motion-picture films which use rare languages; persons who can adapt press and publications output to the needs of a foreign area by preparation of suitable cartoons or pamphlets; or who can provide translation services in languages not available from within on a regular staffing pattern basis; or who can provide narration services for radio in foreign languages.

Most of these specialties are not of a sufficiently continuing nature to justify full-time employment of a continuing nature. Many of the specialists with the requisite qualifications do not meet civil-service standards, are not interested in applying for civil-service examinations simply for temporary employment, or are not available for temporary employment at civil-service rates.

The employment of aliens, to which this provision also pertains, is absolutely essential to the continued output of the radio broadcasting program: there are at present 123 resident aliens performing this work in New York; without these employees, 18 languages, many of them beamed to areas behind the Iron Curtain, would have to be dropped.

I submit to the gentleman that those are the justifications submitted to our committee for the writing of this language.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If you only had the language in the act you prefer, why repeat it in an appropriation bill?

Mr. BOW. Because the Smith-Mundt Act definitely provides, I will say to the gentleman from Kansas, that this language be incorporated in an appropriation bill. Now, we strangely have this basic language saying that in order to enforce it it must be contained in the appropriation bill. If we do not put it in this bill, it would not be applicable. It is a rather strange feature, I admit, but we must put it in this bill in order to have it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The second question: Do I understand it is the belief of this committee that the persons employed under this section are necessary employees who cannot come under or who do not pass examinations under Civil Service in order to fit those particular jobs; that you cannot recruit them from Civil Service?

Mr. BOW. I think that is true, sir.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And in no wise would this section affect the Veterans' Preference Act?

Mr. BOW. Not speaking for the committee, but speaking for this particular member, I think that is true.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield, what is the status of these people? Are they contract workers?

Mr. BOW. Part of them are contract workers.

Mr. GROSS. This Government as of this date has 427,000 alien contract workers scattered all over the world. How many more are we going to load on the taxpayers?

Mr. BOW. I cannot answer the gentleman's question on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 25, strike out lines 1 to 6, inclusive.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to strike from the bill section 207, on page 25, which provides:

None of the funds appropriated by this title may be used in the preparation or prosecution of the suit in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Southern Division, by the United States of America against Fallbrook Public Utility District, a public service corporation of the State of California, and others.

I think the best way to argue for the adoption of this amendment is to quote the questions asked of and the answers given by the present Attorney General of the United States. At page 7 of the Department of Justice hearings we find this:

Mr. ROONEY. With regard to your request that the language concerning the Fallbrook Water District matter be deleted from the bill, what is your reason for asking that?

Mr. BROWNELL. Basically it is this: That the whole suit involves Camp Pendleton, which is one of the largest military installa-

tions on the west coast, a Marine installation. The Government bought that property not knowing what their water rights were. If the water is taken away an investment of over \$100 million would be lost. I say the way to find out what the water rights of the Government are is to do it in court, and the effect of the rider is to prevent the Department of Justice from defending the Federal Government in court and really would mean a default.

Mr. ROONEY. The rider is not in the best interests of all of the people of the United States by any means, is it?

Mr. BROWNELL. I think not.

Mr. ROONEY. And should not have been inserted in the bill?

Mr. BROWNELL. That is right.

This rider was inserted in the bill last year on a close rollcall vote.

Continuing:

Mr. ROONEY. As a lawyer, that would be your opinion?

Mr. BROWNELL. That is it exactly.

Mr. ROONEY. I am glad to see my position has been vindicated after all this time.

The Marine Corps, incidentally, is not in favor of such a rider being contained in this bill?

Mr. BROWNELL. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. In other words, its lawyers agree with you in regard to this?

Mr. BROWNELL. That is correct.

At page 230 of the same printed hearings on the Department of Justice appropriation we find this:

Mr. CLEVENGER. The committee will come to order.

This testimony which we will hear now is a completion of the statement which was partly covered by the testimony of the Attorney General, and we will ask you, Mr. Rankin, for your statement at this time in regard to the Fallbrook Public Utility District matter which is contained in section 207 of the committee print of the bill.

After another remark or two by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER], Assistant Attorney General Rankin replied:

Mr. RANKIN. We appear before this committee asking that Congress eliminate that language from the new appropriation act.

We think it is not proper and that it does not leave the Department of Justice free to defend the United States in its legal rights; that it is not in accordance with the American tradition of permitting the trial of legal issues by the courts and a proper determination of those questions in the courts. We feel that this case, in the best interest, not only of the United States, but all of the litigants, should be tried so that the courts can determine the rights of the United States with regard to water at Camp Pendleton, and also the rights of all the other parties to the litigation. It is very important to the private parties to this litigation, in making their plans about the development of their various properties, as well as it is important to the United States in making plans concerning Camp Pendleton, that they know what their legal rights are to the use of water, the priorities concerning that use, and their relative positions regarding it. Before there can be any proper development of the whole area on any permanent basis, the interested parties must know what those rights are and what reliance they can place upon them.

That is substantially the position which was taken here on the floor of the House a year ago in opposition to this rider. I think it is unconscionable for the Congress to usurp the power of the courts on a matter such as this. This controversy should be left to the

courts, and the rights of all the taxpayers of the United States of America, not merely the litigants in the Fallbrook case, should be fairly and equitably determined. I trust the House will, in its wisdom, adopt the proposed amendment which would strike this rider from the bill.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, with complete confidence that the amendment will be defeated, as it has been defeated in previous sessions or, when the section was not written into the bill, it was written there by the Congress. It is manifestly impossible in 5 minutes to discuss a technical matter so complex as this. The United States bought for the Marine Corps what was known as the Santa Margarita Ranch, which had concluded a trial, lasting years, with the Vail Ranch to decide the water rights between those two great ranches in southern California. Camp Pendleton was established there. The lawsuit over water rights was not started at the instigation of the Marine Corps or of the Navy, so we have been told, but at the instigation of an employee of a former Attorney General. It was the intention of the Attorney General to file papers upon approximately 12,000 residents in the watershed in this area to settle a case involving underground water, surface water and the accumulation of water. The case involving individual rights has gone to trial. It is on appeal. A stipulation has been arrived at by which all of those 12,000 people will not be subjected to separate demands upon them to prove their water rights. If we can maintain the status quo and support a bill in the Interior Committee to build a small dam to accumulate further water, this can be settled. At no time has the Marine Corps been denied water. It is understood that the entire amount of water, irrespective of all demands, will be available to the Marine Corps, if it is needed for military purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude hastily to recognize my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], who has been there himself to investigate this situation.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I have been there and have investigated this, and I quite agree with everything that the gentleman from California has said as to the need for this particular bill. I am sure the Committee on this side is opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I wonder whether or not, in view of the position taken by the gentleman from California and the testimony of the Attorney General, he thinks that the present Attorney General, Mr. Brownell, is incompetent or inept?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think neither. I think a predecessor of Mr. Brownell had a young man in the Attorney General's Office who came out to California and

attempted to establish what he designated as the "paramount right" of the United States to all water and to bypass State water laws for the first time in the history of California water litigation, and if that were asserted and maintained, every State in the United States would have an interest in this suit as well as the State of California.

I yield to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT] in whose district the property lies.

Mr. UTT. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. I just want to say to the Members of this Committee that the suit has been divided. The suit on the Santa Margarita Water Co. has already been tried. It is now in the Supreme Court of the United States in the Ninth Circuit Court and there are 22 assignments of error. It is improper to continue the suit in the district court until those matters have been disposed of, because there have been 22 assignments of error based on the fact that the court did not follow the California water law. They made a decision which flies in the face of our concept of basic California water law, and the suit should not go on. The rights of the Government are not prejudiced because of the fact that they are maintained intact so long as the suit exists, and the riparian rights are in order. There is no shortage of water so far as military use is concerned. There is simply a shortage of water for the tax-free land of tenants and the Santa Margarita ranch.

Mr. ENGLE. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. I chaired the subcommittee that held the hearings, both here in Washington and in California, on the Fallbrook matter.

Here are the facts: The Justice Department started a lawsuit against 12,000 small farmers, lot owners, and business people in the Fallbrook area. Because of the hardship of that lawsuit on thousands of little people, we tried to get the Justice Department to hold off the serving of summons until we could work out a settlement here in the Congress. We did work out legislation which passed this House without even a rollcall. That bill is pending in the Senate. But the Justice Department would not hold up its legal proceedings to let Congress settle the matter, or listen to Congress. The Justice Department was going to proceed, break the small landowners with the cost of this lawsuit, force them to the wall, and confront everybody with a fait accompli. These thousands of small landowners could not afford to fight for justice—the cost would force them to throw in the sponge. That situation called for action by the political agency of our Government—the Congress, and we took action to achieve justice by other means—legislation.

How do we prevent a great agency of this Government from using its financial

and other resources arbitrarily to crush the common citizen? The way to do it is cut off their money. That is exactly what we have done, and that is the effect of the provision the amendment seeks to strike out of the bill. The provision simply holds the legal case in status quo until the pending bill is acted on by the Senate, one way or the other. If you believe the Congress has the right and the good sense to do justice between the people of Fallbrook and the Federal agencies involved at Camp Pendleton, then vote this amendment down.

This is a situation in which the legal remedy is not adequate. The rights involved, except those of the local people, are rights of the Federal Government, and the property of the Federal Government. The Congress—not the Federal courts—is primarily responsible to the people of this country for the rights and property of this Government. We have the right, and the responsibility, to arrogate to ourselves decisions relating to those rights and that property, where we think the circumstances warrant—and remove the matter from the strict legalisms of the courts. We have chosen to do that previously in this particular case. We should continue the prohibition against this lawsuit in the confidence that we will make the right decision here in respect to the rights and property of the Federal Government in the Fallbrook case.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 17, noes, 77.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JOHNSON of California, 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. 8067) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Clevenger amendment with regard to payments to air carriers.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on the other amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLEVINGER: On page 30, line 80, strike out "\$23,000,000" and insert "\$40,000,000."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 104, noes 28.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with an agreement made with the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my point of order at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that the vote be postponed until tomorrow?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. I think the gentleman from New York was seeking to withdraw the point of no quorum. If we agree to that I shall then ask unanimous consent that the vote go over until tomorrow.

Mr. ROONEY. And couple with the request that the first order of business tomorrow shall be the rollcall on this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot make any agreement as to the rollcall tomorrow; the House will determine that tomorrow.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROONEY. Can we submit the consent request now that the rollcall be had tomorrow?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Might I at this point assure the gentleman from New York that on our side we will see to it under the circumstances that the roll is called tomorrow if that is what he wants.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman very much; that is exactly what I want.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York withdraw his point of no quorum?

Mr. ROONEY. If that is the proper thing to do.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wants to know if the gentleman withdraws it or not.

Mr. ROONEY. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings on the measure before us go over until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN HOSPITAL, MEDICAL, AND NURSING EXPENSES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 456.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House such amounts as may be necessary to defray hospital, medical, and nursing expenses in the treatment of injuries incurred in the House of Representatives by its Members during the session of the House on March 1, 1954.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and of course I am not going to, will the gentleman from Indiana explain the resolution?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was introduced by our colleague from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG], a very close friend of one of our colleagues who was injured the other day.

The purpose of the resolution is to provide for payment out of the contingent fund of the House of the necessary medical and hospital expenses for our five colleagues who were so tragically wounded on the House floor the other day. They were here on duty in the House of Representatives. It seems to me and to everyone with whom I have discussed this matter it is only fair and right that the hospital and medical expenses which they are incurring in the treatment of their wounds be borne out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a rising vote.

The question was taken, the Members rising.

The SPEAKER. One hundred and ninety-four have voted in the affirmative, none in the negative.

So the resolution was agreed to unanimously, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXCISE TAXES

Mr. REED of New York, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported the bill (H. R. 8224) to reduce excise taxes and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1307), 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. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I do not see the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] presently on the floor, but

I am sure he would want to ask unanimous consent that the minority views be filed also, and I submit that in the form of a unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who made remarks in the Committee of the Whole today be given the privilege of revising and extending their remarks and including extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1265)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$8,120,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,431,909"; and the Senate agree to the same.

JOHN TABER,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
CLIFF CLEVINGER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT THOMAS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$600,000 for contingent expenses of the Senate, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Changes chapter number as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Authorizes the transfer of \$8,120,500 to the Coast Guard appropriation for acquisition, construction, and improvements instead of \$7,620,500 as proposed by the House and \$8,620,500 as proposed by the Senate. In allowing this amount it is the desire of the conferees that the Secretary of Defense shall, prior to the transfer of any of these funds, certify to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate the necessity of such proposed transfer.

Amendments Nos. 4 and 5: Change chapter numbers as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Increases the travel limitation of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to \$143,200 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$1,431,909 for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government instead of \$300,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,831,909 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees in approving this amount eliminated \$400,000 included in the budget presentation for task forces which may have to be created. The Commission is in the process of organizing budget requirements for all task force work and will know better after plans are more definite whether an additional amount will be required.

Amendment No. 8: Increases the travel limitation for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government to \$302,344 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 9 and 10: Change chapter numbers as proposed by the Senate.

JOHN TABER,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
CLIFF CLEVINGER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT THOMAS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the House made some brave retrenchments in this bill and cut the estimates something like \$2,200,000. Out of the \$27,942,616 requested the House sent only \$25,785,707 to the Senate.

But the conference report now under consideration here carries \$27,517,616, reducing the saving to a little over \$400,000 instead of the \$2,200,000 favored by the House.

At this rate it will be a long road to a balanced budget and a reduction in the national debt.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEXICAN AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H. J. Res. 355) amending the act approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461-1468), as amended, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 3, strike out all after "the" down to and including "1461-1468)" in line 5, and insert "Agricultural Act of 1949."

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution amending title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE SEIZURE AND FORCED INCORPORATION OF LITHUANIA, LATVIA, AND ESTONIA BY THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 438 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the second paragraph of House Resolution 346 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of (1) the seizure and forced 'incorporation' of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the treatment of the said Baltic peoples during and following said seizure and 'incorporation'; and (2) the subversion and destruction of free institutions and human liberties in all other areas controlled, directly or indirectly, by world communism, including the treatment of the peoples in such areas."

SEC. 2. The fourth paragraph of such resolution is hereby amended by inserting the words "or outside" immediately after the word "within."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out line 12 and lines 1 and 2 on page 2 and insert:

"Sec. 2. The fourth paragraph of such resolution is hereby amended by inserting immediately after the word 'within' the following: ', and after March 1, 1954, outside,'"

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment as to which I understand there is no opposition.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCOTT: Page 2, after line 5, insert the following:

"Sec. 3. The first paragraph of such resolution is hereby amended by striking out 'seven' and inserting in lieu thereof 'nine.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana

[Mr. MADDEN], and yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a continuation of a House resolution that was approved in the last session of this House and to some extent an extension of that resolution by providing for the expansion of the consideration by the committee of the forced incorporation by the Soviet Union of other states than the Baltic States mentioned in the original resolution. The resolution also extends the right of the committee to make certain necessary investigations outside as well as within the United States.

The resolution has the unqualified and very vigorous approval of the State Department in a memorandum which I understand came to the attention of the Secretary of State himself and was drafted by the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Smith, and which will be introduced more at length by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN], in the consideration of the bill.

The tragic manner in which the Baltic people were duped out of their freedom was the Kremlin's first successful big bluff. It should have been called at Yalta, at Teheran, or at Potsdam. The fact that they got away with it only led to the perfection of a pattern of aggression which has been steadily and carefully expanded. In Czechoslovakia, Poland, and other Iron Curtain nations, the pattern has remained the same. Only political expediency has altered its implementation.

The three Baltic nations which had been under the Czar for more than a century, yet, had maintained their languages, their culture, and their customs. But most important of all, they maintained their innate love of liberty. In 1918 when the Russian Army collapsed, the Bolsheviks revolted in Russia and the German Army weakened and the three nations proclaimed their freedom. Almost immediately, they were besieged by the Bolsheviks. They defended their lands so successfully that the Russians finally sought peace. Each of the three nations eventually entered into non-aggression pacts with the Kremlin and, in 1921, they became members of the League of Nations.

The intent of the Soviet regime in Russia to seize the Baltic nations was demonstrated in 1918. But the strength to enforce the seizure was not mustered until 21 years later. It only came about through the Stalin-Hitler friendship pact in 1939.

Exiled diplomats and government officials of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have testified that during the period when Molotov and Von Ribbentrop were negotiating the Germany-Soviet friendship pact, Stalin summoned representatives of the three Baltic governments to the Kremlin and ordered them to draw up mutual-assistance agreements which would permit the Red army, navy and air force to occupy strategic ports, airfields and areas. The Balts were unwilling to sign away their territorial integrity—which the Kremlin had always guaranteed; but when the Hitler-Stalin pact was followed by Germany's invasion of Poland 10 days later, they reluc-

tantly permitted Stalin to assume the role of protector of the Baltics.

They now know that the Stalin-Hitler agreement included the payment of \$7,500,000 in gold to Hitler for the Soviets' sphere of influence in the Baltics. They know, too, that in that pact of August 23, 1939 Hitler turned over the Baltic nations and a part of Poland to Stalin.

But the Kremlin was wary of Hitler and fearful of the unrest in the Baltic nations. Litvinoff—translated means the man from Lithuania—and Molotov repeatedly pronounced the Kremlin's intention to respect the sovereignty as well as the territorial integrity of the Baltic nations.

Stalin cunningly waited until June 14, 1940 before he made his master move. That was the day the victorious German army marched into Paris. That was the day when, with Hitler and all Germany looking south, Stalin issued an ultimatum to the Baltic nations. He demanded new governments in the three nations—governments friendly to the Kremlin and willing to guarantee free passage of Soviet troops. Without waiting for a reply, Red troops moved into Lithuania. The next day they occupied Latvia; a day later, Estonia.

This was Vishinsky's first big job. He directed the seizure of the three nations from Riga, capital of Latvia. His associates, Dekanozov in Lithuania and Zhdanov in Estonia eventually received the award that goes to those in the Politburo who achieve too much power. Of the three, only Vishinsky is still alive.

With the heads of the three governments jailed or exiled, and Red puppets in their places—always the leaders of the Soviet Friendship Societies—it only remained for the Kremlin to order phoney elections of Parliaments whose first order of business was to beg Russia to incorporate their nations into the Soviet Union. With machine guns strategically placed at these sessions, the elected members had to vote for incorporation or personally learn why Stalin chose to call himself the man of steel.

The fact that Hitler turned on Stalin and invaded the Baltics a year later does not alter the Kremlin's claim that the nations were incorporated into the Soviet Union. Former Secretary of State Cordell Hull expressed his concern about the Baltic nations and states that he spoke to President Roosevelt about it.

The President promised to talk to Stalin about the liberty of the 6 million subjugated people but there is no evidence on the record that he ever did.

So far as the world is concerned, the Iron Curtain rang down on the Baltic nations on the day that Paris fell to the Nazis. The Soviet pattern of aggression and the succeeding years of mass arrests, deportation, and murder cannot help but be recorded as one of the great horrors of history.

I have talked with people who saw freight cars filled with children who had been forcibly separated from their parents—dead from suffocation; with legal experts who attest that they were there when nearly 2,000 bodies were dug out of stench-laden earth; with former Government officials who have lists of

names, charges, and destination of deportation for over 200,000 people.

The Soviets made one mistake in the Baltic nations. When they fled before the Nazi armies in 1941, they left behind them enough documents to hang Stalin, Malenkov, Molotov, Vishinsky, Beria, and the entire Politburo in any court anywhere in the world.

Today, everyone and everything is sovietized from the Czech border eastward to the Pacific. The Kremlin has almost a billion people under its control. But among that billion they have the greatest fifth column this world has ever seen. Millions still remember the promise of liberty and freedom that came at the end of World War I, and the more nebulous promises of the Atlantic Charter of World War II. The hope of freedom still exists, even under the Kremlin's cruel domination. Revolt and unrest still prevail behind the Iron Curtain and those with courage continue to escape to the free world.

I believe that our American heritage demands that we do everything in our power to keep alive the spark of freedom behind the Iron Curtain. By every available means of communication, and that includes the Voice of America, we should tell the captive peoples to keep up their hope.

The Kremlin's house of cards will fall.

The extraordinary effectiveness of this committee's work is mentioned in Babson's Washington Forecast, which offers confidential advice on governmental matters, in its issue of February 1, 1954. The Babson Forecast calls this deadly documentation:

Much of the credit for the administration's new look at communism must go to the House "Baltic" Committee, headed by clear-thinking Congressman CHARLES J. KERSTEN of Wisconsin.

The committee's documentation of Soviet murder and treachery in Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania got widespread press coverage throughout the world.

It constituted the first formidable step in regaining the world propaganda initiative for the West.

We have learned that, this week, the committee will request a new appropriation of \$175,000 to expand its documented indictment to include the rape of Rumania, Poland, and Czechoslovakia.

It is our prediction that this first request for investigative funds by a special House committee in the current session of Congress will be promptly granted.

And Representative KERSTEN will soon propose exploitation of another facet in America's new realism toward world communism.

With reference to the history of the Baltic States prior to their forced incorporation into the U. S. S. R., here is what happened between 1918 and 1940 in the Baltic area.

All three Baltic States emerged as independent sovereign republics as a result of the post World War I political settlement in that region. Originally they were part of the Russian Empire and in 1918, by the decision of their popular representative bodies, proclaimed independence. The Soviet Government—1918-19—attempted then to establish Communist rule in the Baltic countries by force of arms. This attempt, however, failed because of the

weakness of the Communist rule in the Russian Soviet Federal Socialist Republic, and because of strong armed resistance on the part of the Baltic peoples. The Soviet Government therefore postponed their incorporation to a more favorable occasion and concluded peace treaties with Lithuania on July 12, 1920; Latvia on August 11, 1920; and with Estonia on February 2 of the same year. Subsequently, or even prior to that, the Baltic States were recognized by all European governments and admitted to the League of Nations on September 22, 1921.

Their position, vis-à-vis their eastern neighbor, was strengthened still more by nonaggression pacts concluded between Lithuania and the U. S. S. R. on September 28, 1926—the validity of which was extended until December 31, 1945; between Latvia and the U. S. S. R. on February 2, 1932; and between Estonia and the U. S. S. R. on May 4, 1932.

By these bilateral treaties, the Soviet Union undertook to respect, in all circumstances, the sovereignty, as well as integrity, and the territorial inviolability of the Baltic countries.

Many official pronouncements of Soviet statesmen—Litvinov, Molotov, and so forth—can be quoted to the effect that the Soviet Union professed its firm adherence to the spirit as well as the letter of those agreements.

With the upset political equilibrium in Europe, caused by German aggression and the friendship and neutrality—Stalin-Hitler—pact of August 23, 1939, the Soviet Government had its hands free to resume its communistic expansion in the Baltic area, abandoned in 1920. The incorporation of the Baltic States was accomplished in stages, the first being the conclusion of mutual-assistance treaties between the U. S. S. R. and Estonia on September 28, 1939; Latvia on October 5, 1939; and Lithuania on October 10, 1939. By virtue of these treaties, Soviet military bases were established on their territories. The presence of these Red army detachments was later used to exert pressure on the Baltic Governments. In June 1940 the Soviet Government took further steps in its carefully planned piecemeal incorporation design. It confronted the three Baltic States with ultimative requests for establishment of new governments "capable and willing to warrant the honest execution of the mutual-assistance pacts" and "free passage of Soviet troops in sufficient numbers to guarantee the realization of the mutual assistance pact."

The next step was to stage new elections in order to elect a Parliament willing to ask for incorporation into the U. S. S. R. The candidates were named, and the whole operation was supervised by Dekanozov in Kaunas, Vishinsky in Riga, and Zhdanov in Tallinn. The new elected Diets adopted at their first session resolutions obliging the Soviet Governments of the respective Baltic Republics to apply to the Soviet Union for inclusion in the U. S. S. R. On August 3, 1940, the Supreme Council of the U. S. S. R. acceded to Lithuania's request. On August 6 Latvia was accepted, and on August 7, Estonia.

The occupation, seizure, and incorporation of the 3 Baltic nations violated every agreement previously entered into by the U. S. S. R. and the 3 countries.

Soviet occupation of the 3 countries continued until July 1941. During this time more than 200,000 people were deported, killed, or disappeared. Then, in July, Hitler attacked Russia, occupied the Baltic area, and held it until 1944, when the Red armies again returned, and they completed the annexation and incorporation that was started in 1940.

The House Baltic Committee on February 9, 1954, released the following statement, with which I am in full accord:

The Baltic committee, which I truly believe to have proven itself bipartisan throughout hearings in Washington, New York, Detroit and Chicago has seriously, and successfully, endeavored to document what happens to a nation—in this case three nations—when the Soviets move in.

The Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia were the first to suffer from Communist aggression. In all three countries there were only six million people—but we found, in addition to the exiles who had lost their land, their homes and their families that there were many great Americans deeply concerned with the fundamental freedom of people.

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles was our first witness. His historic statement on the principles for which our Government stands at the international conference table has—as I stated on the floor yesterday—produced notable and outstanding success at the current Berlin conference.

Our committee must finish its documentation of the illegal seizure of the Baltic nations. Many important witnesses are unable to come to the United States. It might be necessary for our small group to go to them.

But even more important is the very basic fact, brought out by testimony before our committee, that the seizure of the Baltic nations and their incorporation into the Soviet Union was but the first in a well-planned series of aggression which has now brought nearly a billion people under the domination of the small clique in the Kremlin.

The same pattern of merciless, inhumane treatment that was used in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in 1940 and 1941 was later used in Poland, in Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and in the other captive nations.

A map, for example, placed before our committee as evidence and attested to by former President Herbert Hoover and General Rastikis, chief of staff of the Lithuanian Army, conclusively proved that the Nazi-Soviet Friendship Pact of 1939 sold out not only the Baltic nations but gave half of Poland to Stalin. This means that Soviet aggression in the Baltics and in Poland went hand in hand—even though Hitler never dreamed that after his death Stalin would steal Poland through phony elections first perfected in the Baltics.

We have conclusively proven, by testimony, films, and documents that Soviet Ambassador to the United States, Andrei Vishinsky, was the mastermind who subjugated the Baltic States. We ask permission to show the role he played in the ruin of Rumania.

We ask, too, that we be given the opportunity to document the maneuvers of Premier Georgi Malenkov in reestablishing the Cominform in Poland in 1947 which resulted in the bondage of the Polish people now endure.

Think of it: In 7 years the most modest estimate of Poles deported from their homeland is well over a million.

Our committee hopes that, through being granted the privilege of more latitude in our investigation, we can, before this session of Congress closes, bring before you conclusive proof of a great international conspiracy through which the many are enslaved by the few. Our investigations thus far show that the story is the same, the pattern is the same, only the magnitude of the crime changes as we go from the Baltics to the Ukraine, to Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland—a pattern first imposed on the Russian people themselves.

We ask for time. We ask for funds to fully expose it.

I should report to you that the Baltic Committee is probably the only one established by the House in recent years to win 14 attacks in 3 weeks by the big guns of the Moscow propaganda machine. We even have a new name. Pravda, Radio Moscow, and the entire Communist press have called us KERSTEN's traveling circus.

But from behind the Iron Curtain—through Stockholm, Sweden, comes word that brings assurance that this investigation is worthwhile. It may give you some measure of the concern our hearings have caused in the Kremlin.

"After Pravda, the entire press of Soviet Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania reprinted the attack (on KERSTEN's traveling circus) and those Balts who cannot hear the Kersten Commission in Baltic broadcasts could read in their daily papers that the Soviet crimes against their countries are being inquired into and that their case is not entirely forgotten in the democratic West."

We cannot forget the Poles, the Czechs, the Slovaks, the Hungarians, Rumanians, Albanians, Russians, or Ukrainians and others under Soviet domination any more than we can afford to forget the Balts. For who among us cannot proudly boast of ties with Europe through blood or friendship?

The day is not far off when we will have a free world of free nations and free people. And I believe that our committee should conclude its work in such form and in such manner that the red mark which the Reds have made on human history will become a matter of record that will live forever and plague the criminals responsible for it.

Through this amendment, we can achieve two objectives: We can show the Communist conspiracy for what it is. We can keep the faith, the hope, and the spirit of captive millions alive. And, through thousands of tomorrows, we can help to show those who follow us what it means to lose freedom and how it can be lost through a carefully planned and well-executed conspiracy.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to read the communication from the State Department to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania referred, as I think it sums up the situation as to the advisability of extending the scope of this inquiry. This communication is signed by Under Secretary of State Walter B. Smith, but I understand reliably that the language was formulated by Mr.

Dulles while he was in Berlin. It is dated February 8, 1954, and reads as follows:

Memorandum for the Honorable CHARLES J. KERSTEN, House of Representatives.

The following are the Department's views regarding the work of the House Baltic Committee and your proposal to broaden the scope of the committee's inquiry, as set forth in the draft resolution enclosed with your letter of January 17, 1954, to Secretary Dulles:

1. The Department considers that the work of the House committee has been wisely planned and effectively conducted. It is apparent that the hearings held to date have made a valuable contribution to United States objectives in disseminating impressive evidence of Soviet disrespect for the rights and sovereignty of small nations.

2. The Department believes that it will be beneficial to broaden the scope of the committee's work to provide for inquiry into similar cases where communism has extended its domination over free peoples. Careful, well-documented investigation of such cases would be valuable (a) to assure the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain that they are not forgotten and that the United States does not endorse their captivity; and (b) to educate public opinion in the free world regarding Communist techniques in seizing power and the terrible realities of life under Communist rule.

This amendment expands the scope of the inquiry of House Resolution 346 originally authorizing and directing the House Select Committee to investigate the seizure of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Soviets and the treatment of their peoples. Our committee is in the process of documenting and exposing the Communist seizure of the Baltic nations. We have completed a substantial part of our work with regard to the Baltics and contemplate some further Baltic hearings.

The amendment expands the inquiry so as to show the Communist subversion and destruction of freedom in countries such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and other areas where the ugly and inhuman Communist way of life has made itself known.

The United States has not acquiesced in the Communist enslavement of the peoples of the captive nations. Among the first of the captive nations to be enslaved by Communist aggression were the defenseless Baltic nations.

The same blueprint of Communist enslavement was imposed upon the brave people of Poland, Hungary, Rumania, the Czech and Slovak people; the peoples of Bulgaria and Albania; it was the same pattern of enslavement earlier applied by the Communists to the Ukrainian nation and to the other nations of the Soviet Union, including the first imposition upon the people of Russian, or Bolshevik terror by the small but ruthless band headed by Lenin.

I believe the work of the Baltic committee is making an important contribution to the security of the United States, particularly by keeping alive and strengthening the bond between the people of America and the peoples enslaved by communism behind the Iron Curtain.

The success of the committee thus far has been due to the fine work of the committee members and of our hard-working staff.

At this point I would like to pay a tribute to the outstanding work of one of our committee members, the Honorable ALVIN M. BENTLEY, of Michigan, who was shot down on the floor of this House Monday afternoon.

In behalf of every member of our committee and staff, we want to pay a special tribute to him and let him know that we need him back with our committee at the earliest opportunity his health will permit. Mr. BENTLEY's examination of witnesses at our hearings, particularly those in Detroit, in bringing out from witnesses the story of their actual experiences of the inhuman practices of the Communist NKVD, is an example in point. These firsthand stories of Communist cruelty practiced upon enslaved peoples were beamed over the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe and have caused violent and hysterical Soviet reaction. The experience and background of the gentleman from Michigan admirably qualify him to unmask Soviet occupation, having for 2 years been attached to the American Embassy in Hungary under Communist occupation during the trials of Cardinal Mindszenty and thereafter.

Likewise the other members of our committee have made very valuable contributions to the effectiveness of our work. Mr. BUSBEY, of Illinois, and Mr. BONIN, of Pennsylvania, have, by their intelligent questioning of witnesses who experienced life under the Communists, brought out the horrors of Communist occupation.

Mr. MADDEN, of Indiana, chairman of the Katyn Forest Massacre Committee, and Mr. MACHROWICZ, of Michigan, likewise on that committee, who have the exceptional background of experience in the investigation of the Katyn Forest massacre, have likewise brought out, for the benefit of the American people and of the world, the inhuman practices of the Communists in the Baltic nations.

Mr. DODD, of Connecticut, whose experience in the Nuremberg trials, admirably qualify him, and likewise have given him a deep understanding of the Communist conspiracy. He, too, has helped pierce the curtain of deception hiding NKVD atrocities.

I would like to call attention to some of the statements made at the time when Mr. Dulles wrote this letter on behalf of our committee in Berlin and many of the other statements made in Mr. Molotov's presence for the benefit of the people in Europe. At that time he, on two different occasions, specifically referred to the Communist rape of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia to the great embarrassment of Mr. Molotov.

A reading of Mr. Dulles' statement made at the Berlin Conference shows clearly that he understood Soviet duplicity and hit hard at the history of their bloody rule over people everywhere the Communists have come to power.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that by bringing out the facts as to the actuality and realities of the treatment of people once they fall slave to the Communists as told by the lips of those who at firsthand have experienced it is one of the most

effective ways that we can get a hard-hitting information program. But, further and more important than that, it shows that we have a real bond of sympathy with these captive nations—the peoples of Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania, the Ukraine, the Russian people, the other peoples of the Soviet Union. That is what we must keep alive. We must keep these allies on the other side of the Iron Curtain. That is the chief motive of this committee to show our understanding for these suffering peoples and to show the realities of the Communist way of life.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I congratulate the committee for the splendid work they have been doing which I followed with great satisfaction. I learned that the propaganda organs from Moscow have criticised severely not only you, as chairman, but the entire committee for exposing the Communist crimes committed in the Baltic States. It appears to me that your committee has hit the Kremlin where it hurts the most. Does the gentleman not think that is correct?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio who, I know, knows a great deal about the Communist conspiracy that at least on 14 different occasions since we started our hearings, Radio Moscow and the Communist radio have been screaming. I think they have been hurt and I think we can hurt them far more with this type of truth.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Further, I understand that the Voice of America has been carrying beyond the Iron Curtain particularly into the Baltic States the testimony which you have elicited from those witnesses, including verbatim testimony of many of the eyewitnesses, and that there is clear and concise evidence that the Voice of America got this story across to the people of the Baltic nations.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Both the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe recorded all of our hearings, I believe, and beamed them across, and the fact that we had such a violent response shows that these programs carried across the Iron Curtain.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Of course, in the cold war, we are fighting for the minds and loyalties of men, and I want to quote from a statement by one of the foremost and distinguished geopoliticians in the United States, Father Walsh, of Georgetown University, of Washington, D. C., who said:

The hotter we make the logistics of the cold war, the colder we make the probabilities of a hot war.

I agree with that statement, and I wonder if the gentleman likewise agrees with it?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I am in complete agreement with that, because it is my understanding of that statement of Father Edmund Walsh of Georgetown that the more sympathy and union we can create between our-

selves and the enslaved people behind the Iron Curtain, the more impossible we make it for the Communists to mold them into an aggressive force against us.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. I congratulate the gentleman on the vigorous and determined fashion in which he has undertaken his duties as chairman of this committee. I am in complete sympathy with what he is doing with his committee in this work. However, as I read the resolution, it seems to be quite all-embracing, and I wonder if the gentleman would give us a little more concrete information as to the method he intends to follow. I notice that it will take in the bamboo curtain, for instance.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I think we will have to use a little common sense with regard to that. I think a majority of our witnesses would come from the countries of Eastern Europe, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and so forth. There might be a few from other areas, but the Department of State and the committee members thought it wise not to put down exact areas, because it might thereby create an obligation. But without any question, the countries of Eastern Europe will afford most of the witnesses that can be effective in such further hearings.

Mr. SADLAK. I was particularly interested to know whether the gentleman planned to go into Rumania and Hungary.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Oh, yes. Rumania and Hungary would be included in the countries of Eastern Europe.

Mr. SADLAK. Then, of course, the bamboo curtain takes in China, which was not so long ago in completely friendly hands. Does the gentleman plan to take in that phase now?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. At this point I would say our first approach would be where the witnesses are most numerous and available.

Mr. SADLAK. And the same pattern or design is approved there?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. That is true.

EXPOSE WHOLE RECORD OF RED SLAVERY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman and the members of his committee for bringing this very important matter to the attention of the House.

The Russian people were the first victims.

They are in the middle of a prison that has been growing larger with every communist conquest. They have been given up for lost. No one thinks of these, the first living victims of the Reds, or pleads their case with facts or figures, or offers any hope that the liberties stolen from them will ever be restored.

By ignoring their plight, our counter-offensive against communism is failing to strike at the heart of the problem.

The whole record of communist terror and subversion must be probed to its

very beginnings and revealed to all the world as the first step in rolling back this conspiracy against mankind—to the very first crime, which was committed against the Russian people, until we enlist their support by documenting the fraud and force that enslaved them, our job will only be half done.

With this in mind, we should give unanimous approval to House Resolution 438, introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN]. It would authorize a committee to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of, first, the seizure and forced incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the treatment of said Baltic peoples during and following said seizure and incorporation; and, second, the subversion and destruction of free institutions and human liberties in all other areas controlled, directly or indirectly, by world communism, including the treatment of the peoples in such areas.

Section 2: The fourth paragraph of such resolution—House Resolution 346—“is hereby amended by inserting the words ‘or outside’ immediately after the word ‘within’.”

These two little words are important. We must know how the Communist conspiracy takes root underground and how it spreads. Obviously, we cannot take our committee past the Red army and the Red secret police, to secure evidence within the dungeons of Lubianka prison, or within the remote and forbidding slave camps in Siberia.

Therefore we must get our evidence outside from reliable and fortunate witnesses, who have escaped from the terror.

The investigation must be conducted as close to the Iron Curtain as possible, to contact refugees from the captive countries, and also Russians who have fled to freedom with the stories of Now It Can Be Told.

I believe that such a forthright investigation would pile up a tremendous moral indictment of communism; it would also provide the free world with accurate and moving testimony that could be radioed back into the dark world of communism, bringing hope that the emancipating truth is known and is actively working for the day of liberation.

The facts must be marshaled completely. They must be verified, so that the case against communism will be overwhelming.

On a number of days during the year, on occasions that mean so much to the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, and other nations that are groaning under the heel of Communist brutality, we offer vague promises of help.

Up to this moment there has been no sign of any supporting action.

I believe that this resolution is the first realistic step and in the right direction. Communist propaganda has enslaved people with lies. We must help to liberate them with truth, but first we must have the courage and the decision to get at the facts that will expose the deceptions.

and cruelties of communism from those who have suffered from it so that the power of world opinion will start it on the road to oblivion.

The searchlight of investigation, under the wide scope of House Resolution 438, will help to uncover all the dark crimes of communism so that they will have no place to hide, even within Russia itself.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution expanding the Baltic committee was passed out of the Rules Committee without any opposition. I simply wish to remind the Members of the House that I believe one of the most effective ways of combating and curtailing the spread of communism is the work that this committee is doing. During December we held hearings in Washington, New York, Detroit, and Chicago, and we listened to the testimony of a great number of witnesses, collected a great many exhibits which were admitted into the testimony, and those facts were not only published in the newspapers generally throughout this country but Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America carried the proceedings behind the Iron Curtain.

As chairman of the Katyn committee in the last session of Congress I can testify, to the outstanding effectiveness the work of a committee engaged in this type of investigation can accomplish. In London and Frankfurt, Germany, we held 6 days of hearings in each locality. Every day we had between 70 or 80 newspaper reporters, radio commentators, and newspapers throughout all Western Europe carrying the testimony and proceedings. Not only that, but the testimony and facts that were revealed, exposing communism in its true light, were carried behind the Iron Curtain. The newspaper Pravda, and the Warsaw newspapers and others including radio behind the Iron Curtain were making daily malicious attacks upon our committee, which was the best evidence that we were highly effective.

Congressman MACHROWICZ and I spoke at the opening of a convention of newspaper journalists in Berlin on Friday of the week when we held hearings at Frankfurt, Germany. Over 500 delegates were in attendance. Most of these delegates were journalists who had escaped from behind the Iron Curtain. A number of them were members of the underground from various captive countries.

We talked to a number of these journalists and they stated that for the first time since the war the Katyn committee had brought out facts and information revealing the true criminal and barbarous mind which is possessed by the Kremlin rulers. These facts were sent not only to the free countries but to all captive nations behind the Iron Curtain. The Communist propaganda machine was placed on the defensive for the first time by reason of the revelations recorded by the Katyn committee.

I wish to read an excerpt from a newspaper article. It testifies more than anything else to the great work which this committee is accomplishing and will accomplish. You have all read about

John Hvasta. He was the ex-GI who was a prisoner for almost 4 years behind the Iron Curtain. He said, and I quote:

"People in Czechoslovakia don't get much of a thrill out of their buildings, especially government buildings," he added. "In fact, they don't get any thrill out of their government. But here you do. At least I do, and I think most people do. We may cuss out our Government, but we appreciate it just the same.

"The word 'American' is a passport in Czechoslovakia," he said, explaining to me how he was able to travel 200 miles from his prison in Leopoldov to the American Embassy in Prague. "I never would have been taken in by Czech families along the way had I not been an American."

Hvasta was greatly interested in the freedom balloons which this writer helped to launch from the German border into Czechoslovakia 3 years ago, carrying messages of hope and friendship.

"I heard about the balloons though I didn't see any," he said. "What the people there need is exactly this kind of encouragement. All the people behind the Iron Curtain are strong for America, but they have to be reminded that we have not forgotten them. We have far more friends than we realize, but we don't take advantage of that fact."

The work of the Baltic committee will reassure the freedom-loving people behind the Iron Curtain that the free world has not forgotten them.

This means that the work of this committee through the testimony to be revealed by witnesses some of whom were leaders in their Communist captive nations before World War II will give millions renewed life and courage to continue the struggle against communistic slavery. I know that every Member of this House deplores the unfortunate wounding of a member of this committee by the Puerto Rican terrorist last Monday afternoon. ALVIN BENTLEY devoted a great service to the Baltic committee and we all hope that his recovery is rapid so he can resume his duties as a member of our committee. Of course, the same sentiments are held by all of us toward the other Members who were shot by these fanatics.

I want to commend the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman KERSTEN, for the outstanding work that has been done so far, and I do hope that this resolution will be unanimously adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the gentleman have any further requests for time on his side?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, this resolution extending the life and the scope of the Kersten committee should be passed by this House.

As a member of this committee since the date of its organization, I have had an excellent opportunity to observe and to evaluate its work.

When assigned to this committee I believed that a great opportunity to render service to the cause of freedom and liberty awaited us as members of the committee and likewise awaited all

of us as Members of this Congress. That belief has been confirmed.

I saw in the establishment of this committee the first real opportunity to investigate the destruction of the free Baltic nations, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia by the Soviet Union.

I knew that such a committee could not undo any of the dreadful things that had happened. I knew that we could not rewrite history; that we could not bring back life to those who were murdered by the Communists of the Soviet Union. I knew that we could not free from the worst type of slavery and bondage those who are in the Soviet prison camps and jails. I knew that we could not restore liberty and decency and freedom to the hapless inhabitants of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia who live from day to day under the heel of the occupying Soviet tyrant.

I never expected that this committee could achieve by itself the end result of our foreign policy and the ultimate objective of free and decent peoples all over the world.

I did believe then, and I believe now, that this Congress through this Kersten committee could ascertain the facts concerning the destruction of these free countries. I knew that we could write a record of what happened based on the testimony of living persons and on the availability of truthful documents and honest records.

Mr. Speaker, that has been partially accomplished and the record that has been written so far is a chapter of history that the world must never forget. This record must be completed.

It is important that this history be written now because many of those living who can tell us what happened are growing older. Soon they will not be available. Besides, the documentary material must be recorded and preserved under a proper authority.

Unfortunately there are still people in the world who do not believe that the Communist conspiracy murders, plunders and terrorizes free people wherever and whenever it gets an opportunity to do so.

There are still responsible heads of state who appear not to understand the implications of the Communist threat to freedom and to liberty. People like Nehru of India, still do not understand. Some people in our own land do not understand.

For those who are still in ignorance and in darkness in our own time, and for those who will come after us and face new problems concerning freedom and new threats to liberty, the record of what happened in these places must be set down.

By the extension of the life of this committee this mission can be fulfilled.

That is the first purpose of this resolution.

By widening the scope of this committee to include those other countries which have been dragged behind the Iron Curtain we can extend and make more complete this record. There are great numbers of individuals who are available to tell us what happened in Poland, in Hungary, in Czechoslovakia, and in the Balkan countries. From

their lips and from the records the history of this dark time can be preserved. Not only will we have made a great contribution toward the documentation of this black period, but as well, and at the same time, we can accomplish two other great objectives by the conducting of this investigation through a committee of representatives of a free people.

First, we will sustain hope in the hearts of those who are now in Soviet thrall; we will give them faith because they will know we have not forgotten them.

Secondly, we will serve notice to the world that the struggle goes on, that the people of America will never retreat from this battle for liberty and that we will never give up the struggle for peace and for freedom under law.

Before closing, let me observe that this committee, among its other accomplishments, occupies a standout position for the manner in which it has conducted its affairs.

The chairman of this committee, Congressman CHARLES KERSTEN, of Wisconsin, has been a model of fairness, of moderation, and of industrious application to the work assigned. At a time when congressional investigations are a matter of grave concern across this land, Congressman KERSTEN and the members of this committee have demonstrated that a congressional committee can investigate Communists and communism judiciously, temperately, and honestly.

For all of these reasons and for many more which the limitations of time do not permit me to relate on the floor of this House, I earnestly ask that this resolution be passed by this House.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ].

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take any more time than is necessary on this matter but I do want to add my words of commendation to our distinguished chairman of the Baltic committee for the splendid work he has done thus far. As a minority member of the committee I think I can attest to the fact and I can attest also to the fact that already very much has been accomplished at a relatively low cost to us if we talk in the matter of finances.

Just this afternoon we spent a lot of time debating how much we should spend on the Voice of America and our United States Information Service abroad. We appropriated \$75 million for that purpose, and very wisely, in my opinion.

With a relatively small sum of money, because the work of this committee has taken very little money, we can accomplish so much at such low cost and I am sure, therefore, there will be no dispute about the passage of this resolution.

The purpose of the work of this committee is twofold. First of all, we are conducting a psychological warfare. We are letting the people behind the Iron Curtain know that we have not forgotten them, that we still do intend to work until the days of their enslavement are ended. Secondly, we are accomplishing something that sometimes we forget

about, and that is, in order to properly face this Communist problem which we have before us we must understand it. We cannot understand it unless we study it properly. We cannot study it properly unless we see what they have done in the past and unless we accumulate all of the evidence that is available.

This committee has done a splendid job in that respect, and I am sure it will continue to do so if it is permitted to proceed under the terms of this resolution, which I heartily support and trust will be passed by the House unanimously.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I compliment and congratulate the able gentleman of Wisconsin and the distinguished committee for bringing this significant resolution to the floor of the House. It will, of course, have my wholehearted support.

Full investigation of the calloused, merciless, godless persecution of millions of unfortunate democratic-minded peoples has been too long delayed.

This inquiry which covers broad scope may well be the entering wedge which will in time open up and foreshadow the liberation of these sorely afflicted nations. It will give new heart and new courage to the oppressed and persecuted.

It will also serve to inform the free world as well as peoples behind the Iron Curtain of the enormity, barbarity, cruelty, and savagery which have characterized the Soviet program of infiltrating, consolidating, and incorporating these freedom-loving peoples into the ideological, military, territorial, and political orbit of world communism.

The investigation will reveal to the world the unconscionable excesses of the Communists, not only those destructive of liberty and violative of humanity, but in the broader sense, those which have so diabolically stifled the national sovereignty, political independence, and social justice of the oppressed nations.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BONIN].

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Baltic committee to investigate the illegal seizure of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Communist overlords of Moscow, I rise to support the House Resolution 438. The Baltic committee saw and heard witnesses who portrayed the most dastardly acts of barbarism to the helpless people of these proud nations. Our committee established a new precedent of recreating, for the future benefit of free people, the method in which ruthless dictators deprive millions of people of their freedom, liberty, and independence. It was clearly shown that Andrei Vishinsky, the Soviet representative to the United Nations, wilfully and maliciously participated in the rape of Latvia and was responsible for the massacre, murder and imprisonment of thousands upon thousands of freedom-loving people.

Our hearings established the fact that the word of Communist dictators cannot be believed. In the case of the three

Baltic nations, the dictators of Russia entered into solemn compacts, treaties and agreements and, within a short span of 20 years and at the outbreak of the Second World War, the Government of the Soviet Union, on various pretexts and unfounded allegations, violated all the treaties signed by them and proceeded with the occupation of these indefensible countries. On May 29, 1940, Lithuania was presented with a menacing note from Moscow charging the Lithuanians with letting their foreign agents kidnap and torture two Red army soldiers in order to force them to disclose military secrets. The Lithuanian Government officials sought to clarify this incident which actually had been inspired by Moscow agents. Sixteen days later, the proud nation of Lithuania was handed an ultimatum from Moscow demanding the immediate formation of a new government acceptable to the Communist dictators and also for the admission of new troops to occupy all of the important centers of that nation. Substantial Red army contingents had already been placed at strategic points in pursuance to the Mutual Aid Pact between the Soviets and Lithuania. Being unable to resist these demands, the Lithuanian Government capitulated on June 15. The occupation of all Lithuania by the Red troops began immediately.

Then, to add insult to injury, the Soviet News Agency, Tass, informed the world that the Baltic nations had conducted a military alliance against the Soviet Union, to justify their ruthless action against the freedom, independence, and sovereignty of these helpless nations. We heard the same identical charges preferred against Estonia and Latvia and with the same type of hypocrisy—in accordance with the plan of deceit, lies, and hypocrisy which is ever present in the dealings of the Russian Commissars. Red troops occupied all three of these little nations. This is demonstrative proof that no solemn agreement entered with the Communists can be relied upon by any nation of the free world.

The most recent demonstration of their subterfuge occurred in Berlin and, as a result of the Russian conduct at the Berlin conference, Secretary Dulles was able to use the information supplied by our Baltic hearings to prove the Communist leaders had no intention of abiding by the rules of honesty and decency.

The resolution under consideration at the present time, expands the activities of the committee in order to prove to the world that the same identical pattern was used by the Russians to take over Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. Our committee, under this resolution, will establish that these governments came under the domination of Communist influence as a result of the use of lies, chicanery, murder, and other means by the Russians.

I earnestly urge the Members of the House to unanimously adopt this resolution.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to declare my full support of House Resolution 346, as amended by House Resolution 438. The resolution, as amended, sets up a select congressional committee to conduct a complete investigation of the incorporation and seizure of the Baltic nations—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—by the U. S. S. R., as well as the Kremlin's subversion and destruction of free institutions and liberties in other countries such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, and other captive nations now compelled by Communist tyranny to remain behind the Iron Curtain.

It is clear that the seizure, merciless and inhuman domination of these countries is part of a well-defined pattern of Soviet Communist imperialism, which has brought nearly a billion people under the domination of the Kremlin clique. There are some 15 millions in forced labor camps in Soviet Russia. Since 1939 a total of 264,200 square miles has been brought under direct Soviet imperialistic and Communist control. The validity of the Soviet claim to the countries and territories in these areas rests principally upon sheer force and brutality.

The U. S. S. R. occupied Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia in June 1940 and these countries were annexed by Soviet decree in August of that year. In the meantime, the flower of Polish leadership and thousands upon thousands of other freedom-loving Poles have been deported to arctic Russia and to Siberia. Many others have been executed without trial. Polish industry and mining are under the control of the Soviet Union. The Polish people are compelled to do without basic needs while the Kremlin reaps the Polish harvest. The formerly free Polish farmer, miner, and worker has now been forced to become in effect a Soviet serf, chained to the slave farm collectives, mines, and factories.

This resolution, as amended, recognizes that savage crimes against humanity have been committed in Poland, in the Baltic States and elsewhere behind the Iron Curtain, and that natural justice demands that there be presented to the world the evidence of the crimes, the identity of the criminals and the manner in which the crimes were committed. It is important to know how the criminals were able to subjugate these peoples and the methods and individuals who were used in the diabolic process. We must have a public record of Soviet crimes for the whole world to see and to this end we must collect all of the information in one place under official auspices.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is entirely fitting and appropriate that this inquiry should be made by a select committee of the United States Congress, which is the very backbone of our free and democratic form of government.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD a letter from the Polish-American Congress, Inc., Illinois division, in support of the resolution, as amended:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
ILLINOIS DIVISION,
Chicago, Ill., February 27, 1954.
The Honorable THOMAS S. GORDON,
Representative in Congress, Illinois
Eighth District, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GORDON: It is our understanding that House Resolution 438 comes up for a vote in the House of Representatives on Tuesday, March 2. We would be extremely grateful to you for any support you can give toward adoption of this all-important resolution.

We have given this resolution careful study and sincerely believe the best interest of the United States can be served if the present Baltic committee's investigation is extended to include a study of Soviet Russia's bizarre and illegal seizure of Poland and her neighbors.

Our files are replete with reports of inhuman treatment and persecution of the Poles by their present Communist rulers. These Soviet-dominated rulers seized Poland and the other countries covered by the proposed resolution through the most outrageous act of treachery ever recorded by history.

Extension of the Baltic committee's investigation can be the best answer to those in our country who still cling to their belief that Russia can be trusted to keep her agreements. It will likewise best serve to support President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles in their bold determination to contain Soviet expansion.

As Americans, we are deeply concerned that the United States have as many supporters in Europe as possible. So long as the Soviets realize America has not abandoned her traditional position of freedom and justice for all mankind, they will not dare start a third war. Exposure of all the facts leading to the enslavement of our traditional allies—including Poland—by the Soviets is undoubtedly the most forceful way we can demonstrate to those poor victims of Communist aggression that this country has not forgotten them.

It is for these reasons that we earnestly hope you will add your support to this vital resolution, House Resolution 438.

We would be greatly honored to learn your own observations on this subject.

Respectfully yours,

ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,
President.
(For the Board).

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, it is not generally recognized in this Congress that California is the third ranking State in the United States in wool production. California's many attributes and the myriad of crops grown there have tended to overshadow the importance of wool. Yet, wool production is an important segment of the economy of the State, particularly the San Joaquin Valley, of which the district which I am privileged to represent is an integral part. As a matter of fact, the major portion of California's wool production is in my district.

I mention these points, Mr. Speaker, as a preliminary to calling the attention of this body to H. R. 7775, on which hearings began today before the Com-

mittee on Agriculture. This bill embodies the Administration's recommended wool-support program and is vitally needed to spur domestic production of this product, whose critical and essential character for military needs has been recognized by both the administration and Congress. The Congress has set by statute a production goal of 360 million pounds of shorn wool per year in the United States. This figure has not been attained under the present program in the face of import competition. In fact, the number of sheep in California and in the Nation have declined during the past year until we have 800,000 fewer breeding ewes in the Nation today than we had 12 months ago.

Those of us in the House who represent wool-producing areas are hopeful that the wool program can be enacted into law as soon as possible and without being hampered by amendments affecting other commodities.

To complete the task of attaining adequate domestic wool production one other action is required. Before the President of the United States is a recommendation of the Tariff Commission affecting wool imports which was arrived at after 8 months study. Although I am not acquainted with detailed findings of the Commission, the facts presented at hearings several months make it self-evident that additional fees on imported wool not only are desirable but absolutely essential. Due to the great amount of wool which is imported annually the present price support program for wool never has been able to operate as was intended by Congress.

Domestic wool is continuing to accumulate in Government inventory. The wool program thus far has cost the Commodity Credit Corporation \$90 million. This does not include any possible losses which may accrue on the nearly 100 million pounds of wool now in Government storage, nor on the 35 million pounds now under appraisal from the new clip, much of which is likely to be foreclosed upon by the Government. The cost of storage on wool now in Federal inventory is \$100,000 a month. The establishment of a higher import fee to enable the sale of that wool into the domestic market without loss to the Government, in my judgment, would be an important economy measure on behalf of all taxpayers of the United States.

Taking these facts into consideration, officials of the Department of Agriculture as well as representatives of the wool industry urged the Tariff Commission to fix a higher import than that now existing. My best advice is that an increase of 12 cents per clean pound is required to protect both the Government support program and the industry up to the support level. This move is considered necessary to provide for an orderly transition into the new program, if and when the Congress approves it. I have therefore urged such decisive action upon the President. This is not to say that I am an advocate of the high tariff in all instances. As a member of the minority party in Congress, I subscribe

to the theory of free trade in most instances. However, this case is one in which I believe increased import controls are dictated.

I might underscore the effect of the plight of the wool industry on our economy by pointing out that county assessors in California have begun setting lower valuations on sheep for tax purposes because of the low income of the sheep industry. Upon this valuation of sheep and the land on which they graze rests a portion of our tax revenue for school districts and other districts and county governmental functions.

There is another factor as far as California is concerned. In my district thousands of acres are going out of cotton production through the imposition of quotas on the 1954 crop. Action to bring the income from wool more nearly into balance with the production of other agricultural commodities can do much to alleviate the loss of revenue created by the required diversion of these acres to other agricultural production. This will ease, to some degree, the ill effects upon the San Joaquin Valley's economy which will result from the imposition of the cotton acreage quotas.

To my mind there is no question of the clear-cut need for adoption by the Congress of the bill embodying the new wool program and executive action increasing the import fee on foreign wool.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Kersten committee is deserving of high praise for their work in exposing the manner in which the world Communist conspiracy works.

The committee has exposed the utter worthlessness of any agreement or treaty with the Moscovite conspiracy.

The whole history of Moscow indicates that they use any agreement or treaty with another power as a means of further extending their empire.

What they actually do is to use a legal instrument, so recognized by the standards of civilized man, to commit illegal acts which lead to the downfall of independent nations and their incorporation into the empire of Moscow.

I laud the committee for the wonderful job it did in pointing out the manner in which the madmen of the Kremlin forced the Baltic States to enter into nonaggression pacts with them and the manner in which these pacts were used to destroy the sovereign independence of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Another major contribution of the committee was the manner in which they identified one Andrei Vishinsky as the mastermind behind the subversion of the sovereign independent State of Latvia.

The committee proved beyond any doubt the criminal activities of Vishinsky in bringing about the forced annexation of Latvia into the empire of Moscow.

I am happy to note that the committee did not hesitate to point out that this is the same Andrei Vishinsky who heads the Russian delegation in the U. N.

I am only sorry that Vishinsky did not accept the invitation of the committee

to appear before it and face the irrefutable evidence compiled by the committee against him.

In any case, Vishinsky has been properly branded as one of the outstanding international criminals of our day.

In my opinion the methods of inquiry developed by the House Baltic Committee should be extended to inquire into the illegal annexation of all the nations now enslaved by Moscow. This is a very large undertaking, but one in which, I am sure, the committee will have the same kind of success they have had in investigating the annexation of the Baltic States. Such an investigation will make it clear to all the people held captive within the Communist empire that the Government of the United States has not deserted them and that the inevitable day of the triumph of human freedom over slavery is not too far off.

In my considered judgment the Congress could strike a real blow for peace and freedom by authorizing the House Baltic committee to extend its investigation into all the nations enslaved by the international Communist conspiracy.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as I rise to support the Kersten resolution, House Resolution 438, the words of John Hvasta, Hillside, N. J., youth, who recently escaped from behind the Iron Curtain, seem to ring in my ears. It is part of his testimony that the name "American" served as sort of a passport in his house-to-house and town-to-town journeys and concealment, all leading to his final penetration of the curtain and his return to his loved ones at home. According to John Hvasta, America has more friends behind the Iron Curtain than is generally realized. These subject peoples hunger for news from the land of the free and the home of the brave, and their courageous underground movements are sustained by events such as are now taking place on the floor of this House.

Dr. Gustave Kosik, chairman, and John C. Sciranka, secretary and editor, American Friends of Slovak Freedom, Passaic, N. J., in my district, urge speedy enactment of the Kersten resolution, and so does Mary M. Kizis, director of the Lithuanian Information Center, of New York, speaking for many Americans of Lithuanian extraction among the people I am privileged to represent.

Peoples now reduced to slavery know that ultimately the truth will make them free, and this resolution provides some of the mechanics for getting the truth.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered. The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 453 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7328) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto for final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], and yield myself 1 minute.

This is a resolution to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research.

Does the gentleman from Mississippi have any requests for time?

Mr. COLMER. I have no request for time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 7328) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill H. R. 7328, with Mr. GRAHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bill that has been reported out unanimously by the Committee on Armed Services. It is a bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research.

This legislation would authorize additional construction, and purchase and installation on additional equipment, at the Langley Aeronautical Laboratory at Hampton, Va., which is a high-speed,

hydrodynamic facility, costing \$1,220,000; alterations to two small supersonic tunnels at the Ames Aeronautical Laboratory, Moffett Field, Calif., at a cost of \$349,000 and alterations to an existing supersonic tunnel, air drier for propulsion systems laboratory, air heater for altitude test chambers, and rocket engine research facility at the Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory at Cleveland, Ohio, at a cost of \$3,431,000.

Any of these approximate costs that I have enumerated are authorized to be varied upwards 5 percent to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all the work so enumerated shall not exceed \$5,000,000.

This legislation is requested by the Defense Department, following a thorough study and endorsement by the Budget Bureau. I might say also that it is in keeping with the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics program of the past several years to keep its construction legislation consistent with the military construction authorizations.

I do not desire to burden the House with any lengthy remarks in support of this legislation, but I believe that in view of developments there is certain pertinent information that should be given this afternoon.

About 2 weeks ago, our Nation was startled to see reproduced on the front pages of our daily press and in the principal news magazines, photographs of two advanced design, long-range bombers in quantity use in Russia. To me this is clear evidence that any Nation, unfriendly, as well as friendly, can build military aircraft and missiles of increasing capabilities.

Here in the United States, the agency which carries the heavy responsibility for providing the major portion of new basic aeronautical information, from which can come the design of tomorrow's airplanes and missiles, is the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. We hear very little about the work of the NACA, as it is known, because this agency is modest almost to the point of being bashful. At this time, however, I believe it is important to recognize how vital is the work this agency is doing.

Last year, almost on the eve of the 50th anniversary of the first powered flight in the world, by the Wright brothers, two aeronautical events took place which, to say the least, forecast in sober terms the shape of things to come. The first was a series of successful first flights by the North American F-100, America's first production fighter, capable of supersonic speed in level flights. The second was a flight by Maj. Charles E. Yeager, USAF, in a Bell X-1A on December 12, 1953, during which he reached the phenomenal speed of $2\frac{1}{2}$ times the speed of sound—1,600 miles per hour.

These achievements climaxed the little publicized but deadly earnest effort which began during the closing days of World War II, an effort in which the NACA played a vital part along with the military services of our aircraft industry.

The goal ahead was flight at supersonic speeds, flight faster than sound. At the time that the scientists of NACA applied themselves extensively to the

program, the top speed of our military aircraft was less than 500 miles per hour. In less than a decade, the speed of production type tactical military airplanes has been virtually doubled and in special research airplanes such as Major Yeager was flying, the speed has been more than tripled.

That, I submit, is real progress.

But unfortunately America cannot rest on its aeronautical laurels. We know that halfway around the world there are other scientists applying themselves to the problems with at least equal vigor. We know also that such effort, by those unfriendly scientists, is being supported 100 percent by a government which respects only superior force.

It is an equally sobering fact that the scientific problems associated with supersonic flight today are increasing in number, complexity, and expense. Many of these important problems, to be solved as completely and as quickly as the national interest demands, require the use of research tools.

The NACA, it can be said, is constantly modernizing the research equipment it now has. However, new equipment is also needed from time to time. The proposed legislation before us is designed to provide for these alterations as I enumerated at the beginning.

To sum up, both the potential of our atomic weapons and our defense against such weapons depend in major part on superior aircraft and missiles. By virtue of an immense effort, this country now holds a position of leadership in many areas of aeronautical science.

But no complacency is justified in view of the high scientific and technical capabilities disclosed by the Soviet, whose progress includes that in nuclear weapons. It cannot for one moment be assumed the Soviets will not likewise make advances in aeronautical science which we know to be possible.

I feel certain H. R. 7328 will receive prompt and wholehearted support of all Members on both sides of the aisle.

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

Mr. SHAFER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I have not had a chance to read the report very carefully, but can the gentleman tell me this: There cannot possibly be any funds in this bill for the Truman Airport at Grandview, Mo.?

Mr. SHAFER. Not in this legislation.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill does not call for a large expenditure of funds but it is an extremely important bill. Those of us who are charged with the responsibility, as this Congress is, of protecting and defending the United States of America, know that we must have air power. We know that especially in this phase of national defense scientific exploration is extremely important.

We are blazing a trail in aviation, and without proper experimentation and scientific support, we cannot hope to lead the world in air power and air developments. This bill is a distinctly forward step in the progress of air power

throughout the United States and in our national defense. As America moves steadily forward into the supersonic era, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the task of America's aircraft industry to create the designs which will meet the operational and performance requirements of the military services is a gigantic one.

Actually, air power in the United States is composed of three indispensable elements: The military services which determine the requirements for new aircraft, and make use of them; the aircraft industry, which designs and constructs the new aircraft; and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics—better known as the NACA—which provides much of the foundation knowledge about aerodynamics, hydrodynamics, jet propulsion, and all the other complex subjects for use by the aircraft designers.

That is what the NACA exists for, to supply as the fruit of its scientific laboratory research in aeronautics, the new knowledge which will enable design of aircraft and missiles of superior performance.

Actually, the NACA research programs have both the long-range, all-inclusive objective of acquiring the new scientific knowledge essential to assure American leadership in aeronautics, and the immediate objective of solving, as quickly as possible, the most pressing problems, thereby assuring the success of America's current supersonic aircraft construction program.

During its 39 years' existence and especially since World War II, the President and Congress have recognized the tremendous responsibilities of the NACA and have supported this Federal agency in its intensive program of fundamental scientific studies in the several fields of aeronautical science. Today the NACA operates 3 research centers, 1 at Langley Field, Va., another at Moffett Field, Calif., and the third at Cleveland, Ohio. Here are nearly 7,000 scientists and necessary supporting personnel. Much of the work they are doing is on an around-the-clock basis.

Consider for a moment, gentlemen, the kind of performance that we are demanding from our new fighters and bombers. In addition to being able to fly at supersonic speeds, they must have the necessary range to enable accomplishment of their fighter or bomber missions.

They must, of course, be maneuverable. Their qualities of stability and control must be sufficiently manageable to permit satisfactory operation by their pilots. By their design and construction, these new aircraft must be capable of avoiding, or at least withstanding, the manifold problems of flutter, buffeting, and aerodynamic heating—problems which become more and more serious and complex as speeds increase.

To give but a single example, it has been publicly stated that the power required to operate the refrigeration equipment for one of our newest high-speed aircraft is greater than the output of the most powerful of our World War II aircraft engines—think on that a moment, gentlemen.

This is so, of course, because of the heat barrier which looms ahead. Actually, in the field of guided missiles, the heat barrier is a very real thing, right now. Missiles are being flown at speeds four times that of sound, and faster. When a missile maintains such speed, 2,500 miles an hour or more, the temperature of its outer surface or skin, can rise to 900 degrees or more Fahrenheit, a temperature beyond that where aluminum can hold its strength.

There are other aeronautical problems of equal urgency and importance. Take, for instance, what happens in the transonic speed range. Here the flight of the airplane is subject to two entirely different sets of aerodynamic laws, one of them pertaining to speeds lower than that of sound, the other pertaining to speeds faster than sound. The degree to which one or the other of these sets of aerodynamic laws is paramount, or is influenced by the other, is constantly changing.

We have, due to the inventiveness of NACA scientists, within the past few years been able to construct new wind tunnels which were useful in the study of flight problems in this transonic speed range. But even so, we have been unable to develop the mathematical means for predicting accurately aerodynamic behavior in the transonic speed range, and as a consequence, have been forced to depend on building up the necessary experimental data for each new design. We have yet to learn the extent to which detailed information about one specific design can be applied successfully to other designs.

One of the greatest difficulties in providing such vitally needed information has been the development of the research tools with which to provide it. H. R. 7328, the bill before you, is to provide authorization for the NACA's 1955 construction program, to enable acquisition of some of the new, sharper research tools which are needed for the solution of today's urgent aeronautical problems.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to further take up the time of the committee this afternoon to go into the details of the bill. I am merely going to say that it is extremely important to our national defense. There is no opposition to it on either side. Certainly everybody I know here on this side is very strongly in favor of the quick enactment of the provisions of this bill this afternoon.

In addition, we have a man on this side of the aisle, the gentleman from North Carolina, who has spent a long time working on this type of legislation, supporting the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Mr. DURHAM, of North Carolina. In my judgment, he is an expert, if there is an expert in Congress in the field of that type of legislation supporting the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. So, Mr. Chairman, I conclude my remarks at this time and yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] for his statement that I

qualify as an expert on these matters. I do not believe I am an expert in this field, but I do feel the House is entitled to an explanation of why we bring this legislation here in this form. This agency has been operating since 1914. It operated for many, many years under a few words in an appropriation bill authorizing the NACA agency. Over this period of time, it did most of its work in a small way without having too great expenses. So at the end of the war, the committee felt that this agency should be brought under the control of the House. We wrote the first Civil Aeronautics NACA bill authorizing this agency by an act of the Congress. We put them on a yearly basis for authorization for their appropriation, which I feel is the thing to do because in a field of scientific instruments which changes so fast to authorize a tremendous sum of money for a long period of time was not thought to be wise by your committee because the change in these scientific instruments is almost continuous. That is the primary reason why this bill is here today. We set up this basic, fundamental agency which, in my opinion, is the heart of the Air Force of this country. Our Air Force could not function today without the tools and the scientific analysis made of these tremendous speeds and temperatures and other things involved in the field of aerodynamics today.

This agency of our Government is today performing one of the most important positions in our ever increasing airpower. Around it we have built what today is the strongest airpower force in the world. This agency work is conducted by a group of scientific men under the direction of Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, a man who has contributed most of his life to the development of what we call the military plan in the basic law.

This gentleman is the very heart of our airpower both domestic and military. Today's planes have justified our confidence in this agency. It has performed in a manner that should make every American proud of what has been accomplished. I trust no one will object to this bill, as it is necessary.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, pursuant to subsection (b) of section 1 of Public Law 672, approved August 8, 1950 (50 U. S. C. 151b), the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is authorized to undertake additional construction, and to purchase and install additional equipment at the following locations:

Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, Hampton, Va.: High-speed hydrodynamic facility, \$1,220,000.

Ames Aeronautical Laboratory, Moffett Field, Calif.: Alterations to two small supersonic tunnels, \$349,000.

Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory, Cleveland, Ohio: Alterations to an existing supersonic tunnel, air dryer for propulsion systems laboratory, air heater for altitude test

chambers, and rocket engine research facility, \$3,431,000.

Sec. 2. Any of the approximate costs enumerated in section 1 of this act may, in the discretion of the Director of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, be varied upwards 10 percent and, with the concurrence of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, by such further amounts as may be necessary to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work so enumerated shall not exceed \$5 million.

Sec. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$5 million to accomplish the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 11, after the word "upwards", strike out "10 percent and, with the concurrence of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, by such further amounts as may be necessary" and insert "5 percent."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GRAHAM, 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. 7328) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, pursuant to House Resolution 453, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONNEL STRENGTHS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. R. 2326, an act to amend the act of August 3, 1950, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions thereof relating to the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Line 7, strike out "1958" and insert "1957."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7996) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the engrossed bill (S. 1138) entitled "An act for the relief of John Soudas."

DO WHAT IS BEST FOR THE COUNTRY

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, each day we are beseeched by mail and by visits from various organizations urging us to do something special for them. They may want an increase in certain benefits they may be receiving or a reduction in the taxes they may be obliged to pay. Not infrequently their concern is not what may be for the benefit of anyone but themselves. They say they want economy, but they want the other fellow to take the cut. They say they want a balanced budget, but they are the only ones entitled to a tax reduction.

This is not the attitude of the great majority of American people. I should like to read to the House a letter I received from a constituent of mine who lives in the small community of Wellington, Ill. I do not know him. Nor is it particularly important for our thought here whether you entirely agree with his views. The important thing about this letter is the refreshing, encouraging attitude it expresses. He wants only that which he believes is in the best interests of the country, and obviously, he is willing to make whatever personal sacrifices that may be necessary.

I read this letter because it is so typically and so truly American:

DEAR MR. ARENDS: From what I read in the newspapers, it seems to me that the House of Representatives should follow the lead of the Senate and support the plan for the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Having only 1 dependent, my income tax was \$114 this year. An increase in exemptions for those in the lower income brackets would seemingly benefit me. But I don't think so. We not only need to balance the budget but what about starting to reduce the national debt?

Business conditions are not bad, they are normal. In normal times there are always some unemployed and a few farmers or other businessmen going broke because of poor management.

Let's reduce or eliminate (where practical) the subsidies for we farmers, airlines, business, transportation, etc.

Sincerely,

LOUIS A. ZIEBART.

MORE SMOKES FOR VETERANS

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include certain correspondence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate the opportunity given me to acquaint the House with a development affecting our veterans which I feel will be applauded generally.

For a long, long time it has been possible to give tax-free cigarettes to veterans in Federal hospitals. Strangely enough this could not be done in the case of servicemen or veterans who chanced to be hospitalized in State institutions. So we have had a condition of inequality and discrimination that has been really cruel.

However, that has now all been changed.

We are now assured of more smokes for veterans.

In a letter that has just come to me from Deputy Commissioner O. Gordon Delk of the Internal Revenue Bureau, I am advised that that Bureau has set up regulations respecting tax-free cigarettes that cut through the discrimination I have mentioned. Under the new regulation, veterans' organizations and other groups can now distribute tax-free cigarettes also to veterans in State hospitals. This will be a tremendous encouragement to them. It will widen greatly their opportunity to be of service, to be of comfort. Veterans' organizations have been doing an outstanding work, a very humane sort of work during the years, and the gifts of cigarettes, although it is only a little thing, has meant a great deal to our veterans and has very markedly helped their morale. Especially is this little action of service appreciated in mental hospitals where there is a loneliness which is all too pervading and which is mitigated by the visits of groups with their gifts of cigarettes.

As a practical proposition, it will mean that we can now give 2 packs of cigarettes where only 1 was given before.

I want to commend the administration for its sympathetic interest in our veterans and its fine action in their behalf. It is a very happy and also a proper decision. It emphasizes that in its view, also, it should make no difference in determining the question of whether a cigarette ought to be tax free, whether the veteran lies in a Federal bed or in a State bed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include copies of correspondence between the Internal Revenue Bureau and myself on this subject. The Bureau's letter, especially, will be of very large interest not only to veterans, but to veterans' organizations and other volunteer groups who visit our hospitalized veterans and who have been following the custom of giving gifts of cigarettes.

(The material referred to is as follows:)

UNITED STATES TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 25, 1954.
HON. FRANK J. BECKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKER: Representatives of the Internal Revenue Service have just concluded several conferences with representatives of the Veterans' Administration, in a joint effort to work out administratively, in accordance with the request contained in your letter of November 30, 1953, some satisfactory arrangement by which tax-free cigarettes would be made available for gratuitous distribution to present and former members of the military and naval forces of the United States confined in other than Federal hospitals.

These conferences developed the fact that under existing procedures tax-free cigarettes are now distributed free of charge to present or former members of our Armed Forces who are patients in Federal hospitals or in other hospitals where such persons receive medical care pursuant to contract with the Veterans' Administration. Therefore, the efforts of the conferees were confined to the matter of working out an arrangement which would make tax-free cigarettes available for distribution to present or former members of the Armed Forces of our country hospitalized in hospitals operated by the several States and the District of Columbia. I am happy to advise that as a result of the sympathetic understanding of the problem and a mutual desire on the part of the Internal Revenue Service and the Veterans' Administration to cooperate in alleviating the situation of which you complain, agreement has been reached on an administrative arrangement under which tax-free cigarettes could be furnished to such present and former servicemen.

Briefly, this arrangement would provide that the officers in charge of such hospitals will act as representatives of the Veterans Administration in the purchase, storage and distribution of the tax-free cigarettes and that the purchase, storage and distribution of the tax-free cigarettes by such representatives will be accomplished under the necessary supervision and control of the Veterans' Administration. The arrangement also contemplates that any organization of war veterans which is granted recognition (by or pursuant to the provisions of section 200, Public Law 844, 74th Cong., 38 U. S. C. sec. 101) in the presentation of claims under the statutes administered by the Veterans' Administration, or any local post or chapter of any such recognized organization, may donate cigarettes for this purpose by turning over to the head of such a hospital the funds with which to purchase the tax-free cigarettes.

In order to aid in carrying this arrangement into effect, the Internal Revenue Service proposes to amend such of its applicable regulations as may be necessary to permit the sale of tax-free cigarettes for the purpose described above.

Very truly yours,

O. GORDON DELK,
Acting Commissioner.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C. November 30, 1953.
MR. T. COLEMAN ANDREWS,
Commissioner, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDREWS: It is good to know that this administration is willing and anxious to give painstaking and cooperative consideration to the setting up of methods, without the need of statutory legislation,

for the distribution of tax-free cigarettes to veterans in other than Federal hospitals.

This matter has had your consideration and also that of the Treasury Department for some time and I hope the studies that have been made, both from the practical and the legal angles, will thoroughly satisfy the Internal Revenue Bureau that a method can be agreed upon which will do the two things we are aiming at: from my viewpoint, to help widen and broaden the efforts of our veterans organizations to enhance the benefits they are accomplishing through the distribution of cigarettes to hospitalized servicemen and former servicemen and, at the same time, from your viewpoint, to set up such safeguards in the distribution of these tax-free cigarettes as will properly protect the integrity of our Internal Revenue system.

On the latter point, specifically, I want to acknowledge your kindness in your letter to me of April 30 to volunteer the comment that you appreciated my interest in safeguarding the revenue by inclusion in legislation I had introduced of provisions specifying particular safeguards under which cigarettes might be bought tax-free for distribution to our veterans.

I have cooperated with veterans organizations in this particular work for many, many years. I am confident, without any reservations, that I reflect their ideas completely when I state that it would be a wonderful, a grand action by this administration to accomplish the distribution of tax-free cigarettes to hospitals, other than Federal, but which also house our former servicemen and veterans. The veterans organizations have been doing an outstanding work, a very human sort of work during the years, and the gratuity of free cigarettes, although it is only a little thing, has helped tremendously in building up desirable morale among our hospitalized veterans. You would see this especially—most sharply—in the mental hospitals, where, entirely too much, there is a loneliness which is all too pervading and which the visits by members of local posts and chapters of our veterans organizations helps much to dispel and mitigate, and when such visits are accompanied by the distribution of cigarettes and other little gratuities.

There is no question of moment involved here touching dollars and cents. Your bureau is already on record as not being at all minded to finally judge this matter from the revenue viewpoint. The agreement that we must reach is how we may best accomplish the desires of the veterans organizations and at the same time meet your policy needs insofar as the protection of the revenue goes.

Here is my suggestion, predicated on this main and fundamental idea: that the serviceman or the former serviceman is to be served. Therefore, it should make no difference whether this veteran lies in a Federal bed or in a State bed, or whether his hospitalization is paid for by the Federal Government or by a State.

It seems to me it is a cruel discrimination which can distinguish between a Federally hospitalized and a State hospitalized veteran, whether the latter is under contract with the Veterans' Administration or not. In the average contract hospital case it seems to me that it would be logical and eminently proper to have the director of such a hospital act for and on behalf of the Veterans' Administration and/or the Internal Revenue Bureau so far as the ordering, receipt, and distribution of tax-free cigarettes is concerned. The test should not be the type of hospital or who runs it; it ought to be the veteran who is in that hospital, and if that veteran served in the Army, Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard, or in any branch thereof, that should be enough. The present law permitting tax-free cigarette distribution

to veterans in Federal hospitals I do not believe was intended to be exclusive in character, and that the real objective in that provision was to reach the hospitalized veteran.

Taking Kings Park Hospital on Long Island as an illustration: This is a State institution, a mental hospital. There are veterans hospitalized there on a Veterans' Administration contract basis. There are also State cases there, presumably. A few miles away is the Northport Hospital of the Veterans' Administration. In the latter our veterans organizations can arrange for the distribution as gifts of tax-free cigarettes. At Kings Park they may not. And here is a service that under the present scheme of things is denied the man who happens to be lodged at Kings Park. As I said before, it is a cruel discrimination. It would be an easy thing, as I see it, to make the director of the Kings Park Hospital the agent of the Veterans' Administration for the distribution of tax-free cigarettes to the veterans of that hospital.

I should, of course, be most happy to meet with you at any time or times to help gain a solution of this matter and thus to help very materially and substantially the service by your veterans organizations to those unhappy people, the Nation's veterans, who chance to be hospitalized.

I can only reemphasize that I know every veterans organization and all of our people generally would applaud an administrative decision by this administration along the lines of my submission to the end that the fine and the humanitarian work they are now doing may be broadened and expanded.

Yours respectfully,

FRANK J. BECKER.

REDUCTION OF EXCISE TAXES

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, the proposed cut in the excise tax contained in H. R. 8224 on many of the necessities of life will undoubtedly provide one of the best stimulants to business of any proposal to come before this House.

As taxpayers, we are now handing over \$1 billion of our money each year, paying as high as 25 percent in excise taxes just for the privilege of buying everyday necessary articles of clothing or services which we need.

By reducing the excise tax to 10 percent, we are freeing major segments of our economy from a yoke that has in some instances almost throttled businesses to death. Some of the current unemployment undoubtedly can be traced to this source.

The purchasing power of every American family will be increased measurably by this reduction in excise taxes. Business will be stimulated, and in turn provide additional revenue for the Government. Now is the time to remove a major portion of this annoying, discriminatory system of taxation.

DEFENSE AND HUMAN VALUES

Mr. PHILBIN. 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. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, there is a rather pathetic inconsistency on the part of those who now spread hysteria and terrorism among the American people about the horrible dangers of atomic air attack, yet who just a few months ago were moving so expeditiously to cut down and cripple our air arm to the tune of over \$5 billion.

There has been a great deal of false propaganda, loose thinking, and misconception concerning the atomic and hydrogen bombs. You are familiar with some of the speeches and statements which would in effect spread fear and terror among our people. Such utterances, whether so intended or not, tend in the direction of appeasement and confusion.

Regardless of the admittedly destructive power of these new weapons, our political leadership has essential and greatest responsibility toward the American people. First, to set up appropriate defenses and countermeasures and, secondly, to do and say nothing that would arouse irrational fear and apprehension among the people, thirdly, to draw the shades of secrecy from the basic facts of the atom without disclosing strictly security information.

It is believed by experts that a high percentage of attacking planes could get through. General Vandenberg set the figure some time ago at about 70 percent. However, the extensive radar screens and new techniques we have developed are now believed to warrant a much lower estimate of attacking planes that could get through. Instead of prating about these dangers, it should be the duty of the Congress to do something about them, to implement the right kind of defense as speedily as possible and without regard to the cost.

It would be fatuous and the height of folly for this Nation to reduce or keep down the cost of national defense just to serve the purposes and fatten the tax pocketbooks of members of the "big business" axis and its satellites. Yet that seems to be perhaps the pervading spirit to date—a disregard for human values; the accentuation of greedy, selfish policies to preserve material wealth. Of course, such policies will never secure the long-time approval of the American people; indeed, they forfeit majority support.

I have been in vigorous support of every measure to build a strong defense, particularly a strong Air Force. I believe in a balanced defense, not one that would be weighted against the Army or the Navy because I believe them both to be of paramount importance, but one that will give the Nation a rounded defensive military system and also a most powerful Air Arm that would enable us on a world-wide basis, if necessary, to launch devastating retaliatory attacks upon any nation or group of nations evil enough to challenge our security and the cause of human freedom.

Congress must stand for the kind of dynamic military institutions which the

Nation needs in these troubled, unsettled times.

If we start measuring and limiting our military system by our tax pocketbooks, we should keep it in mind that the time may well come when the national security will be gravely imperiled.

I am continuing my efforts as a member of the House Armed Services Committee to accelerate the program designed to protect the Nation against attack, as well as that necessary to retaliate against attack. Both are of paramount essentiality. Both must be implemented with every possible speed. Both must be shaped in such ways as to retain balanced, well-rounded and where necessary, integrated Armed Forces capable of defending the country and also capable of seeking out and destroying the enemy whenever an attack is made upon our shores or cities.

More than ever we need now to emphasize human values before material values in our national life and in the setting up of necessary defenses.

I do not believe for a moment that any loyal American would intentionally wish at this time to weaken or impair our armed strength and thus make the Nation more vulnerable to attack.

The point I am making is that apparently some people in public life today are willing to curtail military appropriations very materially, notwithstanding the present very dubious prospects of world order. I believe such a course, motivated in large measure by material values and the quest for diminished taxes, is a serious risk, so I believe, to the security of the country.

Let us not only zealously preserve our spiritual ideals which are the very source of our strength, but let us also protect our human values—the well-being of the individual as well as the safety, security, and prosperity of all our people. The national defense must be our constant and most intensive concern. It should not be jeopardized by materialistic and selfish aims.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the other special orders.

FARM PRICE PARITY AND PROSPERITY

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I called the attention of this House to the fact that the whole prosperity of this Nation was dependent on the prosperity of our farmers; that we could not have a lasting, prosperous economy unless we had a prosperous agriculture; that if we allowed farm prices to sink to 75 percent of parity, or below, that we would inevitably have disastrous depression and unemployment sweeping all sections of the country; whereas, on the other hand, we had never known a period when the average of farm prices

was as high as 100 percent of parity that all of our people were not prosperous.

In view of this fact it seems to me clear that we should maintain as far as we can the price of our basic agricultural commodities at at least 90 percent of parity and not let them drop down to the disastrous level advocated by some which would break not only the farmers but all of our people.

We have been told that we ought to have flexibility in any program. I do not know why. We are told by some highly placed agricultural authorities that we need flexibility in our farm price-support program. The great girders that support our bridges are not supposed to be flexible; the foundations of our homes are not supposed to be flexible. I do not know why supports on agricultural commodities are desired to be flexible. I want these supports to be firm when the weight of our economy falls on them. I don't want them to flex when they should hold firm. We are told we need sliding supports. Why? Do we want price supports to slide out from under the farmer every time he needs them?

I think it would be well to observe that if there is any need for flexibility in a price-support program we have all we need in the present program. We do not have the "high" "rigid" supports that some people have talked about. We have never had a rigid support, one that does not change. The supports on all of our basic agricultural products do change. They change regularly. They are tied to parity. Parity is tied to the cost of the things farmers buy. We are supporting those basic commodities at only 90 percent of parity; that is, only 90 percent of a fair price. When the general economy of our Nation goes up, employment increases, wages go up, farmers' costs go up, and parity goes up. The dollars and cents level of support of those commodities, of course, then increases. On the other hand, when the temper of our economy slows down, when people become unemployed, when wages drop, when prices are lower, then parity drops, and the 90 percent of parity at which we support farm prices is in dollars a lesser figure than it would be if conditions were better. So we have today in our present program the only type of flexibility that I want or that I believe the American people need.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman is making a very scholarly address. I have followed the gentleman's record in the Congress since he first became a Member. He has always been sincere and devoted to the cause of agriculture of the United States. In reaching the point you have in your address, do you not feel that we do have a flexible support as now set up for the basic commodities, such as cotton? While it is a support of 90 percent of parity, it is flexible?

Mr. POAGE. It is, indeed. Every time the price level goes up that support goes up in dollars, but when the price level goes down and the farmer

can buy at a lower level, his support also goes down in dollars.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Like, for instance, the price of automobiles, of General Motors, Chrysler or any automobile company. The price may go up and it may come down.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. So, likewise, the support at 90 percent on the basic commodities is also flexible?

Mr. POAGE. That is right. It is flexible now and it is tied to the general economy of the Nation, it is tied to the prices that the farmer has to pay; but there are those who are telling us that these supports should not be tied to what the farmer has to pay, on the contrary they want supports tied to the amount of commodities produced, to make the whole support program ineffective when it is needed, and leave it at an effective level only when it is not needed. To me the proposal of a sliding scale simply means slide out from under you every time we need any support.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ARENDS. Will the gentleman tell the House what he proposes in the way of a farm program? As the gentleman knows, we have to do something about it.

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. ARENDS. Has the gentleman some ready recommendation besides 90 percent support prices to meet the situation?

Mr. POAGE. First, I do recommend a continuation of 90 percent of parity supports on storable basic commodities. Of course, the 90 percent support price alone is inadequate. I think the gentleman will agree with that. You have to have a good many things to go with that support price. We need especially disposal programs. As I have visualized it for a good many years, there are at least two outstanding prerequisites which must exist before the farmers can properly call upon the Government to give them the 90 percent support now available to storable basics. First, the product that they ask to be supported must of necessity be storable, else there is no opportunity for the Government to carry it over from year to year in order to work out the problem without undue loss.

In the second place, it seems to me that the farmers themselves must be willing to carry a portion of the burden. We have recognized that in the case of the six basic commodities by providing that at any time the farmers themselves refuse to approve marketing quotas and acreage allotments, that the support shall only be 50 percent of parity instead of 90 percent of parity; in other words, we say that "over the long pull, Mr. Farmer, you must, working together, bring your production in line with the demand, else the Government will not help you over the short pull to make the adjustment."

Now, it is much more difficult for farmers to make adjustments than it is for a manufacturing plant. It takes a longer period of time because it takes

a cycle of at least 12 months to carry out a farm operation, and consequently you cannot make the changes so rapidly. That is why it seems to me eminently sound that the Government should help tide farmers over during that period of change, and that is all we ask. That is exactly what happens on the support of these basic commodities, the storables. In the days of old Joseph, away back in Pharaoh's time in Egypt, they took their products during the period of flush production and put them in the granaries and held them there until the time when need came. The Government can do that with these commodities today.

Now there are those who say that will not work. But it has worked. Our great crop in my section of the country is cotton, and we can carry cotton for many, many years after it is picked and stored, and the United States Government, through the cooperation of our farmers who have repeatedly voted to limit their production and who have never rejected controls, has right now a net profit of \$267 million through the process of supporting the cotton crop. Not only did we aid the cotton farmers of America, but we put \$267 million into the Public Treasury. Now that is not a bad deal for the United States Government.

There are other crops where we do not have the storability that we have in those six major crops, particularly the dairy commodities and fresh meats, and I recognize you cannot apply to those perishable commodities the same kind of treatment that you can apply to the basic storable commodities, both because you cannot store them and because you cannot control the production of them like you can control the production of these basic commodities.

Unquestionably the producers of those commodities are entitled to every consideration we can consistently give them.

So it would seem to me that we must emphasize the disposition, the sale, of larger quantities of those commodities, and while I have been reluctant to follow the philosophy of subsidy, I listened this morning to the distinguished Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, our former colleague, Hon. Ross Rizley, who came before the Committee on Agriculture and pleaded for a subsidy on wool. And, I do not know that there is any better way of handling it. I do not know that we can offer anything better than what has been suggested, and that is to pay a subsidy on wool. Maybe we must rely on subsidies and on purchase programs for these perishable commodities. Maybe we must use indirect supports.

Mr. ARENDS. We face a little different situation with corn than you do with cotton. As I understand, when the acreage reduction in both cotton and wheat first came in here and we increased the acreage reduction, you did not want to abide by the acreage reduction, and you increased it on cotton and wheat. In the commercial corn area, particularly in my section of Illinois, they reduced the corn acreage from 20.8 to 27 percent, and the normal farmer who has been trying to conserve his soil finds himself in a predicament. Now that we are trying to solve the problem,

what are we going to do with the corn allotment?

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman from Illinois is very much better versed on corn than I am, but I would be inclined to go along with him if he feels that this 27-percent reduction is too much to take in 1 year. I would be inclined to agree with him and go along with whatever figure he felt was a reasonable proposal, just as he went along with us on the cotton proposition when we felt that 33 1/3 percent was too great and cut the reduction down to about 22 percent, because we felt 33 1/3 percent was more than the cotton farmer should take in 1 year. We suggested that it would be better to spread it over 2 years instead of 1. I do not know whether the amount that is being proposed now for corn is too great. If it is too great, I recognize that you can store corn, and you can carry it for a period of several years, and that it is not essential that you take all the necessary cut in 1 year. I think that is one of the beauties of the Government's giving assistance in these programs. The Government can carry these commodities over a longer period of time than any one individual farmer can carry them. That should enable us to make the needed cut by such degrees as will enable us to step down, as I tried to suggest once, in 2 steps rather than 1, and maybe not break a leg in doing it.

It is quite possible that the gentleman from Illinois may want to suggest that we take the reduction in corn acreage in more than one step. Ultimately we will have to come down just as much in both cotton and corn. I think we must recognize that. We have no illusions as to cotton. We know we are ultimately going to have to come down. We started to come all the way in 1 step, but we are now proposing to do it in 2. But we do believe that the farmers must express their good faith by being willing to bring production down to the level that the people will consume, because if we keep producing more than the people will consume we certainly cannot expect the Government forever to take it off our hands. But I do think we should take the cut in such steps as will not destroy the patient as we do it.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

FOREIGN TRADE POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, how many American citizens must be out of work before this administration will do anything to relieve unemployment? How long must our people be out of work before this administration will take action? From past experience, it appears that neither question is of any concern when a greedy administration comes into

power, yet it is inconceivable that anyone with a scintilla of respect for his fellow human beings would endorse or even passively accept the conditions responsible for their distress—regardless of political considerations involved.

Whereas Members of Congress have been reminded time and again of the need to protect the domestic coal industry and other American industries from the ravages of cheap foreign products unloaded in this country, it is probable that top administration officials have not been properly advised of the damage that is being inflicted by excessive imports. Otherwise those officials could hardly recommend a continuance of the policies responsible for the unemployment and poverty that have become prevalent in my district and in many other districts of this once-prosperous Nation.

Last July 23 the House had an opportunity to correct unfair foreign trade policies through passage of a bill to place a quota limitation on residual oil and to make other necessary changes in the Nation's trade program. But at the last minute the majority leader rushed up Pennsylvania Avenue with word that the bill should not be passed. Unlike Paul Revere, who warned his countrymen of an impending invasion by foreign forces, this messenger was armed with orders to continue the policies of confining American business within an economic stockade in order that international interests might continue to profit without restriction. The excuse for this directive was that a commission to study the trade problem had been established, and that it appeared more politic to force Americans to endure their suffering rather than to disturb the marketing tactics of international profiteers. "I do not intend any criticism at all of those who have spoken here today, who have industries in their districts that are under severe hardships," the majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana, said to the House on that fateful day last year. Then he proceeded to issue the mandate for rejection of the bill to safeguard American industry and labor. Here is the way he explained the administration's anomalous position to his colleagues:

He—

The President—

wants this bill defeated, because it defeats the purposes, it defeats what we are trying to do in this other operation.

So I say that we ought to stand by the administration; not just because it is a matter of standing by the administration, but because it is the proper thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, it is now a full 7 months later, the commission studying foreign trade has made its report, and the administration is still standing by despite the fact that economic conditions in my district and in scores of other districts in the United States are getting progressively worse. Foreign residual oil is causing more and more unemployment in the coal and railroad industries, and the distress has spread to countless other businesses. In the glass industry there has been a steady decline as a result of the influx of foreign products made by

laborers whose wages would be entirely unacceptable in this country.

The disastrous effects of the deluge of residual oil on the economy of this country were described in full last year by such prominent industry and labor representatives as Tom Pickett, former Member of Congress and now executive vice president of the National Coal Association; Thomas Kennedy, former Lieutenant Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the vice president of United Mine Workers of America; Harry See, national legislative representative, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; and W. D. Johnson, vice president and national legislative representative, Order of Railway Conductors.

As for the impact of foreign products on the handmade-glass industry of this country, let me point out that the Morgantown Chamber of Commerce last month submitted a statement to the United States Tariff Commission showing that the industry in our area has been badly hurt in the past several years and that there is an imminent prospect of further layoffs. Our workers are highly skilled artisans who have spent many years learning their trade, and many of them are third-generation glassworkers who know no other trade.

In view of this testimony, is the administration willing to continue the prevailing trade policies, or can we finally expect action that will enable our industries to prosper once more and restore to our citizens the rights to those jobs from which they have been disfranchised by cheap foreign labor?

As Representative of a district that has been unjustifiably imposed upon by insane foreign-trade practices, I implore you to give ear to the prayers of our own people regardless of whether the remedy conflicts with the contents of any messages that may be carried up Pennsylvania Avenue in behalf of a political philosophy.

EXCISE TAXES ON AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's action by the House Ways and Means Committee on excise taxes is, to say the very least, disappointing to me and to the millions of people in America who are vitally concerned with the welfare of the automobile industry.

In his announcement when he introduced the bill, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], said the excise tax cuts provided by the bill would "give needed stimulation immediately to consumer purchasing power." It would, he said, "give immediate stimulation to the Nation's business."

In all sincerity, let us take a look at the facts of the present economic situation. Is there any segment of American business more in need of stimulation than the automotive industry? This

House is aware, I am sure, that many thousands of workers in Detroit and other automotive production centers have been laid off because new car inventories are rapidly piling up and because a number of other factors point to declines in automobile sales this year.

This industry right now needs the shot in the arm that a reduction in excise tax rates can give it. Instead of a shot in the arm it has been given a stab in the back by this excise tax bill, because, in addition to denying the industry any relief, the bill establishes as permanent law 10-percent excise taxes on passenger cars, 8-percent taxes on trucks, buses and automotive parts. There is no expiration date in the bill for these excises, an action which is without precedent in my memory as to excise-tax legislation. This bill means the permanent saddling of this great industry with a crippling tax burden.

Henry Ford everlastingly proved that if you can get the price of automobiles low enough you can sell them and sell them in such quantities that the automobile industry will rank as the foremost manufacturing enterprise in the Nation. Because he mass-produced low-priced automobiles the industry has passed far beyond the luxury class. It now turns out a product that is a vital necessity in our way of life—a necessity in more ways than I have time to recite. The job of 1 out of every 7 workers in America today is in some way related to the automobile. The automobile has necessitated our good roads—it was the progenitor of the petroleum industry—it provides a means of intercourse and communication between our peoples that is convenient and inexpensive. I could go on, but I would only be belaboring the obvious. The importance of the automobile is the common knowledge of everyone.

Why then the discrimination in this bill against the automobile industry—an industry that draws raw materials and manufactured products from every part of the Nation? Ladies' handbags, fancy furs, costume jewelry, shaving lotion and eau de cologne, movie tickets, flash bulbs, and fountain pens are getting preferential treatment at the expense of an industry that is a vital part of our national economy. I am not arguing against relief for these other products. On the merits of each case, they may all be entitled to relief. But I cannot see the justice or the logic of such relief when the automobile industry is made to carry the burden of avoiding further budget deficits.

During the last great war, the executives of the automobile industry and the highly skilled, energetic and productive workers who manned the automobile factories earned for Detroit the title of the "Hub of the Arsenal of Democracy."

Does it seem just, by any stretch of the imagination, that, after this splendid record in time of war and of service to the peacetime economy of the Nation, the automobile industry should be per-

manently burdened with the load of these taxes?

What pains me most is the absence of a termination date in this bill. It would appear that the committee has decided, as a matter of policy, that excise taxes shall be a permanent source of revenue and that the automobile industry, because of the great volume of its business, will have to carry the load in avoiding budget deficits.

This legislation is grossly unjust. It is discriminatory. It is economically unsound. I hope the injustice of the provision will impress itself upon the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MCGREGOR and to include certain charts, the result of a questionnaire recently sent out by him.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOLTZMAN in two instances.

Mr. DIES and to include a speech on outlawing the Communist conspiracy.

Mr. WOLVERTON.

Mr. BUSBEY the remarks he will make in the Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY the remarks he will make in the Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania on a bill he is introducing today.

Mr. ROBINO (at the request of Mr. FRIEDEL).

Mr. WESTLAND.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SEELY-BROWN (at the request of Mr. SADLAK) for March 5, on account of illness in the family.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2984. An act to prohibit reduction of any rating of total disability or permanent total disability for compensation, pension, or insurance purposes which has been in effect for 20 or more years; and

H. R. 7996. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 687. An act for the relief of Sister Walfreda (Anna Nelles) and Sister Amaltrudis (Gertrude Schneider);

H. R. 711. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruth R. Ekholm;
 H. R. 749. An act for the relief of Shul-Fook Fung;
 H. R. 788. An act for the relief of Beryl Williams;
 H. R. 823. An act for the relief of Abraham G. Sakin;
 H. R. 824. An act for the relief of Demetrios Konstantino Papanicolaou;
 H. R. 828. An act for the relief of Dr. Vincenzo Guzzo;
 H. R. 907. An act for the relief of Wolodymyr Hirniak;
 H. R. 946. An act for the relief of Mrs. Louise Blackstone;
 H. R. 965. An act for the relief of Michael Demcheshen;
 H. R. 1339. An act for the relief of Dr. Soon Tai Ryang;
 H. R. 1346. An act for the relief of Zia Edin Taheri and Frances Hakimzadeh Taheri;
 H. R. 1358. An act for the relief of Dr. Marcelino J. Avecilla and Dr. Teodora A. Fide-lino-Avecilla;
 H. R. 1495. An act for the relief of Louis M. Jacobs;
 H. R. 1649. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gisela Walter Sizemore;
 H. R. 1688. An act for the relief of Henry Ty;
 H. R. 1795. An act for the relief of Helena Shostenko;
 H. R. 2035. An act for the relief of Mrs. Michaline Borzecka;
 H. R. 2387. An act for the relief of William M. Smith;
 H. R. 2504. An act for the relief of Sisters Adelaide Canelas and Maria Isabel Franco;
 H. R. 2507. An act for the relief of Alfonso Gatti;
 H. R. 2622. An act for the relief of Maria Teresa Ortega Perez;
 H. R. 2623. An act for the relief of Jose M. Thomasa-Sanchez, Adela Duran Cuevas de Thomasa, and Jose Maria Thomasa Duran;
 H. R. 2774. An act for the relief of Endre Szende, Zsuzsanna Szende, Katalin Szende (a minor), and Maria Szende (a minor);
 H. R. 2817. An act for the relief of George A. Ferris;
 H. R. 3005. An act for the relief of Charles Sabah;
 H. R. 3236. An act for the relief of Constantin and Lucia (Bercescu) Turcano;
 H. R. 3455. An act for the relief of Jalal Rashtan;
 H. R. 3749. An act for the relief of Wolde-mnar Jaskowsky; and
 H. R. 5773. An act to provide for the re-fund, under certain conditions, of money paid as premiums on United States Govern-ment life insurance or national service life insurance which is canceled for fraud.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 5, 1953, 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:

1328. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1955 involving a decrease in the amount of \$23,900,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission (H. Doc. No. 348); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1329. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to remove the requirement for a final physical examination for inductees who continue on active duty in another status in the Armed Forces"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1330. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, of the exchange stabilization fund created by section 10 (b) of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, approved January 30, 1934, as amended, pursuant to section 10 (a) of the act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1331. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of the Bureau of Mines for the calendar year January 1, 1953, through December 31, 1953, pursuant to sections 102 (a) and 212 (c) of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 692; Public Law 552, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1332. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cotton'"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1333. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1948, to provide for censuses of manufactures, mineral industries, and other businesses," relating to the year 1954; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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. COLE of Missouri: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 573. A bill prohibiting lithographing or engraving on envelopes sold by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1303). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2098. A bill to provide for the compensation of certain persons whose lands have been flooded and damaged by reason of fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods; with amendment (Rept. No. 1304). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7057. A bill to authorize the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to transfer, exchange, and dispose of land in the Eden project, Wyoming, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1305). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8092. A bill to facilitate the entry of Philippine traders; without amendment (Rept. No. 1306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 8224. A bill to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1307). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 8127. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appro-

priations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1308). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 54. An act for the relief of Juan Ezcurra and Francisco Ezcurra; without amendment (Rept. No. 1269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 316. An act for the relief of Vera Lazaros and Cristo Lazaros; without amendment (Rept. No. 1270). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 551. An act for the relief of Mamertas Cvirka and Mrs. Petronele Cvirka; without amendment (Rept. No. 1271). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 850. An act for the relief of Alice Power and Ruby Power; without amendment (Rept. No. 1272). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 931. An act for the relief of Vilhjalmur Thorlaksson Bjarnar; without amendment (Rept. No. 1273). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1038. An act for the relief of Silva Galjevsek; without amendment (Rept. No. 1274). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1137. An act for the relief of Utako Kanitz; without amendment (Rept. No. 1275). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1440. An act for the relief of Paolo Danesi; without amendment (Rept. No. 1276). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1652. An act for the relief of Robert A. Tyrrell; without amendment (Rept. No. 1277). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2073. An act for the relief of Esther Wagner; without amendment (Rept. No. 1278). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 683. A bill for the relief of George P. Symnriotis; with amendment (Rept. No. 1279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 970. A bill for the relief of George Economos; with amendment (Rept. No. 1280). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1755. A bill for the relief of Theresa Mire Piantoni; with amendment (Rept. No. 1281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1784. A bill for the relief of Rito Solla; with amendment (Rept. No. 1282). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2385. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Fruscione; without amendment (Rept. No. 1283). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2404. A bill to adjust the status of a displaced person in the United States who does not meet all the requirements of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1284). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2406. A bill to adjust the status of a displaced person in the United States who does not meet all the requirements of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1285). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3349. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margarete Burdo; without amendment (Rept. No. 1286). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3876. A bill for the relief of Martha Schnauffer; with amendment (Rept. No. 1287). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4135. A bill for the relief of George Telegdy and Julia Peyer Telegdy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1288). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4864. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hildegard Noel; without amendment (Rept. No. 1289). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5090. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Magdalene Zarnovski Austin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1290). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 214. An act for the relief of Geraldine B. Mathews; with amendment (Rept. No. 1291). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2791. A bill for the relief of Esther E. Ellicott; with amendment (Rept. No. 1292). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3109. A bill for the relief of Theodore W. Carlson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1293). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3672. A bill for the relief of Clyde M. Litton; with amendment (Rept. No. 1294). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3751. A bill for the relief of Alexandria S. Balasko; with amendment (Rept. No. 1295). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3756. A bill for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives; with amendment (Rept. No. 1296). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3970. A bill for the relief of Bernhard F. Elmers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1297). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4475. A bill for the relief of Curtis W. McPhail; with amendment (Rept. No. 1298). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4713. A bill for the relief of Paul E. Milward; with amendment (Rept. No. 1299). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5436. A bill for the relief of David Hanan; with amendment

(Rept. No. 1300). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5460. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Chancy C. Newsom; with amendment (Rept. No. 1301). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4532. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ann Elizabeth Caulk; with amendment (Rept. No. 1302). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H. R. 8220. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 20 of the United States Code, entitled "Education"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8221. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 21 of the United States Code, entitled "Food and Drugs"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEADER:

H. R. 8222. A bill to amend various statutes and certain titles of the United States Code, for the purpose of correcting obsolete references, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H. R. 8223. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 23 of the United States Code, entitled "Highways"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 8224. A bill to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 8225. A bill to establish public use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 8226. A bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 8227. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in order to provide that revenues under the provisions of such act shall be used as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8228. A bill to provide adequate diets for the unemployed and their families in distress areas of unemployment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 8229. A bill to amend the hospital survey and construction provisions of the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to the States for surveying the need for diagnostic or treatment centers, for hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, for rehabilitation facilities, and for nursing homes, and to provide assistance in the construction of such facilities through grants to public and nonprofit agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 8230. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit a taxpayer to deduct tuition expenses paid by him for the education of his children through the 12th grade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 8231. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the prod-

ucts of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 8232. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to assist the States of Maryland and Delaware to reestablish their common boundary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 8233. A bill to promote the agriculture of the United States by acquiring and diffusing useful information regarding agriculture in foreign countries and the marketing of American agricultural commodities, and the products thereof, outside of the United States; to authorize the creation of an Agricultural Foreign Service in the Department of Agriculture; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 8234. A bill to incorporate the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VELDE:

H. R. 8235. A bill to appropriate money for the construction of the Calumet-Sag Channel, Ill., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 8236. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to provide that feed grains acquired through price-support operations shall be sold to dairy farmers at prices equivalent to 75 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 8237. A bill to limit the term "water-proof" when applied to cloth or fabric; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 8238. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act to permit individual motor carriers to file suits to enjoin operations being conducted in violation of such part; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. REED of New York:

H. Con. Res. 204. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the report thereon; 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. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 8239. A bill for the relief of Fung Ping Wah (also known as Reginald Ping Wah Fung) and his wife, Fung Wai-Yin Li (also known as Doris Fung); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLT (by request):

H. R. 8240. A bill for the relief of Fa Hsiang Wu and George Kuosing Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN (by request):

H. R. 8241. A bill for the relief of Letterio (Leo) G. Curro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8242. A bill for the relief of Max Moskowitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 8243. A bill for the relief of Ida Kaganowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 8244. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Nell Woolgar Allen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8245. A bill for the relief of Juan Ysais-Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 8246. A bill for the relief of Conception Gallofin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Testifies Before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in Support of H. R. 7397

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the testimony of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, given today before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in support of H. R. 7397, is very important. Mrs. Hobby explained to the committee that the bill is designed to simplify and improve the several grant-in-aid programs which are now administered pursuant to the provisions of the Public Health Service Act. She pointed out that there are 14 major grant-in-aid programs administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Of these 14, 6 are for the support of State and local health services. The provisions of H. R. 7397 apply only to this latter group.

The bill would replace the present separate authorizations for categorical public health grants for venereal disease control, tuberculosis control, general health and heart disease control—including the separate programs for mental health and cancer control—with an authorization for the following three types of grants:

First. Grants to assist States generally in meeting the costs of their public health services.

Second. Grants to assist States in initiating extensions of, and improvements in, their public health services.

Third. Grants to assist in meeting the costs of projects directed toward the solution of public health problems of regional or national significance.

The amount of Federal funds to be available for each of the above three types of grants would be specified in annual appropriation acts.

GENERAL GRANTS

The formula for determining each State's allotment for the first type of grant would be the same as that used in the hospital survey and construction—Hill-Burton—provisions of the Public Health Service Act—which take into account both the relative populations of the States and their relative fiscal resources as measured by State per capita incomes. There would, however, be a minimum allotment of \$55,000. From its allotment, each State would receive payments equal to a percentage of the cost of public health services under its approved State plan, the percentage varying inversely with the State's relative per capita income between a maxi-

mum of 66% and a minimum of 33% percent. This contrasts with present law under which the amount of the allotment and the Federal share of the cost are determined by regulations and differ from program to program.

EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

The formula for determining each State's allotment for extension and improvement purposes would be based on relative State populations with a minimum allotment of \$25,000. From its allotment, a State could receive, over a 6-year period, varying proportions of the cost of approved projects—included in its approved State plan—for extension and improvement of its public health services—75 percent of the cost for the first 2 years, 50 percent for the next 2, and 25 percent for the last 2.

SPECIAL PROJECT GRANTS

These grants would be made on a project basis to States and to public and nonprofit agencies or organizations. They would be available for paying part of the cost of combating unusually severe public health problems in specific geographical areas, and of carrying out special projects which hold unique promise of contributing to the solution of public health problems common to all or several States, and projects directed at meeting public health problems of special national significance or concern.

STATE PLANS

Payments from allotments for the first type of grant—for support of public health services—would be conditioned upon submission of a plan by the State health authority—and mental health authority in connection with mental health—which meets requirements prescribed in regulations of the Surgeon General.

As under existing law, regulations would be issued by the Surgeon General, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and only after consultation with and, insofar as practicable, the concurrence of the State health—or mental health—authorities.

ADMINISTRATION

The grants would continue, as under existing law, to be administered through the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TRANSITION PROVISIONS

In order to provide States an opportunity to adjust their finances to the new allotment formulas, provision would be made to limit to 10 percent any decrease in allotments which any State would receive in any 1 year by virtue of the formula change.

Mrs. Hobby testified that when she first examined the present grant structure, it became apparent that the number, variation, and complexity of existing authorizations and regulations were obstacles to effective administration, particularly State and local administration. Further, it appeared that the

pattern and structure of these grants did not provide the flexibility needed to meet the problems of the several States in the best possible way. She stated further that last year she reviewed the history and operation of all these programs and came to the conclusion that there is a real need for clarification, greater flexibility, and more local determination in connection with administering the program. Consequently, legislation was developed designed to accomplish these objectives.

These amendments to the Public Health Service Act would not become effective until July 1, 1955.

Postal Salary Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1954

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein a copy of the statement I made recently before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, in behalf of the salary increase for postal employees.

I am most hopeful that the Members of this House will see fit to support the Withrow bill so that the salaries of our postal employees can be adjusted upward to meet increased living costs.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE RELATIVE TO THE POSTAL PAY INCREASE, MARCH 1, 1954

Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to thank you and the members of the committee for giving me an opportunity to speak to you about a matter which is of grave concern to us all—the proposed increase in pay for postal employees.

Several times before on the House floor I have urged my colleagues to act, and to act quickly, on a raise in pay for this group of Federal employees which has served us so well and so faithfully over the years. Although the cost of living has continued its upward spiral our postal employees have had no increase in pay since 1951. They are hard pressed to provide even the barest essentials for their families. Many employees have been forced to take on additional work, and in many instances the wives of postal employees have had to go to work in an effort to relieve the financial hardships caused by inadequate salaries.

Our Post Office Department is one of the largest businesses in the world. It was inaugurated as a service to the people of the country, and only through the diligent efforts and the unflinching teamwork within the postal organization has it been possible to overcome the many complex problems which arise, and to ensure the type of mail service we have come to expect.

Economy in Government operations seems to be the watchword here in Washington today. That is a good thing. However, economy means more than an actual saving of

money per se. It means wise and careful management, and the utilization of funds to the best advantage. As I have said previously, the Post Office Department was set up with the intention of providing a necessary service to the people, and because it does not pay its own way, I cannot see why employees must wait for postal rate increases before they can expect increases in their own salaries. Other Government departments and agencies are not self-sustaining, and if our Government can subsidize the farmers, airlines, steamship companies, and even foreign countries, then in my opinion we can and should extend a helping hand to the postal workers.

I most respectfully urge the members of this committee to report out a bill which will provide for an adequate increase in salaries for that group.

Dorchester Day

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, 11 years ago last month the Army transport *Dorchester* went down in icy waters off the coast of Newfoundland. In that dark night of terror many men died bravely, and others, no less brave, survived. And if not all were brave in that sudden hell of fire and ice and darkness, when the torpedo struck the engine room, and boilers burst and lights went out, and the ship listed with its mortal wound, what man can blame them? Honor is due to all who died for us that night, suddenly or through long agony, bravely, or in a scrambling terror. But honor is doubly due to those 4 men, the chaplains, Washington, Poling, Fox, and Goode—1 priest, 2 ministers, 1 rabbi—who stood firm in the midst of panic, aided the captain and other officers in restoring order, and went down together, praying as one to that one God whom we all own as Lord, Creator, and Father.

As long as America lives those four men will stand together, in the white light of history, at the ship's rail, forgetful of self, calling down the mercy of God upon the endangered, the dying, and the dead. They will so stand in our children's history books, teaching them in one vivid mental picture what is finest in the tradition of America—selfless courage in the face of danger, devotion to God, service to fellow man. Catholic priest, Protestant ministers, and Jewish rabbi, they represent that more than tolerance by which we, of all faiths and races, are one in the spirit of America.

If 1 of these 4 men was first in proposing that they remain with the ship—we do not know which man that was. One gave his lifebelt to a soldier—we do not know which man that was. That is as it should be. These four are equal in bravery, equal in honor, before the remembering world.

But I, for my own reasons, wish to say a few words of Father John P. Washington. He was, like me, born to a Catholic family. When John Washing-

ton was a year-old baby, or thereabouts, in Newark, I was born in the same city. Like many of my friends, he went to Seton Hall College—now Seton Hall University—in South Orange, and then to Immaculate Conception Seminary in Darlington, being ordained in 1935 as a priest of the diocese of Newark, and then serving parishes in Elizabeth, Orange, and Arlington. Many of my hearers, from Arlington and Kearny particularly, probably remember Father John Washington, who arrived at St. Stephen's Church in Arlington to be one of Father Murphy's assistants, just in time to take part in the ceremony of laying the cornerstone of the splendid new church, and stayed there until he entered the Army as a chaplain. Those of us who were fortunate enough to know him have a proud memory to cherish and hand down to our descendants.

I take pleasure in the thought that the name of Washington, already so glorious in the history of America, was held on high this time by one whose father and mother had come to America as immigrants from Ireland. I take a personal interest in the achievements of second-generation Americans, and I particularly like the kind of immigrant family in which the children are brought up, as the young Washingtons were, in thoroughly American style, yet with a care to preserve, along with the religion brought from the old country, legends, and traditions that help to make life beautiful and happy. Young John Washington was taught to love the land and history of Ireland, as well as the land and history of America, to remember the Battle of the Boyne as well as the Battle of Fort Ticonderoga. We here, his friends and neighbors, know that his name is now enshrined in a phrase, one of the watchwords of our liberty, as deathless as "In the name of the great Jehovah and the Continental Congress." That watchword is a simple list of four names: Washington, Poling, Fox, and Goode.

Results of McGregor Poll on National Issues

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. J. HARRY MCGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1954

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD the results of a questionnaire I sent to the citizens in the 17th Ohio District. I am proud to represent this district in the Congress of the United States. The questions were concerned with major national and international problems facing Congress today.

I regret I could not send a questionnaire to each of my constituents in the district, but I believe the replies I have received are the opinions of a cross-section of those I represent.

Questions sheets were sent to almost every occupational group: Republican and Democratic committeemen and women, laborers, attorneys, housewives, public office holders and Government employees, salesmen, retired men and women, ministers, college and high-school students, and their instructors. Also included are those working in business and industry, newspaper, radio, and professional positions.

Blanks were mailed to individuals and reproductions of the questionnaire were published in nearly all of the 20 daily and weekly newspapers in my district.

A large percent of the completed forms contained comments on the questions which proves to me that the average citizen is interested in the vital issues now before this legislative body and is anxious to express his views on them. I am very pleased so many took the time to write and attach letters and notes to the questionnaire enlarging upon their answers.

The population in my district is composed of about half rural and half urban residents. Nearly all of the labor and farm organizations are represented as well as large and small business. There are also two colleges and two universities.

It is not often that a Congressman can obtain a true picture of such an evenly divided district, but through the questionnaire method, I feel I have gained the majority opinion of those I represent.

The questionnaire and the results are as follows:

QUESTIONNAIRE IN AN ENDEAVOR TO LEARN THE VIEWS OF THE FOLKS BACK HOME

	Yes	No
	Per-cent	Per-cent
1. Should the present farm program (90 percent parity and price supports) be continued?.....	46	54
2. Should we have controls on the production of farm products?.....	38	62
3. Do you favor continuation of—		
(a) technical assistance to Europe...	76	24
(b) economic aid to Europe.....	35	65
4. Do you favor continuation of—		
(a) technical assistance to Asia....	72	28
(b) economic aid to Asia.....	42	58
5. Do you advocate the admittance of Red China into the U. N., although the refusal of which might lead to the renewal of the Korean war?.....	19	81
6. Do you favor the extension of social security coverage to 10.5 million additional persons, including doctors, dentists, ministers, farmers, and others who are self-employed, although this might possibly mean an increase in the rate paid by both the employer and the employee?.....	51	49
7. Do you advocate the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway at this time, regardless of the lack of a written agreement with Canada relative to construction and operation?.....	68	32
8. Do you favor allowing the 18-year-olds to vote?.....	70	30
9. Do you favor the methods of Senator McCARTHY in his endeavors to disclose the actions of the Communists in this country?.....	59	41
10. Do you favor the continuation of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House?.....	90	10

Signature.....
Street.....
City and State.....
Occupation.....

Please fill out and return this questionnaire to J. HARRY MCGREGOR, Member of Congress, 1434 New House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

Percentage distribution of replies to questionnaire

Question 1. Should the present farm program (90 percent parity and price supports) be continued?

	Yes	No
Total replies.....	46	54
Attorneys.....	33	67
Business, industry, and salesmen.....	21	79
Farmers.....	35	65
Farm groups.....	18	82
Housewives.....	17	83
Labor.....	32	68
Ministers.....	38	62
Newspaper and radio.....	50	50
Occupation not given and organizations.....	35	65
Professionals.....	21	79
Public officeholders and Federal employees.....	20	80
Retired.....	29	71
Teachers.....	42½	57½
Students.....	62½	37½

Question 2. Should we have controls on the production of farm products?

	Yes	No
Total replies.....	38	62
Attorneys.....	49	51
Business, industry, and salesmen.....	28	72
Farmers.....	26	74
Farm groups.....	9	91
Housewives.....	17	83
Labor.....	25	74
Ministers.....	50	50
Newspaper and radio.....	50	50
Occupation not given and organizations.....	35	65
Professionals.....	29	71
Public officeholders and Federal employees.....	33	67
Retired.....	34	66
Teachers.....	45	55
Students.....	46	54

Question 3. Do you favor continuation of—
(a) Technical assistance to Europe?

	Yes	No
Total replies.....	76	24
Attorneys.....	76	24
Business, industry, and salesmen.....	78	22
Farmers.....	70	30
Farm groups.....	83	17
Housewives.....	66	34
Labor.....	63	37
Ministers.....	92	8
Newspaper and radio.....	100	0
Occupation not given and organizations.....	24	76
Professionals.....	83	17
Public officeholders and Federal employees.....	73	27
Retired.....	82	18
Teachers.....	95	5
Students.....	79	21

(b) Economic aid to Europe?

	Yes	No
Total replies.....	35	65
Attorneys.....	33	67
Business, industry, and salesmen.....	26	74
Farmers.....	32	68
Farm groups.....	9	91
Housewives.....	29	71
Labor.....	23	77
Ministers.....	67	33
Newspaper and radio.....	29	71
Occupation not given and organizations.....	16	84
Professionals.....	24	76
Public officeholders and Federal employees.....	33	67
Retired.....	42	58
Teachers.....	59	41
Students.....	41	59

Question 4. Do you favor continuation of—
(a) Technical assistance to Asia?

	Yes	No
Total replies.....	72	28
Attorneys.....	80	20
Business, industry, and salesmen.....	78	22
Farmers.....	76	24
Farm groups.....	81	19
Housewives.....	67	33
Labor.....	65	35
Ministers.....	93	7
Newspaper and radio.....	86	14
Occupation not given and organizations.....	21	79
Professionals.....	83	17
Public officeholders and Federal employees.....	71	29
Retired.....	78	22
Teachers.....	93	7
Students.....	71	29

(b) Economic aid to Asia?

	Yes	No
Total replies.....	42	58
Attorneys.....	43	57
Business, industry, and salesmen.....	39	61
Farmers.....	38	62
Farm groups.....	11	89
Housewives.....	36	64
Labor.....	25	75
Ministers.....	73	27
Newspaper and radio.....	57	43
Occupation not given and organizations.....	43	57
Professionals.....	41	59
Public officeholders and Federal employees.....	49	51
Retired.....	56	44
Teachers.....	74	26
Students.....	43	57

Question 5. Do you advocate the admittance of Red China into the U. N., although the refusal of which might lead to the renewal of the Korean war?

	Yes	No
Total replies.....	19	81
Attorneys.....	18	82
Business, industry, and salesmen.....	11	89
Farmers.....	11	89
Farm groups.....	0	100
Housewives.....	9	91
Labor.....	3	97
Ministers.....	22	78
Newspaper and radio.....	29	71
Occupation not given and organizations.....	11	89
Professionals.....	9	91
Public officeholders and Federal employees.....	14	86
Retired.....	4	96
Teachers.....	19	81
Students.....	27	73

Question 6. Do you favor the extension of social security coverage to 10.5 million additional persons, including doctors, dentists, ministers, farmers and others who are self-employed, although this might possibly mean an increase in the rate paid by both the employer and the employee?

	Yes	No
Total replies.....	51	49
Attorneys.....	50	50
Business, industry, and salesmen.....	49	51
Farmers.....	34	66
Farm groups.....	18	82
Housewives.....	43	57
Labor.....	53	47
Ministers.....	68	32
Newspaper and radio.....	29	71
Occupation not given and organizations.....	25	75
Professionals.....	37	63
Public officeholders and Federal employees.....	65	35
Retired.....	75	25
Teachers.....	59	41
Students.....	57	43

Question 7. Do you advocate the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway at this time, regardless of the lack of a written agreement with Canada relative to construction and operation?

	Yes	No
Total replies.....	68	32
Attorneys.....	46	54
Business, industry, and salesmen.....	62	38
Farmers.....	46	54
Farm groups.....	28	72
Housewives.....	50	50
Labor.....	36	64
Ministers.....	62	38
Newspaper and radio.....	57	43
Occupation not given and organizations.....	70	30
Professionals.....	55	45
Public officeholders and Federal employees.....	67	33
Retired.....	62	38
Teachers.....	73	27
Students.....	79	21

Question 8. Do you favor allowing the 18-year-olds to vote?

	Yes	No
Total replies.....	70	30
Attorneys.....	51	49
Business, industry, and salesmen.....	54	46
Farmers.....	49	51
Farm groups.....	73	27
Housewives.....	61	39
Labor.....	56	44
Ministers.....	56	44
Newspaper and radio.....	29	71
Occupation not given and organizations.....	70	30
Professionals.....	52	48
Public officeholders and Federal employees.....	43	57
Retired.....	57	43
Teachers.....	72½	27½
Students.....	81	19

Question 9. Do you favor the methods of Senator McCARTHY in his endeavors to disclose the actions of the Communists in this country?

	Yes	No
Total replies.....	59	41
Attorneys.....	41	59
Business, industry, and salesmen.....	72	28
Farmers.....	75	25
Farm groups.....	90	10
Housewives.....	78	22
Labor.....	83	17
Ministers.....	37	63
Newspaper and radio.....	86	14
Occupation not given and organizations.....	76	24
Professionals.....	74	26
Public officeholders and Federal employees.....	71	29
Retired.....	68	32
Teachers.....	56	44
Students.....	48	52

Question 10. Do you favor the continuation of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House?

	Yes	No
Total replies.....	90	10
Attorneys.....	88	12
Business, industry, and salesmen.....	92	8
Farmers.....	90	10
Farm groups.....	99	1
Housewives.....	95	5
Labor.....	92	8
Ministers.....	80	20
Newspaper and radio.....	100	0
Occupation not given and organizations.....	93	7
Professionals.....	96	4
Public officeholders and Federal employees.....	95	5
Retired.....	93	7
Teachers.....	82	18
Students.....	87	13

Is the Massive Retaliation Policy a Dangerous Gamble, Playing Into the Hands of the Kremlin Extremists?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1954

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, although it has received very little public discussion, a strong undercurrent of deep concern is now evident among Members of Congress of both parties over the policy of massive retaliation enunciated earlier this year by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.

The so-called New Look in our military and defense strategy as outlined by the Secretary calls for primary dependence upon a great capacity to retaliate, instantly, by means and at places of our own choosing in case of any renewed outbreak of aggression.

Considering the far-reaching shift in American policy which this pronouncement appeared to indicate, it is unfortunate that there has been so little discussion of it by responsible military as well as diplomatic officials of the administration or any clear-cut definition of just what the policy is supposed to mean.

I have withheld comment on this matter up to now in the hopes that some such clear-cut definition might be forthcoming. I think now that the time has come when the Eisenhower administration should either clarify or withdraw this policy pronouncement before it sets off the very disaster it is intended to prevent—that is, a global atomic war of total obliteration.

I believe this policy strengthens the power of both the Russian military extremists itching to expand the Soviet empire by force and the Communist political theorists in Russia who believe unquestioningly in the Marx-Lenin teachings based on European conditions of a half century or more ago when wars were considered fairly normal and not very destructive affairs.

As the Dulles policy—which presumably also is the Eisenhower policy—now stands, it is a threat to make a worldwide atomic war out of any new Korea, to drop atomic bombs on Peiping if the Chinese Communists invade Indochina, or to atomize Moscow if Russia were to march against Iran or any other neighbor.

This may or may not be what the Secretary meant to imply, but that's what everyone takes it to mean. Presumably the Russians take it to mean that, too. If so, it could be a dangerous gamble—perhaps an almost suicidal dare, playing right into the hands of the crazy men of the Kremlin.

The leaders of Russian communism have always pretended—and some of them like Malenkov may even believe—that the West wants to attack them and wipe them out. That line has been sold to the Russian people for 37 years.

It has been their excuse, if not their reason, for blocking every attempt to reach a real peace. Even during the height of World War II when we were pouring billions in lend-lease aid into Russia, they often treated us more like potential enemies than as allies. Though our allies, they never acted as our friends and never reciprocated our efforts to be friends, for they maintained an official suspicion that such a friendship was ideologically impossible. You must remember that they had been Hitler's allies, too, for a while.

Since World War II they have painted us in the same colors in which they painted the Nazis. And they have waged an intensive and unrelentingly savage hate campaign against us among their own people.

The question is how seriously do they take their own propaganda. Do they really believe it? If so, is it possible that they might seize on the Dulles pronouncement as their signal to rain atomic bombs on us at the first sign of any localized aggression anywhere in the world. Would they or would they not be likely to do that in the belief they were acting in self-defense?

Those are some of the question this "new look" raises—vital questions which deserve thoughtful and well-considered answers from the administration.

For myself, I believe the policy of this country should be one of continuing to organize the strength of the whole free world to stop aggression, but not to go out inviting global atomic war over minor-league skirmishes or border incidents, not to stand on a vague and unclear policy which seems to convey to the suspicious denizens of the Kremlin that we are as trigger happy as they are. And by all means we should certainly take no stand which might invite an atomic Pearl Harbor in our own cities the minute pro- and anti-Communist regimes in some far corner of the earth start a local war against each other.

Justice for the Dairy Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1954

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, title 7, United States Code, section 1427. This proposed amendment provides that feed grains acquired through price-support operations shall be offered for sale to dairy farmers at prices equivalent to 75 percent of parity. Processors and other persons in the normal channel of trade would, under the proposed amendment, be allowed to purchase feed grains on this same basis for resale in processed form or otherwise to dairy farmers at prices which will properly reflect the price at which such grains were purchased from the corporation.

The reason for the introduction of this bill is very simple—justice. As we all know, under present law and regulation, dairy products will be supported at 75 percent of parity beginning April 1, 1954. Also under law, feed grains which are the raw product of these dairy products will be supported at 90 percent of parity at least until January 1, 1955. Certainly the injustice of this situation is obvious to anyone. In order to remain in business, the dairy farmer must purchase feed grains for his cows. Because of the price-support program, he is presently paying an artificially high price for these grains. Without the relief afforded by this amendment, beginning April 1, 1954, the dairy farmer will be squeezed between two irresistible forces—high price supports for feed grains on the one hand, low price supports for dairy products on the other.

A great many of the dairy farmers in my district would prefer no price supports at all on either dairy products or feed grains. They are independent people and want only an opportunity to run their own show with the least possible interference from the Federal Government. They have demonstrated their sincerity as to this by suggesting and proposing a "self-help plan," whereby Federal supports will be eliminated entirely and the dairy farmers themselves will handle their own surplus and production problems.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge and plead that the Congress take early and positive action on the bill which I have introduced today so that justice may be done and the dairy farmer who, in the aggregate is one of the most important segments of the economy of this country, will not, of necessity be faced with economic disaster beginning April 1, 1954.

Statement by Hon. Homer Ferguson, of Michigan, on the Anniversary of Soviet Domination of Rumania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 4, 1954

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the anniversary of the Soviet domination of Rumania.

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

STATEMENT BY HON. HOMER FERGUSON, OF MICHIGAN, ON THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE SOVIET DOMINATION OF RUMANIA

Saturday, March 6, 1954, marks the ninth anniversary of the Communist seizure of the Government of Rumania and I wish to call attention to this mournful anniversary because it contains a lesson which has not yet been learned by many people throughout the world.

The lesson to be learned from the Communist seizure of Rumania is that communism and Communist leaders cannot be trusted.

Rumania, of course, was occupied by Russian forces toward the end of 1944 and the Communists immediately began to exercise every conceivable pressure to secure their complete control, aided by the few Communist Rumanians and the firepower of the Red army.

The Rumanian Government was unable to resist the powerful Soviet demands indefinitely in the face of the military power of the Communists. On March 6, after Russian troops had occupied the principal Government office buildings, the Communist government was formed without the participation of the two strongest Rumanian parties.

As well as studying the lesson of these events, we must also use this occasion to pay tribute to the Rumanian people who have been ruthlessly exploited for the benefit of the Soviet Union and yet have not lost their love for freedom or their determination to regain it.

Anniversary of Hungarian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 4, 1954

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the anniversary of Hungarian Independence Day, which will be observed on March 14.

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

STATEMENT BY HON. HOMER FERGUSON, OF MICHIGAN, ON THE ANNIVERSARY OF HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

It is a real pleasure for me to join in saluting those brave Hungarians who stepped forward with great courage to free their homeland from the bondage of Hapsburg rule in the 1848 war for Hungarian independence.

Louis Kossuth won his place in history in the forefront of the great fighters for freedom and independence during that unfortunately brief period of Hungarian independence in 1848 and 1849. That great patriot ranks with George Washington as a fighter for liberty.

This anniversary of Hungarian Independence recalls the continuing love of the Hungarian people for liberty and freedom and brings to mind great leaders like St. Stephen, who united Hungary; Col. Michael DeKowitz, Hungarian patriot who fought for America's freedom during our Revolutionary War; and contemporaries like Cardinal Mindszenty.

Unfortunately, the precious independence won by Louis Kossuth and his followers was short-lived as the forces of Austria and Russia combined to crush the Hungarian nation and reimpose the Hapsburg domination.

The basic foundation of the free Hungary of Louis Kossuth—the 10 points—are well worth keeping in mind during this period when the godless forces of communism impose their will on the people of Hungary. Those 10 points included religious liberty, responsible government, equality before law, right of public meeting, and other rights we believe to be essential to the dignity of the individual.

It is fitting and necessary that we observe this anniversary here in America and elsewhere in the free world since I am certain that people in Hungary will not be able to observe it.

I join my fellow Americans of Hungarian descent in praying and working for the restoration of freedom in the Hungarian homeland.

We Must Outlaw the Communist Conspiracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN DIES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1954

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, during the existence of the Dies committee from 1938 to 1945, we investigated and exposed approximately 500 Fascist, Nazi, and Communist organizations, with a claimed total membership in the United States of 10 million persons, and as a result most of these organizations went out of existence before the termination of our committee on January 3, 1945. We exposed several hundred Fascist, Nazi, and Communist magazines, periodicals, and publications, with the result that they were unable to survive the disclosure of their treasonable purposes. We exposed a dozen international labor unions affiliated with the CIO which were controlled by Communists. Ten years later the CIO confirmed our findings and expelled these unions from their organization.

Our committee revealed the names and occupations of several thousand employees and officials with subversive records working for our Government, and gradually and belatedly they were weeded out of the Government service by discharge or forced resignations. Included in this list, which we submitted in 1941, were the names of Alger Hiss, Donald Hiss, Harry Dexter White, Harold Glasser, and George Shaw Wheeler. The work of our committee was an important factor in the conviction of Fritz Kuhn, styled feuhrer of the German-American Bund; Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party, and William Weiner, party treasurer; Nicholas Dozenberg; William Dudley Pelley, leader of the Silver Shirts of America; officials of Bookniga, Soviet propaganda agency; the expulsion of Arno Rissi and Mrs. Leslie Fry, and the prosecution of many other disloyal persons. Many bills of a corrective nature passed the House as a result of the testimony produced by our committee. Before World War II our committee exposed the Japanese fifth column in the United States and furnished to our Government a map showing in great detail the fleet positions and battle formations of the United States Navy around Pearl Harbor. As a result of our hearings and findings, bills were passed under which many Communist leaders have been sent to the penitentiary.

One of our chief recommendations to outlaw the Communist conspiracy, which

may be found in the committee's report filed with Congress on January 3, 1941, has not yet been enacted into law. In connection with this recommendation, our committee said in its report:

As long as these organizations have a legal status in the United States, it will be difficult for any agency of the Government to deal with them.

Our committee also found that from 1919 to 1924 the Communist conspiracy was outlawed in this country by wartime legislation, and that during this period the Communist movement in the United States "remained comparatively stationary and innocuous."

Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1954, I introduced H. R. 7894, which declares that the Communist Party of the United States and its various components of affiliated, subsidiary, and frontal organizations and all other organizations, no matter under what name, whose object or purpose is to overthrow the Government of the United States or the government of any State, Territory, District, or possession thereof, or of any political subdivision therein, by force and violence, are declared illegal and not entitled to any of the rights, privileges, and immunities attendant upon legal bodies created under the jurisdiction of the laws of the United States or any political subdivision thereof; and that membership in any such organization is a Federal offense punishable by a fine not exceeding \$10,000 or imprisonment not exceeding 10 years, or both, provided that the member had knowledge of the revolutionary object or purpose of such organization. If this legislation is enacted, it will deprive the Communists of their greatest asset, which is the legal apparatus and window dressing for the planning and perpetration of treason and the deception of gullible and unthinking people.

The evidence produced before our committee showed beyond any doubt that communism is a foreign conspiracy masked as a political party, and that Communists in the United States are the un-uniformed soldiers of the Kremlin stationed on American soil. The evidence was established that the Communist Party and its components of affiliated, subsidiary, and frontal organizations is an agency for the planning and perpetration of misdemeanors and high crimes. These crimes and misdemeanors belong in a special class. Behind the Communist violations of our statutes there is a special motive which requires a special kind of understanding. The Communist criminal is not an ordinary criminal even when he is committing ordinary crimes. The extraordinary thing about a Communist crime is that it rests upon an elaborate philosophy which is summed up in the doctrine that the end justifies the means. The Communist end is a beautifully depicted utopia. Only after the new recruit has become wedded to the Communist utopia is he initiated into the criminal means by which the Communist Party proposes to attain its utopia. Even according to its professed tactics, the Communist Party and its affiliated organizations is an agency for the planning and perpetration of misdemeanors and high

crimes. Lenin, himself, made this perfectly clear when he said:

Revolutionaries who are unable to combine illegal forms of struggle with every form of legal struggle are very poor revolutionaries.

What I have said explains why Earl Browder was convicted for obtaining a United States passport through fraud. It explains why William Weiner was convicted for fraudulently representing himself as an American citizen. It explains why Nicholas Dozenberg was convicted for perjury in obtaining an American passport. It explains why Dr. Valentine Burtan, Communist agent for Stalin's counterfeiting ring, served a sentence in the Federal prison in Lewisburg, Pa. It explains why the Communist Party practiced fraud on a large scale in obtaining signatures for its election petitions. It explains why Communists defied our laws to recruit 4,000 American boys to send them to fight for Stalin in Spain. All of these men and thousands of others who have not yet been apprehended and convicted committed their crimes in the service of the Communist Party. The Communist Party has put itself on record again and again with respect to its intentions of disloyalty to the American Government, and with respect to its actual loyalty to the Soviet Union.

To Communists treason is a virtue. No Communist who ever appeared before our committee would ever say that in the event of war between the United States and Soviet Russia he would support the United States. Furthermore, the Communist conspiracy preaches and practices the overthrow of non-Communist governments by force and violence. They do not believe in the democratic processes of free elections and parliamentary procedure to achieve their ends.

In view of these facts which have been proven before the Congress and the courts of the United States, is there any possible justification for the continued recognition of the Communist conspiracy as legal in the United States? Are we not placed in an impossibly inconsistent position when we seek to combat communistic activities in the United States

and at the same time recognize Communist organizations as legal bodies? The Communist organizations remain just as legal in America today as they have been since the expiration of the wartime acts in 1924.

The time has come to end this farce by the passage of my bill.

H. R. 3842

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1954

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 1, the world was shocked by the terrorist shooting of five Members of the House of Representatives.

The incident has naturally brought about a series of resolutions calling for tighter security regulations for visitors to the gallery. These resolutions include provisions for the installation of bullet-proof glass protection, photoelectric cells, and many other gimmicks.

Of course, no prudent person will summarily reject any of the measures offered, if they add to the safety of the Members. But the Lugers which shot at and wounded our Members on Monday might not have been available if my bill, H. R. 3842, became law. This bill would direct the Secretary of Defense to search the belongings of members of the Armed Forces and their families returning to the United States, and to seize any so-called souvenir weapons.

Since dropping the bill into the hopper on March 10, 1953, two tragic accidents occurred in my own little community, and thousands of crimes have been committed with these weapons.

Mr. Speaker, it seems logical to me that in order to prevent, or at least to minimize, the likelihood of these incidents, a good beginning is to prohibit the importation of these guns.

Hear us as, in our helplessness, we daily pray for our colleagues who are so desperately in need of that healing ministry which is more blessed than anything that the wisest and most skillful can give.

In Christ's name we humbly pray. Amen.

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

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was granted permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

FEDERAL AID ROAD ACT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following

Independence of Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1954

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, many are the strands which have gone into the making of our civilization. We and our immediate predecessors have borrowed to a greater or lesser extent, from ancient civilizations of the Near East, from ancient Greece and from Rome, and from early Christianity. But many of us firmly believe that some of the best elements in our heritage and some of the most cherished of our ideas and ideals, particularly many of our modern ideas of freedom, liberty, and independence, have their roots in ancient Greece. Greeks of those distant days formulated and developed those sublime ideas, embodied them in ethical and legal precepts, and passed them on to posterity. That, one might say, is the legacy of Greece to us.

Those wise and learned Greeks, however were not able to maintain their independence. For centuries their country was conquered and ruled by foreign overlords and for many centuries they suffered under alien tyranny. Yet during all that time they remained true to their ancient traditions, cherishing the ideal of their national independence. Finally, in 1821 when the oppressive rule of their Turkish overlords had become almost unbearable they revolted against their oppressors and clamored for freedom, liberty and national political independence. We are very happy that their feats of bravery brought them independence, and today in celebrating the 133d anniversary of the beginning of that revolt and the Greek declaration of independence, we heartily hope that Greece will continue to live in peace and enjoy its hard-won freedom.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 5, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

God of all grace, we are again coming unto Thee constrained by a love that will not let us go and compelled by longings which Thou alone canst satisfy.

Grant that on this day of world prayer our spiritual life, which is so often eclipsed by moods of doubt and fear, may be enriched and strengthened with a greater faith and hope in Thee.

We penitently confess that we are frequently more concerned with knowing the truth about mere material things than we are in knowing the truth about Thee and ourselves.

May we give ourselves unreservedly and completely to the guidance of Thy divine spirit as we carry on.

privileged resolution (H. Res. 460, Rept. No. 1309), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8127) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as