I do not know about the State of Arkansas, but the State of North Carolina has been bled pretty nearly white and we have every form of taxation that anybody could think of and at the present moment the legislature is wrestling with the problem of trying to raise about $26 million additional revenue.

Now, to these folks that just go along and vote for every big appropriation on the theory that we can spend ourselves rich, then they had better turn their light on their own backyards and the States and see where we are going to wind up.

Your State has not any more loose revenue running around in it than mine. The Federal Government took out of the State of Arkansas last year the modest little sum of $148 million in income tax alone.

So I do not know. I join with you in hoping that we can put a limitation on this bill for a certain number of years, but we have the solution of this problem right here in the Congress, and we have the problem right in our laps.

But instead of helping solve it by giving the States some consideration, we talk about, well, we do not want any Federal control over the State.

No, I don't want any; we have too much as it is now.

But let me tell you this: When you are taking all the money from the State that the State needs to run its government, somebody eventually will have to take over and run it because the State will not have the sources of revenue.

I just felt like saying that and that is the sermon I preach often without the slightest provocation.

Mr. HAYS. I always profit by hearing you issue a warning because I know how you feel.

Chairman BARDEN. Well, we have brought about this condition, have we not?

Mr. HAYS. Yes.

Chairman BARDEN. And we are going to further aggravate it this year because we are just going right along and everybody is requesting a bigger budget and a bigger appropriation and here comes the foreign bill that will take all the rest of it and create a bigger overdraft.

But we still wrestle with it. I say we are going to have to do something with the schools.

Mr. HAYS. May I make one comment on that? You have been very patient.

Chairman BARDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAYS. I feel that sometime, Mr. Chairman, we tend to deplore this centralization in Washington because it is in sharp contrast to the old Jeffersonian patterns. We say the Government is away from the people and we are incapable of making these decisions as responsible servants because of its hugeness.

I think maybe we underestimate our capacity to meet these changes in our society. But you and I are as close to the people down there in our townships as the governor in the State capitol used to be.

We can act with as much sensitivity to local needs as the State government. My feeling is that when a bill is brought out, and I trust that this committee will recommend some form of aid, there is going to be glory in it for all of us, but I actually wish I could be a member of this committee to look back on what is going to be one of the significant events of 1955. I do hope that as it is done we can say that we have not done it with indifference to the dangers that the chairman wisely mentioned, but that we regard ourselves as still equal to that challenge.

For that reason I hope that the committee will defend what it does and will feel that it is something that is historic.

Chairman BARDEN. That is a very fine statement and I think we can meet the challenge, but here is the problem: It is much easier for us to cast a ballot than it is for folks down there to dig up some more money. That is what disturbs me. We passed a resolution out of this committee unanimously that went to the floor of the House and was passed by the House and then went to the Senate and for some reason it died a slow death, requiring this Federal Government to have some central point whereby we could find what this Federal Government is spending in the field of education, and yet, no, apparently somebody has not the nerve to even look at the picture because the best investigation this committee could make from the best research that we put on it, we found that this Federal Government in the field of education is spending more money that it cost to run the entire public-school system of the United States.

That is an appalling fact, yet we apparently have not the nerve to just look at the result of our acts.

So I get very much confused when I see apparently the carelessness with which we continue to invade the State sources of revenue, and I know and you know they are on their knees so far as sources of revenue are concerned.

It disturbs me greatly. Thank you so much.

Mr. HAYS. I appreciate your patience with me.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Harold A. Wisner, First Presbyterian Church, Galesville, Wis., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, sometimes Thou doth speak in moments of quiet; at other times Thou dost speak through the work of men's minds and actions. Speak this day, individually, through both these methods. Increase, in the spirits of these now bowed before Thee, a keen sense of their responsibility to 160 million Americans and over 2 billion human beings with divine rights.

Continue building, O God, some of the old wastes, and continue repairing some of the desolations of other generations that this land may be made glad with Thy laws. Establish every work done here that is established on truth and equity so that the hopes and desires of people may be fulfilled.

This day, be pleased to direct and prosper the consultations of this august body.

Forgive, O God, those national sins which do so easily beset us and which issue because of the human element.

Inspire now these representatives of the people who have a noble task to do on this day.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4941. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4951. An act directing a redetermination of the national marketing quota for burley tobacco for the 1955–56 marketing year, and for other purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution establishing that when the two Houses adjourn Monday, April 4, 1955, they stand adjourned until Wednesday, April 13, 1955.

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. 1436. An act to preserve the tobacco acreage history of farms which voluntarily withdraw from the production of tobacco, and to provide that the benefits of future increases in tobacco acreage allotments shall first be extended to farms on which there have been decreases in such allotments.

## THE CAPITOL PAGES

Mr. SIKES. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I take these few moments to lay emphasis on a matter which, I know, has not escaped the attention of my colleagues. I believe this year, in this session of the Congress, we have had the finest group of pages I have known in my entire service in this body. They have been courteous, helpful, and friendly. They are a wonderful group of youngsters who genuinely are trying to assist us in every way they can. I feel we should pay tribute to them for their helpfulness and, of course, I include the very fine work of Turner N. Robertson, our chief page, who directs their activities, and without whom I do not know how this great deliberative body would function.

## PARCEL POST

Mr. JONES of Missouri. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, last week I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page 3062, a letter from a constituent of mine in which he called attention to some of the silly regulations which have been prevailing for the last 2 years relative to the mailing of parcel-post packages. That incident brought forth many comments from many sections of the country. From one of my postmasters, he mentions:

The elimination of the burdensome law which restricts acceptance of parcel-post matter for first-class offices will be appreciated, I am sure, by all of your constituents. Every day we have to turn packages down. Also our local factory in order

to get around the law, mails 3 to 5 parcels on the same day to the 1 address where they could mail only 1.

I have also received the following letter from the Southern Hosiery Manufacturers' Association of Charlotte, N. C., dated March 29, 1955:

SOUTHERN HOSIERY MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION,
*Charlotte, N. C., March 29, 1955.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JONES: An article appearing in the Charlotte Observer this morning concerning your remarks about the postal law which limits the size of packages shipped from certain post offices was quite amusing, but it touched only one phase of this ridiculous situation.

In the hosiery industry all that has resulted from this law is the requirement that hosiery mills must now prepare 2 or 3 packages for a single shipment where formerly 1 was sufficient. This simply means that there is an additional expense in packaging materials, the cost of additional labor and more bookkeeping since labels, receipt forms, and shipping information must be multiplied by 2 or 3 for many of the shipments. It also requires the handling of 2 or 3 packages by every postal employee from the shipping point to the destination, as well as the receiving clerk at the other end. We understand that the Post Office Department admits that this additional cost amounts to more than $50 million a year, and we cannot understand why the law is not repealed outright or at least amended so that it will be more practical and sensible.

Perhaps one of the worst results of the law is the fact that mills (hosiery as well as many others) located in cities or towns which have first-class post offices are placed at a competitive disadvantage with those located in towns with second- or third-class post offices. There are many situations where mills manufacture the exact type of goods and sell to the same class of trade but many of them are placed at disadvantage over others because of the additional expense in shipping. An outstanding example of this kind of situation is the city of Burlington, N. C., which has a first-class post office. Burlington is surrounded by small towns, such as Graham, Haw River, Alamance, Glen Raven, and a number of others in the same county, all or most of which have second- or third-class post offices. It is unnecessary to point out how ridiculous such a situation is particularly since the mills located in the town of Burlington are not permitted to ship their goods from the post offices of the surrounding towns.

We are quite hopeful that enough of our Representatives in the Congress will join you in doing something about it.

Respectfully yours,

T. R. DURHAM,
*President.*

I hope the Post Office Department will see if they cannot bring about a change in these regulations.

## DIRECT LOANS FOR FARM VETERANS

Mr. EDMONDSON. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend sections 512 and 513 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the direct loan program from June 30, 1955, to June 30, 1956, and to make available $150 million for this period of time. The bill also increases the class of veterans eligible for direct loans and increases the class of loans which can be made under this provision.

The direct loan program, which expires June 30, 1955, provides only that the funds can be used to make a loan to an eligible veteran for two purposes: First, the purchase or construction of a dwelling to be owned and occupied by him as a home; second, to finance the construction or improvement of a farmhouse.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs has reported H. R. 5106, which places the guaranteed farm loans on a parity with city loans. This bill which I am introducing follows that same line and places the farm veteran on a parity with the nonfarm veteran in the remote areas where other financing is not available. This bill provides that the Administrator or Veterans' Affairs may make direct loans to eligible veterans for the following purposes:

(A) to purchase or construct a dwelling to be owned and occupied by him as a home;

(B) to purchase a farm on which there is a farm residence to be occupied by the veteran as his home;

(C) to construct on land owned by the veteran of a farm residence to be occupied by him as his home; or

(D) to repair, alter, or improve a farm residence or other dwelling owned by the veteran and occupied by him as his home; if the Administrator finds that in the area in which the dwelling, farm, or farm residence is located or is to be constructed, private capital is not available for the financing of the purchase or construction of dwellings, the purchase of farms with farm residences, or the construction, repair, alteration, or improvement of farm residences, as the case may be, by veterans under this title. In case there is an indebtedness which is secured by a lien against land owned by the veteran, the proceeds of a loan made under this section for the construction of a dwelling or farm residence on such land may be expended also to liquidate such lien, but only if the reasonable value of the land is equal to or in excess of the amount of the lien.

It will be seen that not only will this bill enable a veteran in a remote area to obtain a loan to build a home, but also it will permit an eligible farm veteran to obtain a loan to build a home on his farm or to buy a farm and build a home.

The other provisions of the existing law under the direct-loan program will remain substantially as they are today.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a drastic decline in the number of farm loans made to veterans under the provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended. Since 1947 the VA-guaranteed farm loans have declined from 19,862 loans in 1947 to only 1,432 loans in 1954. From the initiation of the loan-guaranty program through December 25, 1954, the total farm loans closed was only 66,957 as compared to 3,607,000 home loans. This bill tends to check the mass departure of veterans from the farms and to open the way for and induce the return of veterans to the farm and at the same time enable the veteran that has stayed on the farm to have equal rights with the city veteran under the provisions of this act.

## LITTLE HOMES

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. 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. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to acknowledge my debt to Grace Bassett, a staff reporter for the Washington Post and Times Herald. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I have always wondered why it was so difficult to get a program providing decent housing for families in the low-income bracket. Perhaps Miss Bassett has let in the light. In a recent article in the Washington Post and Times Herald Miss Bassett states that a gentleman living in a restricted zone of $30,000 homes has said that he is ready to fight in Congress and in the courts to prevent the erection in that zone of $22,000 two-family homes. She quotes the gentleman as saying that these $22,000 homes would work a grievous injury on as good a residential area as you will find and someone else might erect what the gentleman describes as a shed. I know nothing of the facts of this controversy, which I would think that the gentleman would submit to the courts in the usual way. Why carry the fight to the Congress? The gentleman who does not relish little houses in his own neighborhood is the legal consultant for the Republican policy committee.

## RURAL MAIL ROUTES IN IOWA

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a resolution by the House of Representatives of the State of Iowa concerning the extension of the rural carrier service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include the following resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Iowa:

House Resolution 12

Whereas the present rural mail routes in Iowa were established, in the majority of cases, many years ago, when the railroads were established; and

Whereas in those years the mail was mainly delivered to the post office by the railroads and to the rural mailbox by horse and buggy; and

Whereas the mail in most instances is now delivered to the post office by star routes and highway post offices and to the rural mailbox by auto; and

Whereas a reorganization of rural delivery would be more efficient than the present system; and

Whereas in order that rural delivery will be an actuality to all reasonably located homes: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 56th General Assembly of the State of Iowa,* That necessary action be taken by Congress to bring about the necessary reorganization of present rural mail routes, in order that rural delivery become an actuality to all reasonably located rural homes in Iowa; be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield, Postmaster General of the United States; the Honorable Senator Bourke B. Hickenlooper; the Honorable Senator Thomas E. Martin; and the Honorable Congressman H. R. Gross, member of the Postal Committee.

## AMENDMENT OF SUBSECTION 201 OF THE FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950

Mr. OSTERTAG. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 to authorize the Federal Civil Defense Administration to procure radiological instruments and detection devices and distribute the same by loan or grant to the States for educational and training purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the problem of detecting and measuring radioactive fallout from nuclear explosions has become a major concern in the civil defense of this Nation. In approaching a solution to it, it is evident that there must be full coordination of our civil defense resources at all levels of government. Certain tasks can and must be done by the Federal Civil Defense Administration. Others must be carried out at State and local levels.

The Federal Government has some capability today to predict and detect patterns and intensity of radiological fallout. Current Federal capabilities are being tested and improved daily through the efforts of the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Weather Bureau, and other branches of the Federal Government. The Federal Civil Defense Administration has sponsored the development of the basic types of detection instruments required for civil defense operations. These efforts must be properly related and coordinated.

The Federal Civil Defense Administration is working out an arrangement of delegating to the Department of Commerce—Weather Bureau—certain responsibilities in the field of radiological defense which would include the predicting of prevalent wind patterns at different heights, and the probability of direction and intensity of radioactive fallout under given conditions.

Under FCDA delegation No. 1, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will assume the responsibility for radiological defense training and other related aspects of a program designed to minimize the radiological effects of military weapons.

The Federal Civil Defense Administration now has available some 2,000 radiological detection instruments for training purposes. An additional 1,000 instruments for the detection of radioactive fallout will be available under the authority of subsection 201 (h) of Public Law 920, upon the acceptance of the instruments after tests now being conducted by the Bureau of Standards.

No one believes that the mere purchase of instruments to detect fallout and the scattering of these instruments around the country is the answer to a program for effective radiological defense. It should be readily apparent that a nationwide radiological defense and monitoring system is essential to an effective civil defense. A program of radiological defense must be established and operated under the guidance and coordination of the Federal Civil Defense Administration in order to attain maximum efficiency.

Such a program should consist of the following elements:

First. Maximum use should be made of the current capability within the Federal Government to develop standards for detection and methods of the detection of radiological fallout, and the related prediction problems connected with these standards.

Second. An intensified training program for the detection and reporting in operational terms of the presence of radioactive fallout and its appropriate relationship to the civil defense of the Nation should be undertaken. The development of course content and the interpretation of technical data in terms that the operator of a detection device may understand should be done through the combined efforts of the AEC, Department of Defense, Weather Bureau, the Public Health Service, and any other Federal agency or public body having a capability within the field.

Third. The training courses as they become available should be placed in the hands of the States with instruments upon which to train. The courses should consist of the actual instruments to be used, course materials, audio-visual aids, teacher outlines, and any other device which would accelerate the training at the local level. The courses should be graduated on several levels of instruction, geared to the student capability of the patriotic citizen volunteering spare time for the training to assimilate the training.

The Federal Civil Defense Administration should be granted the authority at this time to distribute or donate to State and local civil-defense organizations the radiological detection devices for such a program. These instruments should be distributed as a part of a well-planned training program, such as that outlined herein, which takes advantage of presently established and easily controlled Federal channels.

In order to accomplish this, I am introducing for the consideration of the Congress a bill to amend subsection 201 (h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (64 Stat. 249). The purpose of the amendment is to permit the Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to distribute or donate instruments procured under the authority of subsection 201 (h) to the States and local political subdivisions for civil-defense purposes. This distribution would take place as a part of a well-planned training program to develop the capability of the civilian populace of the Nation to detect the presence of dangerous radioactive fallout and to take the proper defensive measures against this hazard.

It is not anticipated that this authority will replace or eliminate the purchase by the States of radiological detection devices within their present civil-defense programs under the contributions authority of subsection 201 (i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended. The proposed amendment to subsection 201 (h) is intended to accelerate the training program on the State and local level in order that an immediate program may be undertaken to develop an operational capability on the part of the local communities to detect and protect against radiological fallout. The proposed amendment will permit this immediate acceleration. It is expected that funds appropriated under subsection 201 (h) for the purchase of radiological instruments, as requested in FCDA's fiscal year 1956 budget request, will be utilized for this training program, together with existing stockpiles of roughly some 3,000 instruments either on hand or to be delivered shortly.

It is anticipated that additional funds will be made available for Federal contributions for organizational equipment to aid the States in the buildup of their operational capability within the radiological defense fields under the authority of subsection 201 (i).

## JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. KEATING. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious problems facing our country today is that of juvenile delinquency. It is a matter in which many of us have been greatly interested and one which we have been studying for a long time.

I rise at this time to call the attention of the membership to the fact that on next Sunday afternoon from 4:30 to 5 the CBS network program entitled "The Search," that may be seen in Washington over channel 9, will present a worthwhile study on the subject of juvenile delinquency. It does not attempt to solve this problem, but it is an interesting analysis that explains the type of youngsters who have to be dealt with and the problem as it affects both them and their elders.

I am sure this will be of interest to all Members, and I highly recommend it to them.

## MILITARY JETS AT WILLOW RUN AIRPORT, THE NATION'S SIXTH BUSIEST

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the Congress to a situation which is of particular interest to the area I represent but involves questions of national policy. I refer to the threat that a military jet squadron will be stationed at Willow Run Airport, the air terminal for Detroit, Mich. The Willow Run terminal building is located in the Second District of Michigan, which I have the honor to represent.

Willow Run Airport was constructed during the war in conjunction with the Willow Run bomber plant operated by the Ford Motor Co. in the production of B–24 bombers. The terminal buildings, as well as the so-called bomber plant, now owned by General Motors and used for the production of hydromatic transmissions, are both located in Washtenaw County in the Second District. I am informed that this airfield is one of the finest and most modern in the entire United States.

When it became surplus at the end of World War II, Willow Run Airport was transferred by the Federal Government by quitclaim deed to the University of Michigan, located at Ann Arbor, Mich., my hometown. There were provisions for recapture by the Federal Government in the event of another military emergency and also reservations for use without charge by the Government. The University of Michigan conducts experimental research and development work in a part of the facilities at Willow Run and has entered into lease arrangements with the Airlines National Terminal Service Co., Inc., a corporation formed by the airlines, to operate the Willow Run terminal and the airfield.

At the present time 7 scheduled airlines are using Willow Run at a total rate of 320 scheduled operations per day. It handles the sixth largest volume of passengers in the United States and is one of the busiest airports in the United States.

Some 5 air-miles from Willow Run—10 miles by road—is located the Wayne County major airport. This airport is operated by the Wayne County Road Commission. At present only 1 scheduled airline, Pan-American, operates from Wayne County Airport, having 3 scheduled flights a week. It is also used for air freight by two airlines whose operations are principally at night. In addition, the Michigan Air National Guard has a squadron of jet fighting planes based at Wayne County Airport.

The chairman of the Wayne County Road Commission, Leroy Smith, has for many years conducted a campaign to persuade the scheduled airlines to move from Willow Run to Wayne County Airport. This they have consistently refused to do, although the Wayne County Airport is a few miles nearer the city of Detroit, where the great bulk of the traffic originates.

A few weeks ago the Navy desired to transfer jet flying operations from its present inadequate base at Grosse Ile to Wayne County Airport. Mr. Smith was reported in the press as denying the request on the ground that when the airlines transferred to Wayne Major, that airport would be overcrowded. He suggested to the Navy that they base their jet operations at Willow Run Airport.

Included in the Willow Run Airport is a 23-acre area on which there is a moderate-sized hangar known as the Packard property. This area was excepted from the quitclaim deed from the Federal Government to the University of Michigan because at the time of that transfer the Packard area was being utilized by the Packard Motor Car Co. for experimental work. That work has since been discontinued and the area is now vacant. On July 19, 1954, the University of Michigan requested that the so-called Packard area be transferred to the university, being sorely needed for the performance of 11 separate contracts with the Department of Defense, covering research and development, aggregating approximately $4 million per year. I insert a copy of the university's letter, written by its vice president, W. K. Pierpont, to the commanding general of the Air Materiel Command, dated July 19, 1954, at this point in my remarks:

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
*July 19 1954.*

COMMANDING GENERAL, AIR MATERIAL COMMAND,
*Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio*
(Attention: Col. Frederick W. Toomey)

DEAR COLONEL TOOMEY: The regents of the University of Michigan hereby request that AF plant No. 31 (Packard Building), Willow Run, Mich., be made available to it for use in connection with the performance of cost reimbursement contracts covering research and development for the Air Force and the Army, which are being performed by the applicant at Willow Run Airport.

In 1946, the university established the Willow Run Research Center primarily to conduct research for the Air Force, and it is presently performing 11 separate contracts for the Department of Defense, covering research and development which have a combined dollar expenditure of approximately $4 million per year. The space presently available at Willow Run is inadequate for the work in process, and the Packard Building, which is immediately adjacent to the Willow Run Research Center and completely surrounded by land owned by the applicant, is ideally suited to immediately supply the urgent need for additional space.

In support of this application, as requested in your letter of July 13, 1954, the university represents as follows:

(a) Location and adequate description of the property—the legal description of the property is as follows:

"Commencing at the southeast corner of section 8, Van Buren Township, Wayne County, Mich.; thence west along the section line between sections 8 and 17, 1,340.99 feet for a place of beginning; thence 35 feet; thence west parallel with the section line 1,458 feet; thence north 705 feet; thence east parallel with the section line 1,458 feet; thence south 670 feet to the place of beginning, being a part of sections 8 and 17, Van Buren Township, Wayne County, Mich., consisting of 23.593 acres."

Located on this property is a brick building commonly referred to as the Packard Building, which was used continuously for research purposes for approximately 10 years and is ideally suited to the needs of this applicant.

(b) Proposed use and justification therefor: The university plans to consolidate classified research activities on the east side of Willow Run Airport. This consolidation will cause an overall shortage of available research space, which will be alleviated by acquisition of the Packard Building. The building would house research activities for the Air Force, and the large hangar area would be used in particular for a war game area for project Michigan, a tri-service sponsored-contract administered by the United States Army Signal Corps.

(c) Date possession will be required, and the estimated period of occupancy: The university desires possession of the property at the earliest possible date, and would continue occupancy as long as Willow Run Research Center is maintained as an Air Force research facility.

(d) Modification required to adopt building to your needs, including a marked set of plans: No structural modification will be required to adapt the building to university use. The construction of the war-game area in the hangar space will be of a temporary nature and will require no structural modifications.

(e) Efforts to obtain facilities elsewhere: No other facilities are available in the area.

(f) Reasons for not financing with private funds: The university has for a number of years performed research for the Air Force and the Army on a cost reimbursement basis without fee, and the university, as a State institution, has no private funds available or in prospect to provide capital expenditures for its research facilities.

(g) Proposed terms: Since the building is needed to perform work for the Air Force and the Army on a straight cost reimbursement basis, it is requested that the building be made available rent free for the duration of such use.

Willow Run Airport, which was originally an Air Force facility, was given to the university by a quitclaim deed from the War Assets Administrator for the purposes of maintaining a public airport, and of providing a research facility at the university. This parcel was omitted from the deed in the first instance only because Packard Motor Car Co. was still conducting research on the site for the Air Force. Since the property is entirely surrounded by university property which was received from the Government, it is hoped that ultimately this parcel might be given to the university for the purposes stipulated in the original conveyance of Willow Run Airport.

Very truly yours,

W. K. PIERPONT.

Mr. Speaker, no reply to the university's request was received. However, early this month the university received notice from the Detroit district engineer that an air reserve flying squadron would be based on the so-called Packard property. The letter of the Engineers to the regents of the University of Michigan, dated March 3, 1955, is inserted at this point in my remarks:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
UNITED STATES ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ENGINEER,
DETROIT DISTRICT,
*Detroit, Mich., March 3, 1955.*

The REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
*Ann Arbor, Mich.*

GENTLEMEN: Land area, consisting of 23.593 acres, presently utilized by the Continental Air Command, is being assigned to Headquarters, 10th Air Force, to be utilized by an air reserve flying squadron of the above numbered air force.

The air reserve flying squadron will be utilizing the flying strip of Willow Run Airport. This operation will be a weekend training activity. The number of aircraft to be based and operated from this location is 10 of the F–80 type. The ultimate number will be a complete squadron.

This is to advise the use of the airport was reserved by the Government under quitclaim deed, dated January 19, 1947. The proposed operation will be effective in July 1955.

It is requested that the additional copies of this letter be acknowledged by the regents of the University of Michigan and the Civil Aeronautics Administration and same returned for the files of this office.

Very truly yours,

EARL C. ANDRUS,
*Chief, Acquisition Branch,*
*Real Estate Division*
(For the District Engineer).

Mr. Speaker, shortly thereafter the representatives of the University of Michigan and the Airlines Terminal Co. got in touch with me by telephone and urged me to interest myself in this proposed threat to commercial operations at Willow Run Airport. I immediately brought the matter to the attention of Air Force Secretary Talbott by telephone and followed it with a letter dated March 16, 1955, which I insert at this point in my remarks:

MARCH 16, 1955.

Hon. HAROLD E. TALBOTT,
*Secretary, Department of the Air Force,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SECRETARY TALBOTT: Pursuant to my telephone conversation with you this morning, I enclose herewith a copy of a letter I received from Col. Robert E. Miller, president of the Airlines National Terminal Service Co., Inc., and manager of the Willow Run Airport at Ypsilanti, Mich.

I previously heard from representatives of the University of Michigan, to whom the Willow Run Airport was transferred—with recapture provisions, after World War II, and I have also been in contact with officials of the Ypsilanti township who are in the beginning stages of the development of 5,000 permanent homes at Willow Village in the vicinity of Willow Run Airport; Mr. Wendell Edwards, the Federal Housing Administrator of the Detroit regional area; officials of the city of Ypsilanti, and officials of the Ypsilanti Chamber of Commerce.

There is a tremendous boom in residential dwellings in the entire area surrounding Willow Run Airport—for instance, one subdivision will comprise 1,500 new dwellings in addition to the 5,000 which will be built at Willow Village.

I am assured that there is no present or contemplated residential housing development in the area of Wayne Major Airport.

It would seem wiser to concentrate the military operations at Wayne Major Airport where the Michigan Air National Guard is already based, than to attempt to mingle military jet operations with commercial operations at an extremely busy terminal.

I would appreciate your looking into this situation and advising me.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

Mr. Speaker, I enclosed with my letter to Secretary Talbott a copy of a letter dated March 15, 1955, I received from Col. Robert E. Miller, president of the Airlines National Terminal Service Co., Inc., the manager of the Willow Run Airport, a copy of which letter I insert at this point in my remarks:

AIRLINES NATIONAL TERMINAL
SERVICE CO., INC.,
*Ypsilanti, Mich., March 15, 1955.*

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
*Member of Congress,*
*House of Representatives Office*
*Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MEADER: The regents of the University of Michigan have been advised by the Corps of Engineers, Detroit office, that the Headquarters 10th Air Force wish to place an Air Reserve Flying Squadron at Willow Run Airport. The operation will be a weekend long activity. The number of aircraft to be based and operated from this location is 10 of the F–80 type. The ultimate number will be a complete squadron which we understand to be 25 jet planes.

We are very much concerned and disturbed by this proposed activity because of the interference it will cause to some 320 scheduled airline operations per day. Our concern is twofold: first, the safety factor to the commercial airlines and passengers; and second, because of the severe crowding of available air space for the jet operation.

The Michigan Air National Guard, a squadron equipped with jet planes, is and has been operating for the past several years at Wayne-Major Airport 10 miles nearer Detroit and 10 miles nearer the homes of most of the Air Reserve pilots who would be practicing with these F–80 jets. That airport does not have but one scheduled airline operating from the airport and at present that airline operates only three schedules a week. They do have 2 or 3 scheduled cargo carriers but they have the bulk of their operation at night.

The Federal Government has put a large amount of money into Wayne Major Airport and the State of Michigan has spent over $2 million[1] for the Air National Guard installation there and is presently spending an additional $629,000 for the construction of a hangar. It would certainly seem logical for the Department of Defense to concentrate the jet plane operations at Wayne Major and not at Willow Run with the terrific conflict it would cause to commercial air travel.

Just as an example of the way this would operate—we had a military plane alert our tower about 2 weeks ago because the pilot could not get his nose landing gear in proper position. The tower cleared the air for his landing and he made three passes at the field—an operation which took 20 to 25 minutes, finally landing safely (fortunately) at Selfridge Field.

As you know, where jets are operating they object to the runways being sanded because of sand being sucked up into the engine intake and causing trouble. In Minneapolis recently they had glare ice on the runways, the airport management could not sand the runways and a couple of planes slid off into a snowbank, tying up one of the planes for 4 or 5 weeks until it could be put back into service.

We have no disposition to in any way interfere with the well-designed plans of the Defense Department and the Air Force. But we cannot understand why they should pick out Willow Run for their base of operations when a field practically unused for commercial airlines is available 10 miles closer to Detroit by road and approximately 5 to 6 air miles away.

It will be very much appreciated, Congressman MEADER, if you will bring this to the attention of Secretary Talbott, for we feel a severe injustice is being done to Willow Run by this proposed activity. Willow Run has been maintained and operated for the past 7 years without tax money and with practically no subsidy from the Federal Government with the exception of a few thousand dollars spent on high-intensity lights for the ILS runway and $30,000 spent in ramp extension. It has been maintained at, therefore, practically no cost to the Government and yet available at a moment's notice in the event of an emergency for major Air Force operations. Until the emergency is declared, it seems unreasonable and unfair to superimpose the burden of a jet operation on a commercial airport carrying the sixth largest volume of passengers in the country.

We shall await with interest the result of your discussion with Secretary Talbott on the matter.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. MILLER,
*President.*

[1] Probably Federal funds.

Mr. Speaker, subsequently, I received from Mr. E. A. Cummiskey, attorney for the University of Michigan, a letter dated March 15, 1955, a copy of which I transmitted to Secretary Talbott on March 23, 1955. I insert a copy of Mr. Cummiskey's letter at this point in my remarks:

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
*Ann Arbor, Mich., March 15, 1955.*

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
*Member of Congress, House Office*
*Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR GEORGE: In accordance with our telephone conversation of this morning, I enclose herewith copy of the university application dated July 19, 1954, for the Packard Building for use in Government research. I also enclose copy of letter of March 3, 1955, from the district engineer in Detroit advising that the Packard Building is being assigned to Headquarters, 10th Air Force, and that the Air Reserve Flying Squadron will be utilizing the flying strip at Willow Run Airport.

This letter of March 3 is the only notification that the university's application has been turned down. We had been advised unofficially that several different agencies wanted to get the building, including the 30th Air Division of the Continental Air Command, Cook Electric Co., and the 10th Air Reserve. At one time we were advised unofficially that the building would be assigned to the Cook Electric Co., but the next word we received is the enclosed letter of March 3, 1955.

Civilian airline traffic is very heavy at Willow Run at the present time, and we are fearful that the use of the field by military jets will endanger lives of people, particularly on weekends when we understand the Reserve is very active. The airlines are very much concerned about the use of the field by jets, and Mr. Miller advised me that he would write you a letter today stating the airlines' position.

It appears to us that this is all a part of a pattern to force the airlines to move to Wayne Major Airport. As you know, the Wayne County Road Commission has been campaigning for 10 years to get the airlines to move to Wayne Major but has never been able to interest them in the move. They have recently persuaded Mayor Cobo to come out with a public statement advocating the move of the airlines, and we do not believe that that alone would have any effect, but in addition they are refusing to take the Naval Reserve Force, which has to move from Grosse Ile, and are giving statements to the paper that the Navy should move to Willow Run and the airline move to Wayne Major.

Since the Air National Guard is based at Wayne Major and has a big investment (several million dollars) in hangars and equipment, it seems to us logical that the 10th Air Reserve Squadron should be based there also as well as the Naval Reserve.

Willow Run Airport is one of the finest and best equipped airfields in the country, and the scheduled airlines are very happy in the use of the field, and we are confident that they cannot be persuaded to move to Wayne Major unless they are driven out by military use of the field. We are also advised that General Motors is very much opposed to use of the field by jets, as it interferes with their operations at the Detroit Transmission Division.

As I advised you by telephone, we are having a luncheon at the airport on Monday,

March 21, which will be attended by the mayors and presidents of the Chamber of Commerce of Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti, the supervisor of Ypsilanti Township, and Ed Kaegi, general manager of the Detroit Transmission Division of General Motors Corp. We hope to lay out a plan of action to see if we cannot preserve Willow Run as a civilian airport. I will advise you after the meeting what the plans are. In the meantime, I think it would be a very good idea if you would talk with Mr. Talbot and a representative of the FHA, as you suggested on the telephone.

Very truly yours,

E. A. CUMMISKEY.

Mr. Speaker, shortly thereafter I received from Secretary Talbott a letter dated March 24, 1955, indicating that no final decision had been made to base military jet planes at Willow Run, which I insert at this point in my remarks:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
*Washington, March 24, 1955.*

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. MEADER: I refer to your recent inquiry in behalf of Mr. Robert E. Miller, president of the Airlines National Terminal Service Co., Inc., relative to the possibility of the Air Force establishing a flying Reserve activity at the Willow Run Airport.

The Air Force has been surveying various sites throughout the United States to establish additional Reserve activities in connection with our plans for a long-range Reserve training program. Under this program, there is a requirement to establish a flying Reserve activity in the Detroit area and the Willow Run Airport has been considered.

At the present time, however, our plans have not progressed to a point where it has been definitely decided that the Willow Run facility will be utilized since there may be other sites in the Detroit area which will meet our requirements.

When a final decision has been reached concerning this matter, the Air Force shall be glad to further inform you.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD E. TALBOTT.

Mr. Speaker, it was brought to my attention that the failure of the University of Michigan to be able to use the so-called Packard property might impede progress on the very important research and development work the university is doing for the Department of Defense. Accordingly, I wrote Secretary Talbott on March 25, 1955, enclosing copies of relevant correspondence and raising the question of possible conflict of programs within the Defense Department. I insert a copy of my letter of March 25 to Secretary Talbott at this point in my remarks:

MARCH 25, 1955.

Hon. HAROLD E. TALBOTT,
*Secretary of the Air Force,*
*Department of the Air Force,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SECRETARY TALBOTT: Thank you for your letter of March 24 regarding the possibility of establishing a flying Reserve activity at Willow Run Airport.

I wrote you further on this subject on March 23 and enclosed a copy of a letter dated March 15 from E. A. Cummiskey, attorney for the University of Michigan. However, I neglected to include a copy of the university's letter of July 19, 1954 to the Commanding General of the Air Materiel Command requesting the so-called Packard property for use in performing 11 separate research and development contracts for the Department of Defense, and a copy of a letter from the Corps of Engineers dated March 3, 1955. These letters are enclosed herewith.

It appears that there are 2 Defense Department programs in conflict in the situation which has developed at Willow Run. The research and development program would seem to indicate that the 23 acres of the so-called Packard property should be used by the university in connection with the important research and development work they are doing for the Air Force and the Army, but this use is being prevented by the determination to use this property for the jet flying squadron of the Air Reserve.

I thought this point might be of interest to you in the consideration you are giving this question. I have also written Assistant Secretary of Defense Quarles and am enclosing a copy of my letter to him.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

Mr. Speaker, concurrently I spoke on the telephone with the Honorable Donald A. Quarles, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development, and called his attention to the apparent conflict of programs within the Department of Defense and the possible adverse effect of the use of the Packard property for jet Reserve flying rather than for research work, and invited his interest in this situation.

I followed this conversation by a letter to Secretary Quarles dated March 25, a copy of which I insert at this point in my remarks:

MARCH 25, 1955.

Hon. DONALD A. QUARLES,
*Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development,*
*Department of Defense,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. QUARLES: Pursuant to my telephone conversation with you this afternoon, I am enclosing copies of correspondence which raised the question of whether or not the proposed use of Willow Run Airport for the Air Force Reserve squadron of jet fighters will interfere with research and development work being done by the University of Michigan at Willow Run for the Air Force and the Army.

As I told you over the telephone, some of the newspapers have indicated there are two Defense Department programs in conflict here. I would appreciate your looking into the matter and ascertaining whether or not the proposal to use the so-called Packard property for jet flying will impair the progress of research and development work being done by the University of Michigan at Willow Run.

I have discussed this matter with Air Force Secretary Talbott both on the telephone and in correspondence and am enclosing a copy of my last letter to him.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

Mr. Speaker, subsequently I received from Mr. W. K. Pierpont, vice president of the University of Michigan, a letter dated March 25, 1955, reaffirming the university's present need for the Packard property and enclosing a copy of the letter dated March 25. 1955, from the university to the Corps of Engineers with reference to the Packard property. Copies of both letters were furnished both to Air Secretary Talbott and Assistant Defense Secretary Quarles for their information in studying this problem, and I insert these letters at this point in my remarks:

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
*Ann Arbor, Mich., March 25, 1955.*

The Honorable GEORGE MEADER,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MEADER: I am enclosing a copy of a letter I have sent to the Corps of Engineers concerning the use of Willow Run Airport by the Air Reserve for the use of jet aircraft.

We are very pleased and gratified with your active interest in this recent development at the Willow Run Airport, and I would like to assure you that if at any time you need further information, we will be glad to obtain it for you.

We still have a need for the area under consideration for Reserve flying as an additional facility for our research center at Willow Run. It appears to us that the Air Force should give serious consideration at this time to the relative advantages of providing this additional space to the university for its research projects for the military services rather than to continue in its announced intention of using the area for jet aircraft.

Sincerely yours,

W. K. PIERPONT.

---

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
*Ann Arbor, Mich., March 25, 1955.*

CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
*Office of the District Engineer, Detroit District, Detroit, Mich.*
(Attention: Mr. Earl C. Andrus, Chief, Acquisition Branch, Real Estate Division.)

DEAR MR. ANDRUS: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 3, 1955, advising that the Air Reserve Flying Squadron will be utilizing the flying strip at Willow Run Airport for a weekend training activity using F–80 type aircraft.

Although we are aware of the reservation by the Government under the quitclaim deed dated January 19, 1947, to which you refer, we regret the decision of the Government to use Willow Run for military jet planes because of the interference such use will necessarily create for airline traffic. As you know, Willow Run Airport is the Detroit terminal for the commercial airlines. Upon receipt of your letter of March 3, 1955, we submitted a copy to Robert E. Miller, President of Airlines National Terminal Service Co., Inc., which is the representative of the airlines at Willow Run Airport, to get their comments on your proposal. In his reply Mr. Miller stated in part as follows:

"We are very much concerned and disturbed by this proposed activity because of the interference it will cause to some 320 scheduled airline operations per day. Our concern is twofold: first, the safety factor to the commercial airlines and passengers; and second, because of the severe crowding of available air space for the jet operation.

"The Michigan Air National Guard, a squadron equipped with jet planes, is and has been operating for the past several years at Wayne-Major Airport 10 miles nearer Detroit and 10 miles nearer the homes of most of the Air Reserve pilots who would be practicing with these F–80 jets. That airport does not have but one schedule airline operating from the airport and at present that airline operates only three schedules a week. They do have 2 or 3 scheduled cargo carriers but they have the bulk of their operation at night."

It would seem to us wiser for the Air Reserve Flying Squadron to use Wayne Major Airport where there are already jets in use by the Air National Guard and the possibility of interference between military and civilian aircraft would be greatly lessened.

We were further disappointed upon receipt of your letter as we had hoped that the Packard Building, which is located on the 23,593 acres on the east side of Willow Run Airport, would be turned over to the university to provide needed space for research for the Department of Defense. We had made formal application for the building to the Air Materiel Command on July 19, 1954, and have not as yet been formally notified that our application was denied. We are hopeful still that the decision to use Willow Run for military aircraft will be reviewed and that the area will be made available to the university for its research programs.

The principal objectives of the conveyance of Willow Run Airport to the university were to provide space that the university needed for research and to maintain the airport so it would be available to the Government in the event of an emergency. The university assumed the obligation of maintaining the airport as a public airport and has been able to fulfill that obligation only because it served the needs of the airlines for a terminal in southeastern Michigan. The university is able to fulfill this obligation to maintain the airport from revenues derived from the airlines. If military use of the airport seriously interferes with civilian use, the university may not be able to continue to fulfill its obligation, and the airport will revert to the Government under the terms of the quitclaim deed.

We note the statement in the last paragraph of your letter that you desire a copy of the letter acknowledged by the Civil Aeronautics Administration. We suggest that such request be sent to the CAA directly.

Sincerely yours,

W. K. PIERPONT.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like at this point in my remarks to insert a copy of my newsletter to my constituents dated March 18, 1955, and a copy of an editorial from the Ann Arbor News, Ann Arbor, Mich., of March 19, 1955, on this subject:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D. C., March 18, 1955.*

DEAR FRIEND: I asked Air Force Secretary Talbott this week to look into a proposal to base a jet-fighter squadron of the 10th Air Force at Willow Run Airport at Ypsilanti.

Representatives of seven scheduled airlines using Willow Run, officials of the University of Michigan, Ypsilanti Township, the city of Ypsilanti, and the Ypsilanti Board of Commerce are worried about a military jet operation at Willow Run.

Reasons for their concern:

There are 320 scheduled airline operations daily at Willow Run which handles the sixth largest volume of air passengers in the country. The area adjacent to Willow Run is rapidly being developed as a residential area, 1,500 homes in 1 subdivision alone, in addition to the projected 5,000 homes at Willow Village.

A military jet operation at Willow Run will interfere with commercial operations, place in jeopardy Willow Run's perfect safety record, and impair the desirability of the surrounding area for residential purposes.

I asked Mr. Talbott to consider the fact that Detroit Wayne Major Airport, 10 miles nearer Detroit, already is the headquarters for some units of the Michigan Air National Guard, presently operating 20 jets with 30 more to be added this summer. Pan American-World Airways is the lone scheduled air carrier based there with but three scheduled passenger flights weekly. Several air-freight lines also operate from Detroit Wayne Major along with the aviation section of the Ford Motor Co. The airport is far from overcrowded.

Yet, not too long ago, Wayne County Road Manager LeRoy Smith denied Naval Reserve units, currently at Grosse Ile, permission to base at Wayne Major. Instead, he asked the Navy to investigate the possibility of operating from Willow Run.

Detroit newspapers said Mr. Smith gave as his reason the fact that naval flights would overcrowd Wayne Major when the airlines moved from Willow Run to the Wayne County Airport.

Smith knows that only the airlines can bail him out of debt at Wayne Major and is using every means at his command to see that they are forced out of Willow Run. And worse yet, he is attempting to use the Navy and the Air Force as pawns in his game.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

---

[From the Ann Arbor (Mich.) News of March 19, 1955]

DETROIT PRESENTS WEAK CASE IN BID FOR AIRLINES CHANGE

The city of Detroit is getting just about as much support as it deserves in the campaign to move the airlines from Willow Run to the Wayne Major Airport. The people of Detroit don't appear to have gotten very excited about the issue, and the airlines themselves are not jumping at the bait of promised huge expenditures for facilities at Wayne Major.

The airlines know a good thing when they see it, and they see it at Willow Run. They not only have a mutually advantageous agreement with the University of Michigan, which has the airport on a lease from the Federal Government, but they have a record of safety in their landings and takeoffs at Willow Run which stamps it as one of the best air terminals in the United States from that standpoint.

Detroit's big argument is that Willow Run is too far from the city to be considered Detroit's major airfield. It is argued that it shouldn't take half as long to get from the airport home or to a hotel as it does to make the actual flight from another point. That, of course, is true, but it is not a situation that Detroit faces alone. An airport can't be placed in the center of a city and when it is put far enough out to avoid danger of collision with high objects in the area, transportation and time to and from the airport become a problem.

Were the Wayne Major Airport to be substituted for Willow Run, it has been estimated a saving of 11 to 14 minutes' time would result for the airlines patron coming to or going from the center of Detroit. This would be reduced somewhat by a proposed new road running southeast from the air terminal to join the expressway, eliminating the present roundabout way in which Detroit-bound airport traffic must go west from the field before proceeding south and then east.

From the standpoint of miles distance from the center of the largest nearby city, Willow Run is the fartherest of the major airports of the country. On the basis of minutes, and airport officials insist that is the more important measurement, Willow Run is in a better position than several others. Opening of the Detroit city sections of the Lodge and Ford expressways has in a sense brought Willow Run closer to the heart of Detroit.

Detroit must be conceded a big stake in Willow Run; a survey a few years ago showed 88 percent of the airport's traffic from or to Detroit and only 12 percent outstate. Detroit is engulfed at the moment in a surge of civic pride with talk of new hotels, bank buildings, parking structures, and expressways and some notable progress on its new river-front civic center. Some city and county officials apparently feel that such dynamic progress is meaningless without an airlines terminal nearer to the city. One of the weaknesses of their position is that they are trying to move the airlines from Willow Run as a temporary thing; they hope to have another big city airport later north of the metropolis. When that day comes and assuming that the airlines then would move there from Willow Run, it is problematical whether they would consider a "split operation" using both airports. In any event, that is something at least a few years in the future.

Complicating the situation further is a proposal by the 10th Air Force to base F-80 jet planes at Willow Run. This may have been due to a misunderstanding over the chance of moving airlines facilities to Wayne Major Airport. Congressman GEORGE MEADER has objected to the military plan, following the protests of Willow Run officials that it would not be wise to base jets at an airfield where there are 320 scheduled airline operations a day. They logically suggested that the jets be based at Wayne Major where there already is a unit of the Air National Guard.

Detroit—unlike Chicago, which at least through the Chicago Tribune, claims as Chicagoland everything within a couple hundred miles—probably finds it difficult to claim Willow Run as its major airlines terminal because of the fact that while the field is in Wayne County the airport buildings are in Washtenaw.

While Willow Run meets most of the functional requirements of a major air terminal, there have been complaints that its facilities are not in line with those of other big fields in metropolitan areas. That is true, of course, and the reason is that it is a conversion job. It was not built with beauty and comforts in mind, but those factors have been considered in remodeling efforts and it may be expected that something further along that line will be done. The distance from Detroit can't be changed, except possibly by the discussed shorter route, but the facilities and comforts of the airport could be increased with the expenditure of some money. It certainly wouldn't cost anywhere near the $10 million suggested expenditure to make Wayne Major Airport suitable for use as a substitute for Willow Run.

The university, board of supervisors, Ypsilanti city and township officials, and the Ann Arbor Chamber of Commerce all have been concerned by Detroit's efforts to lure the airlines away from Willow Run. Detroit appears to hold the losing hand at the moment because the airlines like their present arrangement with the university, the only such setup in the country. It probably would be wise, however, for the various groups concerned with keeping Willow Run in business, to make a real effort to eliminate any justified complaints against Willow Run as a passenger terminal.

Ann Arbor, with the university and medical center, and Ypsilanti have many residents who use the airlines regularly. Many businessmen and vacationers also use them. It would be a distinct loss to the whole county were the airlines to move. The scheduled conference of university and civic officials on the matter then is important. Detroit has no strong argument for moving the airport at this time, but airlines and university officials should have all the available support in rejecting such an unreasonable request.

Mr. Speaker, because of the interest of the Civil Aeronautics Administration in the safe operation of airports, I arranged for a conference between representatives of the University of Michigan, the airport, and myself with Mr. F. B. Lee, Administrator of the CAA. Yesterday that conference was held, and we were assured that the CAA would take

an interest not alone in the proposal to base jet aircraft at Willow Run but in the 29 or 30 other centers in the United States where the Air Force is contemplating establishing new jet reserve flying operations.

It is very apparent to me that Leroy Smith, as a part of his campaign either to cajole or to force scheduled commercial airlines from Willow Run to Wayne Major Airport, is taking advantage of every conceivable opportunity. It would be far more logical to permit the Navy to transfer its jet flying operations from Grosse Ile to Wayne Major, where there is already a jet operation of the Michigan Air National Guard, and to station the 10th Air Force jet reserve squadron at Wayne Major than to force those military jet operations into a busy commercial airport where there are currently no military jet operations.

The Congress will have an opportunity to consider national policy in situations of this character in connection with the Defense Department appropriation bill on which I understand hearings are nearly completed by the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. In this connection it would be appropriate to consider not only the dislocation to commercial air operations and the inconvenience to the community and rapid residential expansion in the vicinity of Willow Run, but also the amount of Federal funds which have been invested in the respective airports.

I have obtained from the CAA a tabulation showing Federal airport aid to the State of Michigan since the war. This tabulation reveals that Wayne Major Airport has received 52 percent of all Federal aid airport funds granted to the State of Michigan since 1947, whereas Willow Run Airport has received less than 2 percent of such funds.

Although Wayne Major in 8 years has received $4,035,858 in Federal funds it denied the Navy the use of its facilities.

Citizens of Michigan familiar with the history of Federal airport aid to their State will have little difficulty connecting Wayne Major Airport's lion's share of airport aid funds with the powerful influence of Detroit's John P. McElroy as a member of the Michigan Aeronautics Commission.

At this point in my remarks I insert the tabulation of Federal-aid airport funds for Michigan:

*Federal-aid airport program, State of Michigan, fiscal years 1947–55*

| City | 1947 | | 1948 | | 1949 | | 1950 | | 1951 | | 1952 | | 1953 | | 1955 | | Total Federal funds obligated or allocated |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Allocation | Final cost | Allocation | Final cost | Allocation | Final cost | Allocation | Final cost | Allocation | Final cost | Allocation | Final cost | Allocation | Final cost | Allocation | Revised | |
| Adrian | $19,500 | $18,133 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | $18,133 |
| Alma | | | | | | | | | [1] $9,500 | $8,990 | | | | | | | 8,990 |
| Ann Arbor | 91,469 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Bad Axe | 30,000 | 23,111 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 23,111 |
| Battle Creek | | | | | $40,000 | $19,805 | | | | | | | | | | | 19,805 |
| Bay City | 82,750 | 50,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 50,000 |
| Benton Harbor | 75,000 | 42,001 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | [3] $50,000 | [4] 92,001 |
| Boyne City | 4,775 | [2] 0 | $225 | [2] 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Cadillac | 22,000 | 32,474 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 32,474 |
| Cold Water | 25,000 | 16,180 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 16,180 |
| Detroit-City | | | | | 150,000 | 149,728 | | | [2] 17,500 | | | | | | | | 149,728 |
| Detroit-Wayne | | | 240,000 | $528,617 | 1,061,600 | 1,030,641 | $1,000,000 | [3] $1,407,810 | 500,000 | 488,820 | $250,000 | $345,306 | $170,000 | $154,664 | $80,000 | [3] 80,000 | [4] 4,035,858 |
| Detroit-Willow Run | | | | | | | | | | | | | [1] 74,000 | 70,031 | 100,000 | [3] 80,000 | [4] 150,031 |
| Escanaba | 20,000 | 20,000 | 15,000 | 13,991 | | | 22,000 | 39,898 | | | | | | | | | 73,889 |
| Flint | | | 55,000 | 57,448 | | | | | 100,000 | 215,233 | | | 30,000 | [3] 33,000 | 60,000 | [3] 60,000 | 365,681 |
| Fremont | | | | | 10,000 | 5,923 | | | | | | | | | | | 5,923 |
| Grand Haven | 44,250 | 47,350 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 47,350 |
| Grand Marais | 116,500 | [2] 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Grand Rapids | | | 100,000 | 110,931 | | | | | 102,000 | 85,354 | 210,000 | 222,796 | 75,000 | [3] 88,000 | 190,000 | [3] 165,000 | [4] 672,081 |
| Hart | 10,375 | 11,041 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 11,041 |
| Holland | | | 15,000 | [2] 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Houghton | 312,680 | 290,524 | 28,320 | 2,461 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 292,985 |
| Howell | 19,000 | [2] 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Indian River | 6,250 | [2] 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Iron Mountain | 45,000 | 45,000 | | | | | 45,000 | 26,896 | | | | | 5,000 | 4,905 | | | 76,801 |
| Ironwood | 32,500 | 51,438 | | | 25,000 | 14,850 | | | 32,500 | 2,351 | | | | | | | 68,639 |
| Jackson | | | | | [1] 4,000 | 2,982 | 77,000 | 47,697 | | | | | | | | | 50,679 |
| Kalamazoo | 51,375 | 12,785 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 12,785 |
| Lakeview | 10,100 | 7,321 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 7,321 |
| Lansing | | | 75,000 | [3] 143,731 | 20,000 | [3] 20,000 | 75,000 | [3] 86,900 | 75,000 | 52,261 | 70,000 | [3] 70,000 | 70,000 | [3] 70,000 | 100,000 | [3] 66,000 | [4] 508,892 |
| Ludington | 14,500 | 14,500 | 7,000 | 4,750 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 19,250 |
| Marquette | 43,000 | 50,000 | | | | | | | 8,500 | 5,969 | | | | | | | 55,969 |
| Menominee | | | 65,000 | 65,000 | | | | | 9,000 | 4,824 | | | | | | | 69,824 |
| Midland | 47,972 | 60,000 | 12,028 | 14,960 | | | [1] 7,100 | 9,030 | | | | | | | | | 83,990 |
| Monroe | 20,500 | 30,572 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 30,572 |
| Montague | 7,400 | [2] 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Muskegon | | | 70,000 | 70,000 | 70,000 | 115,017 | | | | | | | 20,000 | [3] 20,000 | 21,530 | [3] 65,530 | [4] 270,547 |
| Niles | 27,450 | 59,632 | 22,550 | 39,151 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 98,783 |
| Northport | | | | | 7,100 | [2] 0 | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Owosso | | | 40,000 | 75,430 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 75,430 |
| Pellston | | | | | | | 20,000 | 28,191 | | | | | | | | | 28,191 |
| Pontiac | | | | | 40,000 | 27,861 | | | | | | | | | 0 | [3] 5,901 | [4] 33,762 |
| Port Huron | 65,000 | 89,143 | | | 20,000 | 24,365 | | | | | | | | | | | 113,508 |
| Saginaw-Bay City | | | | | | | | | 7,150 | 11,974 | | | | | | | 11,974 |
| St. Ignace | 11,500 | [2] 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Saulte Ste. Marie | 75,000 | [2] 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Sebewaing | | | | | | | [1] 10,100 | 6,905 | | | | | | | | | 6,905 |
| South Haven | | | | | 15,000 | 15,116 | | | | | | | | | | | 15,116 |
| Sturgis | | | | | 10,000 | 18,487 | | | | | | | | | | | 18,487 |
| Three Rivers | 10,500 | 10,500 | 7,000 | 6,088 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 16,588 |
| Traverse City | | | | | | | 10,000 | 7,897 | | | | | | | | | 7,897 |
| Watervliet | 12,881 | 13,893 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 13,893 |
| Total | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 7,761,064 |

[1] Addition during year.
[2] Canceled.
[3] Project active.
[4] Portion still active.

Mr. Speaker, furthermore, it should be borne in mind that preparation of Wayne Major Airport for the accommodation of scheduled commercial airline traffic would require an additional expenditure of at least $10 million.

If the University of Michigan is denied the use of the Packard property for research purposes, there is a distinct possibility that alternate facilities will have to be constructed at an estimated expense of $4 million.

I urge my colleagues and the executive departments concerned to give careful thought not alone to the community interests and the safety of air travel, but to the expenditure of Federal funds before a movement of far-reaching consequences is initiated.

As further evidence of the overwhelming interest in this problem in my home community I include at this point a telegram I received this morning from the Ypsilanti Junior Chamber Commerce:

ANN ARBOR, MICH., *March 31, 1955.*
Representative GEORGE MEADER,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Public sentiments in Ypsilanti area rapidly growing in opposition to apparent plan to base military aircraft at Willow Run, Mich. Based on present information we, of the Ypsilanti Junior Chamber of Commerce are strongly opposed to such plans and respectfully request the reasons for selecting Willow Run in place of nearby Detroit-Wayne Ma-

jor Airport with its currently used and adequate military facilities.

THE YPSILANTI JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, *Ypsilanti, Mich.*

(Joint message sent to President Eisenhower, Secretary Talbott, Secretary Wilson, Senator Potter, Senator McNamara.)

## SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour today, following any special orders heretofore entered, to revise and extend his remarks and include an address.

## A PROPOSAL TO CREATE A DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL DEFENSE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. RIEHLMAN. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, recent public disclosures by the Atomic Energy Commission of the horrifying facts about the radioactive fallout resulting from detonation of the new atomic-hydrogen weapons, recent news releases by the Air Force concerning the almost unbelievable capabilities of supersonic guided missiles, and news of other startling developments in the field of modern warfare, serve only to reaffirm my conviction that our civil-defense program as presently constituted, is grossly inadequate to cope with the problems that would immediately arise in the event of any attack on the United States.

Even before the disclosure of this most recent information, I had been convinced for some time that our civil-defense program is dangerously outmoded. Last year I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 233 expressing the sense of the Congress that, in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, the President should prepare and submit to the Congress a reorganization plan to establish within the Department of Defense a civilian Department of Civil Defense and transfer all functions of the existing Federal Civil Defense Administration to such new Department. No hearings were held on this bill prior to adjournment of the 83d Congress.

Today, I am reintroducing this bill in substantially its same form, with only minor changes of a technical nature. I hope that this bill, and other similar proposals for a more adequate civil-defense program, will be given early and serious consideration during the 84th Congress.

Our country has made extensive plans and expended unprecedented sums of money to build and maintain a modern military-defense force. I fully concur with the administration's efforts and its policies in building such a strong retaliatory military force. Our best hopes for preservation of the free world lie in our continued ability to carry on international negotiations from a position of strength. Although it is now a matter of hindsight, it is generally agreed that many of our current problems in international affairs might well have been averted had we not disarmed as rapidly as we did following World War II.

However, recent public releases of information concerning the mass destructive capabilities of the latest atomic-hydrogen weapons and other instruments of modern warfare have shocked the people of this Nation into giving more thought to our civil defense. The present civil-defense program, established pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950—approved January 12, 1951—is a loose confederation of individual State programs. While much progress has been made, both at the State level and by the Federal Civil Defense Administration—particularly with regard to negotiation of interstate mutual-aid compacts—the basic system itself has proved to be wholly inadequate.

The Federal Civil Defense Administration, as presently constituted, is primarily an information coordinating headquarters which must depend upon the voluntary efforts of each State in the Union to develop the kind of individual civil-defense operations which each State can afford. The limit of each State's plan is dependent upon the amount of State money available for this activity. Even where the people of the individual States are made conscious of the great necessity for their State's civil-defense program, and even where adequate State funds could be made available for civil defense, the process of translating this concern into a coordinated national civil-defense program is bound to be a slow one.

Can we as a nation, at this period of rapid technological development in the techniques of modern warfare, afford the luxury of such a system? I do not believe that we can. Although I have opposed in the past, and shall continue to oppose in the future, the shifting of many legitimate State functions to the Federal Government, it would seem obvious today that civil defense, as well as military defense, is a proper responsibility of the National Government.

This is not a radical idea by any means. It long ago became apparent that State militias were an outmoded form of military organization for the United States. State militias had to be disbanded in favor of a more integrated approach through the National Guard program, operated under the Department of Defense. Independent State civil-defense organizations are, today as outmoded as independent State military organizations.

One fact which has become apparent is that civil defense is no longer a program which we can afford to relegate to a subordinate position in our governmental structure. The task of civil defense cannot be entirely separated from the main effort of our national-defense program. This means that the Federal Government must assume a greater share of any responsibilities now borne jointly with the several States. The present division of civil-defense functions between the Federal Government and the States is wholly unrealistic in view of the destructive characteristics of modern instruments of warfare. The civilian sanctuaries of a few years ago have become the military targets of today. We must be just as concerned about the defense of the civilian populations of our great industrial and commercial centers today as we have been about the defense of our military bases and installations in the past.

It is not only necessary that there be a greater concentration of authority at the Federal level, but it is also necessary for the Federal Government to shoulder the principal financial burden. Every American citizen is entitled to an equal minimum share of protection afforded by civil defense measures should a war be brought into our back yards. The problem, therefore, is a national one. The responsibility of our national Government to the people can be carried out only by an intelligent program developed and operated from a central point. However, assumption of this primary responsibility by the Federal Government for a minimum national civil defense program would not necessarily preclude continued State or municipal civil defense programs in those cases where individual States or municipalities have the fiscal capabilities to provide for their citizens more adequate civil defense measures over and above the necessary minimum measures provided by the Federal Government.

Although substantially increased appropriations are being requested for the Federal Civil Defense Administration this year, it is no secret that the agency has long been a stepchild in the executive branch of the Government. The Congress has repeatedly made drastic cuts in the appropriation requests of that agency since its inception. Whether the cuts were made as a result of a lack of confidence on the part of the Congress in the program being proposed, or whether these cuts were a necessary economy measure is almost beside the point. The people of the United States have never refused to face up to a problem involving our national safety merely because of the monetary costs involved.

We can no longer depend upon the dual system of charging the Department of Defense with the responsibility of a military defense of our people from enemy action on the one hand, and charging the Federal Civil Defense Administration, through a loose confederation of State civil-defense agencies, with the responsibility for passive civil defense of our citizens in the event of military attack upon our homeland.

While I realize that this approach is radically different from any civil-defense program previously adopted in the United States, the time has come to face the fact that military defense and civil defense cannot be separated. We must develop an entirely new concept of civil defense.

Voluntary participation in civil defense is, like voluntary armies, largely a phenomenon of the past. We are being faced with the realities of total war. Civil defense now requires an effective corps of trained personnel. In terms of importance, it is no longer possible to distinguish this type of service from purely military service.

There is no satisfactory partial solution to the inadequacies of our present civil-defense program. Indeed, it is no longer a question of whether our civil-defense officials have succeeded or failed in their assigned tasks, or whether this person or that party was responsible for the success or failure. It is, rather, a matter of lifting our conception of civil defense out of the framework of pre-atomic-hydrogen days. It is a matter of carefully examining the realities of defense requirements in a completely new and modern setting. It is a matter of considering, in the light of new realities, the problem of constructing a rational national program for civil defense.

While the experience accumulated by the Federal Civil Defense Administration will, naturally, be of great importance in developing a new civil-defense program, a study of the problem itself should be much broader; it should be dealt with on a level encompassing our entire national-defense program. Civil defense must be considered as a part of our total military-defense planning by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and by the National Security Council. It cannot merely be coordinated with the military plans being developed at that level. When civil defense is developed along lines of mere coordination or cooperation with these basic military policy-planning groups, civil defense becomes a second-class program, regardless of the sincerity of both the military and the civil-defense officials.

Because of these considerations, I am reintroducing the concurrent resolution, expressing the sense of Congress that the President, in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, should prepare and submit to the Congress such a positive program.

The program outlined in this resolution provides for the abolition of the Federal Civil Defense Administration and for the creation of a Department of Civil Defense. This newly created Department would be established within the Department of Defense, and would be headed by a Secretary with a status equivalent to that of the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. The Secretary of Civil Defense would be assisted by a civilian Chief of Staff who would become a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The new Department of Civil Defense would be similar to the military departments in many respects. Its functions would be carried out under the direction, authority, and control of the Secretary of Defense, and its recommendations for further legislation would be submitted through the Secretary of Defense, who is a member of the National Security Council.

An incidental advantage which would accrue as the result of incorporating the civil-defense program within the Department of Defense is the possibility for more intensive utilization of surplus military property. Large quantities of surplus military property are now being offered for sale to the public. Under the military surplus property program, as presently constituted, the Federal Civil Defense Administration has no priority in claiming excess military property, much of which would be usable in the civil-defense program. State and municipal civil-defense organizations, at present, are not even eligible to participate in the Federal donable surplus property program. Inclusion of the new Department of Civil Defense within the Department of Defense would make available to civil-defense activities much of the surplus military property now being sold, and a considerable portion of such property could be transferred from the military departments without reimbursement.

As to manpower requirements, it is suggested that the President's reorganization plan request legislation to permit an allotment of personnel to be made to the new Department of Civil Defense through the machinery of the existing Selective Service System from the numbers of men who cannot meet their obligations in the national military service for reasons of conscientious objection, physical disqualifications, or for any other reason. It is not intended to imply that the manpower requirements for this Department shall be supplied solely from the pool of those who are rejected for or exempt from military service. It is my belief, furthermore, that this civil-defense program, within the Defense Establishment, might be studied to determine the possibilities for including it in the plans for any future universal military training program.

This new Department would be charged with the primary responsibility for preparing a comprehensive program of civil defense geared to the age of modern warfare. It would be able to exert leadership in the development and operation of a positive and effective national civil defense system.

One argument is frequently advanced against giving undue prominence to defensive measures such as civil defense and the Air Defense Command. It is argued that our best defense is a strong offensive power, and that programs emphasizing defense rather than offense are isolationist in character, seeking to hide America behind some mysterious wall of impenetrable defense without entangling international responsibilities. As part of this same line of reasoning, it is argued that the men, money, and materials necessary for such defensive measures would result in a dangerous drain upon our offensive capabilities.

These viewpoints deserve full and serious consideration, of course, but I cannot agree that they preclude much more ambitious defensive measures than we have yet undertaken. The problem cannot be phrased in terms of alternative choices. The simple fact is that we must achieve a stronger defense without weakening or subordinating our offensive power. Adequate defensive measures coupled with powerful offensive capabilities do not add up to either isolationism or bankruptcy.

The leadership of the United States would be strengthened by the world knowledge that we are prepared to repel as well as to invade. In the event of war, there would be scant hope for the survival of the free world if we were able to destroy the enemy but incapable of preventing the annihilation of our own cities and people.

Our homes, our cities, our families, our skilled industrial workers, are just as much a part of the total national defense potential as our uniformed military forces. It would be disastrous to continue to ignore this simple truth.

## AGRICULTURE

Mrs. PFOST. 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 Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948. This amendment would increase the domestic sugar-beet quota 85,000 tons, bringing the total quota allotment up to 1,885,000 tons. It would also increase the mainland cane quota 80,000 tons, and the quotas for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands by 20,000 and 3,000 tons, respectively.

The amendment applies the so-called growth formula to all increases above the Department of Agriculture's initial sugar consumption estimate for 1955. It would restore our country's historical basis by providing that 55 percent of the annual increase in sugar consumption go to the domestic producers and 45 percent of that increase go to foreign suppliers.

The formula was adjusted on a temporary basis in 1948 to help Cuba make a postwar economic comeback. Cuba has now had time to make such an adjustment, and it is not fair to continue to penalize the domestic sugar industry. Unless the law is changed, all of the growth in United States sugar consumption will be allotted to foreign suppliers, with 96 percent of it going to Cuba.

The domestic sugar-beet industry is not only ready and willing to handle an expanded share of sugar production—but needs that production if it is to continue as a stable and healthy segment of our economy. Improved farming methods and research have greatly increased the yield per acre. The domestic sugar-beet industry will have an excess of approximately 3 million bags of sugar this year. It will go into storage—and have to come out sometime.

In view of these large inventories, further drastic cuts in sugar-beet acreage are both impractical and unfair.

In my own State of Idaho, for example, 1955 sugar-beet acreage has been cut from 93,000 acres to 79,715 acres. This is approximately a 14 percent cut. A further cut would obviously create a great hardship.

Sugar beets have been used for crop rotation in Idaho for many years. As a supplement to hay and grain the beet refinery byproduct has also been used to feed livestock. The sugar-beet industry has therefore greatly assisted the important livestock industry in my State.

One group which has been particularly hard hit by the fact that domestic sugar-beet acreages have been either fixed at the same level or reduced each year has been the veteran who is homesteading on new reclamation and irri-

gation projects. These acreages are particularly suited to sugar-beet production. The GI boys almost have to have some beet acreage to succeed. Under the quotas in the present law, they are completely shut out.

Mr. Speaker, the adjustments which this amendment will make in our sugar-beet legislation are long past due. We Members who are joining in sponsorship of the amendment hope the House will pass it at an early date.

## JAMES MIDDLETON COX

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, the Third District of Ohio, which district I have the great honor and privilege to represent here in the House of Representatives of the United States, has been noted for many reasons. It has been and is the center of the manufacture of many products which require personnel of unusual high degrees of ability and expertness and whose products are known and used worldwide. Many of the world's greatest scientific achievements stem from this great area. I cannot take the time here now to name all of them, but, just as some examples, it is the birthplace and cradle of aviation; the birthplace of many outstanding advancements in the automotive field, including the automobile electric starter, electric-battery ignition system, ethyl gasoline, and a host of others.

All achievements, however, stem from the minds, hearts, and abilities of people. The real richness and accomplishments of our great Third District of Ohio, therefore, lie in the personal abilities of an impressive number of really great and able people.

The Third District of Ohio has not only made significant contributions to the scientific, production, and business growth of our Nation, but our district has also contributed outstandingly in the fields of the public life of our State of Ohio and the Nation.

One of our most illustrious citizens is the Honorable James M. Cox, who today celebrates the 85th anniversary of his birth.

The Honorable James Middleton Cox, a former Representative from Ohio, was born near Jacksonburg, Butler County, Ohio, March 31, 1870. He attended country schools and Amanda (Ohio) High School; engaged in teaching; worked on a farm and also in the mechanical and editorial departments of a daily newspaper; became owner and publisher of the Dayton Daily News in 1898, of the Springfield Daily News in 1903, of the Miami Metropolis in 1923, and of the Atlanta Journal in 1939. He was elected as a Democrat to the 61st and 62d Congresses and served from March 4, 1909, until January 12, 1913, when he resigned, having been elected Governor. He served as Governor of Ohio 1913–15 and 1917–21. He was the unsuccessful Democratic candidate for election as President of the United States in 1920; vice chairman of the United States delegation to the World Economic Conference at London in 1933, and President of its Monetary Commission; declined appointment to the United States Senate by Gov. Frank Lausche in 1946; retired from political life and continued in the publishing business; resides at Trailsend, Dayton, Ohio.

The Governor, as he is affectionately known and called by all his friends and associates, is still today a hard-working publisher, watching the details of his many and various newspapers every day. He owns and operates, among others, the Daily News in Miami, Fla.; the Journal in Atlanta, Ga.; the Daily News and the Daily Sun in Springfield, Ohio; the Journal-Herald and Dayton Daily News in Dayton, Ohio. He also owns and operates a number of radio and television stations. He is a hard taskmaster and he expects his associates and employees to be on their toes at all times, but at the same time his associates and employees have no more loyal and true friend than the Governor, who is always ready with a helping hand and understanding heart when needed. Instead of now taking a well-earned rest, his greatest joy comes in being on the job every day and he is being ably assisted by his son, James M. Cox, Jr.

Mr. Speaker, Governor Cox is 85 years young today. He has hosts of friends not only in his wide-flung business enterprises, but also in the political and public field throughout the Nation. It is a great privilege and honor for me here today on the floor of the House of Representatives to express my most sincere appreciation to the Governor for his many accomplishments and for his friendship. I also want to express my heartiest congratulations to the Governor and the hope that he will have many more happy and healthful birthday celebrations.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHENCK. I will be happy to.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that I would do myself justice if I did not take this opportunity to say a word about Gov. James M. Cox. For many, many years he and I have been warm, personal and, I might say, political friends. I think Jim Cox is one of the greatest Americans that it has ever been my privilege to know. He is a patriot first; he is a party man next, and for years and years to come in political life, in his public life, and in his various manifold enterprises he will go down as one of the men of this generation who has been helpful to all classes and all kinds of people. I want to congratulate him on his 85th birthday, and I wish for him that his useful and wonderful and serviceable life may be extended many, many years to come.

Mr. SCHENCK. I thank the distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Texas.

## ADJOURNMENT OVER AND PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF APRIL 13

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Massachusetts kindly tell us what we might expect in the way of a program when we return from the recess?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be happy to.

Of course, on Monday there will be no legislative business of any kind. Whether there are going to be any remarks, I do not know, but there will be no business.

We meet on April 13, and on that date the State, Justice, and Judiciary appropriation bill will come up. I am unable to state now what the period of general debate will be, but in any event the leadership on both sides have entered into an agreement that if the consideration of that bill should conclude on April 13 and if there are any rollcalls in connection with amendments or on the passage of the bill requested, the rollcalls will take place on the following day, April 14.

For the remainder of the week there will be no legislative program.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## AUTHORITY TO PERFORM CERTAIN OFFICIAL ACTS DURING ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until April 13, 1955, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday, April 13, 1955, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Monday, April 18, 1955, on the subject of peace.

## ARMED SERVICES APPROPRIATION BILL

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman now know when the appropriation bill for the armed services will come to the floor of the House?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to advise the gentlewoman at this time on that, as I have no information on it. The Committee on Appropriations has been working very hard. I think we may all agree they have done a remarkable job. We have put through 5 regular bills and 1 supplemental bill since the 1st of the month. I know that the chairman and the members of the committee are doing everything they can to get the remaining bills in as quickly as possible. I am sorry I cannot give a definite answer to the inquiry of the gentlewoman, but on the basis of the information I have now it is impossible to do so.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows that it may be necessary to secure additional money to keep certain hospitals in operation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. I am in hopes that the Committee on Appropriations in its wisdom will include in the bill when it comes out of committee appropriations for that purpose.

I might say that I received information this morning relating to one of the hospitals, Murphy General Hospital, where reduction-in-force orders have gone out already, and they are taking action to curtail sharply the admission of patients. All I know about it is from a telegram that I have received. I hope the Department of the Army will stop that, if the information I have received is correct, pending action on the part of the Congress on the appropriation bill to come up, and especially that particular item. Last year we put the necessary appropriations into the bill on the floor.

I might say the same situation applies to the General Army Hospital, somewhere in Arkansas, I believe Hot Springs. So there is the Murphy General Hospital in Massachusetts and the General Army Hospital in Arkansas. If the same activities are going on at that hospital in Arkansas, I hope the observations I have made with reference to the Murphy General Hospital will be heeded by the Department of the Army, and instead of giving notices of reductions-in-force and curtailing the admission of patients, they will permit the functions of both hospitals to continue.

I am very hopeful that the appropriations for both hospitals, for their continued operation through the next fiscal year, will be included in the forthcoming appropriation bill. You notice, Mr. Speaker, I say I am very hopeful. I wish I could say I am sure. But I have every feeling of confidence that the House, in its wisdom, will assure the continuance of the operation of both hospitals during the next fiscal year by making the necessary appropriations.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The Department of Defense tells me that they are still trying to see if there is some way they can keep the hospitals open, by closing only part of them and operating the rest. I was very hopeful that that would be done. I hope they are not waiting for Congress to pass an appropriation bill to relieve them of any responsibility of keeping them open. But I am a little afraid that that may be done.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say this for the Department of the Army. Last year they assured us that if the Congress should put in the necessary appropriation to keep Murphy General Hospital open, they would keep it open. I simply ask them to make that promise again; if we put the money into the appropriation bill, they will keep it open during the next fiscal year.

I also hope that if any actions are being taken in the matter of curtailment of activities at either Murphy General Hospital or the General Army Hospital in Arkansas, at Hot Springs, I believe, that they will discontinue such action pending the opportunity of Congress to pass upon the question.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under what order of business are we now?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is proceeding by sufferance of the House.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, my sufferance is about over.

---

## CRITICISM OF REPORT MADE BY ATTORNEY GENERAL'S COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Monday, March 28, in the extension of my remarks—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 3889—I described the nature of the report of the Attorney General's Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws and I also pointed out that this so-called committee, which has White House sanctions, is a group of private individuals in no way responsible to any branch of the Government, and they are mostly big corporation lawyers who are four-time losers in antitrust prosecutions.

The nature of the report of this committee is plain enough. It is a high pressure public relations product aimed at persuading Congress to emasculate the antitrust laws. The recommendations contained in this report would change the antitrust laws in such a way that the law firms, who represent the big corporations in antitrust matters, could never lose a suit brought by the Government, but they would be getting a perpetual fee for defending one of these suits. The suit would be never ending.

On Monday, I could not speak, however, about the details of the recommendations contained in this report. I had received an advance copy with the understanding that I would not reveal the contents until the Attorney General's Committee unveils the report to the general public today. Today is their big day. It is the day that all of the publicity buildup of the past year has been leading to. I can, however, today describe the principles in this report, as well as some of the detailed recommendations contained in it. Consequently, I invite the Members' careful attention to the analysis below:

Perhaps a better understanding of my other comments could be gained if reference were made here to a few of the concepts regarded as basic to our Federal antitrust laws.

First. The following antitrust facts are accepted by me as self-evident, without documentation or argument:

(1) Government antitrust action against restraints on competition hallmark American capitalism.

(2) Our antitrust laws prohibiting or declaring unlawful specified action constitute declarations of national public policy.

(3) The actions prohibited or declared to be unlawful by the Congress have been found legislatively to be against the national public policy because of their dangerous tendency unduly to hinder competition or create monopoly.

(4) By 1912 we had become sufficiently familiar with the processes and methods of monopoly and of the many hurtful restraints of trade to make possible a definition of some of them. Therefore, after the Congress made a study of a number of the practices, some of them were defined and item by item forbidden by statute.

(5) Among the actions and practices which were specified and item by item forbidden under certain conditions where they lessened competition were:

(a) Price discriminations;

(b) Contracts and conditions providing for exclusive dealing and the tying of goods, wares, merchandise, etc.;

(c) Acquisitions, mergers, and consolidations;

(d) Interlocking directorates.

(6) Certain acts and practices were forbidden outright by the Clayton Antitrust Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, because the Congress had found legislatively that they were contrary to the public policy of a fair and free competitive enterprise system. Other acts and practices were forbidden with qualifications because the Congress had found legislatively that, if they should be continued, harm would develop and trade restraints occur under certain circumstances.

(7) It is a part of the national public policy to halt in their incipiency acts and practices which have a dangerous tendency unduly to hinder competition or create monopoly, or the effect of which may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, or to injure, destroy, or prevent competition. That part of the public policy has often been described as a policy to nip in the bud, before they have come to full flower, acts and practices forbidden by our antitrust laws.

(8) It is in the public interest to give full force and effect to the declared national antitrust public policy.

(9) It is in the public interest to effectuate public policy as expeditiously, economically, and efficiently as provision for doing so can be found constitutionally, statutorily, and judicially.

Second. It is my belief and assumption that any suggestion by an individual or group for legislative, administrative, or judicial consideration or action regarding our Federal antitrust and trade regulation laws should be for the enhancement of the public policy and the public interest as above outlined.

If these fundamental beliefs which I have stated are correct, then the report of the Attorney General's committee is contrary to the public interest. This is a very long report, consisting of 385 pages. It makes a great many recommendations for changing

the antitrust laws and the procedural methods to be used for enforcing the antitrust laws. On the whole these recommendations would bring about such a drastic weakening of the antitrust laws that for all practical purposes these laws would be nullified. More specifically, the recommendations calling for legislative amendments to the antitrust laws are, with a few exceptions, recommendations for weakening the laws. The majority of these call for removing the specific and definite prohibitions against monopoly and against the abuses of economic power by which big business destroys small business. Thus, these recommendations would, among other things, wreck the Robinson-Patman Act.

In lieu of the specific and definite rules of law now applicable to business, the recommendations would substitute vague and uncertain prohibitions, and they intentionally allow those business firms which can afford the continuing expense of an endless legal defense against antitrust prosecution the privilege of introducing evidence and arguing without limitation as to relevancy, and thus to prolong their defense indefinitely. The practical consequence of this has been pointed out in the report of the dissenting members of the Attorney General's Committee, written by Mr. Louis B. Schwartz, as follows: "This has two consequences: (1) It makes the proceedings intolerably long and expensive, putting a drag on enforcement and real burden on defendants; and (2) it operates differentially in favor of powerful defendants as against smaller units, since only the powerful can afford that kind of defense. In a per se case, on the other hand, inquiry should stop when the restraint has been identified."

In short, the practical effect of these recommendations is to leave the antitrust laws in effect for small business and to remove the antitrust laws for big business. There are also recommendations which would substantially repeal the laws which restrain the abuses of great size when such abuses are directed against small competitors, as for example local price cutting to drive competitors out of business.

With reference to the exceptions to the majority of the recommendations, there are a few recommendations which purport to strengthen the antitrust laws. One such recommendation is that the fine for violating the Sherman Act be increased from a maximum of $5,000 to a maximum of $10,000. Thus this recommendation would increase the effectiveness of the law against small business but would result in a fine of no significance to the multi-million dollar corporations and the multi-billion dollar corporations. There is also a general suggestion for extending the antitrust laws to cover organized labor, and similarly there is a recommendation for embracing farmer co-ops within the antitrust laws.

The recommendations concerning administration and enforcement procedures call for weakening those enforcement procedures which have met with some degree of success and for continuing a few enforcement procedures, and a few aspects of enforcement procedures, which have been conspicuously unsuccessful in antitrust law enforcement.

Those recommendations which are most important in terms of their practical impact upon the antitrust laws are reviewed below:

Coming first to the recommendations for amending the antitrust laws, it may be noted that the idea which is common to all of these recommendations is that Congress should repeal everything which specifically and definitely prohibits any monopolistic practice or condition, and substitute therefor a general principle which is well known in this legal field as the rule of reason. Thus we are not without precedent and experience by which to appraise these recommendations. Indeed, the fact which is most distinguished in the history of our antitrust law has been the contest between the idea that business should live under a rule of law and the idea that business should live under a rule of reason..

The first attempt to subordinate business conduct to the public interest was taken with the passage of the Sherman Act in 1890. This act made "every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce * * * illegal." Great hopes were raised by the passage of this act. The then relatively new monopoly controls which had been gained over several segments of business, and the inevitable abuses of this monopoly power had caused wide public concern. The Sherman Act was thus an attempt to put into practice, or to secure in practice, the theories of competition and free enterprise which our Nation had inherited from England, along with our ideals about political democracy and the dignity of the individual. While the people of the United States were trying to put the English idea of competition and free enterprise into practice, however, the English continued to perfect the theory but neglected the practice. The English courts adopted and enlarged the rule of reason for the British common law while monopoly grew and all ideas of competition in practice faded.

During the first decade of this century great pressures were brought to bear to have Congress write this rule of reason into the Sherman Act. This was the period when arguments were being made that good trusts and bad trusts are quite different, and that the law should run only against the bad trusts. Congress repeatedly refused this plea. Nevertheless, the Supreme Court in 1911, in the Standard Oil and American Tobacco cases, emulated the British courts and wrote the rule of reason into the Sherman Act, establishing perhaps the most famous act of judicial legislation of all times. The net effect was to make a wreckage of the Sherman Act which has been only incompletely repaired after many years during which subsequent decisions of the Court have tended to read the rule of reason out of the law again.

It was these decisions of the Supreme Court in 1911 that lead directly to the passage of the Clayton Antitrust Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act in 1914. In these acts Congress responded to a wide public demand to write definite and specific laws to outlaw certain practices which long experience had shown to be contrary to the public interest and which were almost universally regarded as inexcusable. In these acts Congress again took steps to bring business conduct under a rule of law, just as other social activities, and the individual members of society, had long since been required to live under a rule of law.

As I have stated a rule of reason was read into the Sherman Antitrust Act by the Supreme Court of the United States in deciding the case of *Standard Oil Co.* v. *United States* (221 U. S. 1, May 15, 1911). There it was held that the Sherman Antitrust Act "followed the language of development of the law of England" and that the "standard of reason which had been applied at the common law and in this country in dealing with subjects of the character embraced by the statute, was intended to be the measure used for the purpose of determining whether in a given case a particular act had or had not brought about the wrong against which the statute provided." While the Court thus embedded in and established as a part of our national antitrust policy under the Sherman Act the rule of reason, Justice Harlan, a member of the Supreme Court who participated in the decision in the Standard Oil case, dissented:

"To inject into the act the question of whether an agreement or combination is reasonable or unreasonable would render the act as a criminal or penal statute indefinite and uncertain, and hence, to that extent, utterly nugatory and void, and would practically amount to a repeal of that part of the act. * * * And while the same technical objection does not apply to civil prosecutions, the injection of the rule of reasonableness or unreasonableness would lead to the greatest variableness and uncertainty in the enforcement of the law. The defense of reasonable restraint would be made in every case and there would be as many different rules of reasonableness as cases, courts, and juries. What one court or jury might deem unreasonable another court or jury might deem reasonable. A court or jury in Ohio might find a given agreement or combination reasonable, while a court and jury in Wisconsin might find the same agreement and combination unreasonable."

Although our experience has taught us that Justice Harlan correctly prophesied the future, the report proposes not only continued adherence to the concept laid down by the Court in the Standard Oil case of 1911 for the administration and interpretation of the Sherman Act, it also proposes its extension to the administration and interpretation of certain provisions of the Clayton Antitrust Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act.

The rule of reason concept has application to a broad field of varied subjects in cases arising under the Sherman Act. It compels consideration of the reasons why the accused in a particular case embarked upon a course of trade-restraining action. It also compels consideration of the question of whether suppression and elimination of competition in a given situation should be excused of mitigating circumstances. The question concerning the degree and extent that competition has been injured or interfered with in a given situation is only one factor, and perhaps a relatively unimportant one at that, encompassed by the concept of the rule of reason.

I think unwise proposals providing for extensions of exemptions from the application of our antitrust laws beyond those which have been specified by the Congress in the statutory provisions or by the courts in their interpretations of those provisions. I believe any such proposal to be at war with the basic concepts of our national public policy and public interest stated in the forepart of this statement.

Congressional mandates subsequent to and supplementing the Sherman Antitrust Act, and interpretations by the courts of those mandates through the process of judicial inclusion and exclusion, have removed some of the uncertainties from antitrust law. Through those processes businessmen have been informed concerning the legal status of a number of trade practices. By the same token enforcement of our national public policy to strengthen competition has been provided the means for more efficient enforcement and thereby enhanced. The more we are able to define the offense, the less issues need be litigated. When issues are expanded to include the reasoning of men, the legal status of trade practices is left uncertain. An almost inevitable result under such circumstances is the big record and the big case. Fewer prosecutions in antitrust laws occur because of the heavier burdens upon limited appropriations. Also, only those with large financial resources are able to defend themselves in big cases on the basis of big records. Constant criticisms of those results are before us. However, those who would inject into antitrust litigation of each separate case issues regarding the reasoning of men, have failed to provide an answer to the question of how a defendant can be afforded a big, full, and fair hearing on all facets of all issues in each important contested case without expense, time, effort, and the building of a big record. It is one thing to save all of that when the parties

involved are able to reach agreement and stipulate facts, thereby providing shortcuts to the resolution of legal issues, but it is quite another thing when the parties are in disagreement and contest each fact and each issue even to the authenticity of each document involved.

Between 1890 and 1914 it was found that the Sherman Act was inadequate to serve fully the purposes of our national antitrust public policy. Monopoly grew apace. With the rule of reason a part of the Sherman Act * * *.

Between 1890 and 1914 it was found that the Sherman Act was inadequate to serve fully the purpose of our national antitrust public policy. Monopoly grew apace. With the rule of reason a part of the Sherman Act, it was considered to have become insufficient to deal with the monopoly problem as Congress saw it in the period from 1912 to 1914. Therefore, Congress in its consideration of the trade problems enacted the Clayton and the Federal Trade Acts in 1914. In so moving, the Congress acted only because public policy felt the necessity to prevent monopolistic pricing—indeed, to prevent pricing practices of individuals such as discriminations which were felt would enhance the growth of monopolistic conditions. At that time it was widely recognized not only by Congress but by President Wilson, and so stated by him in a message to the 63d Congress, that the public need demanded the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to prohibit discriminations and other specific trade practices. He said: "We are sufficiently familiar with the actual processes and methods of monopoly and of the many hurtful restraints of trade to make definition possible, at any rate up to the limit of which experience has disclosed. These practices, being now abundantly disclosed, can be explicitly and item by item forbidden by statute in such terms as will practically eliminate uncertainty, the law itself and the penalty being made equally plain."

During the period from 1912 to 1936 the Congress conducted several investigations of discriminatory pricing practices. Specifically, a number of such investigations were undertaken to ascertain the nature, extent, and significance of discriminatory pricing so that a determination could be made to legislate or not concerning the practice. Those investigations developed that discriminatory pricing existed. It was found that the practice was widespread. In general, it was found that discrimination was the weapon of large, powerful tradesmen and used with damaging effect upon smaller, weaker competitors. Therefore, it was concluded that the use of the practice presented a threat to the maintenance of the free competitive enterprise system which the Sherman Antitrust Act was designed to protect.

Consequently, the antidiscrimination features of the Clayton Antitrust Act were enacted. It is clear from the legislative history of those provisions that the Congress considered them to be integral parts of our declared national policy for free competitive enterprise, along with the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act. The House Judiciary Committee in reporting on the bill which was introduced by Mr. Clayton, in 1914, referred to the facts concerning price discriminations brought to its attention, and in that connection stated: "The necessity for legislation to prevent unfair discriminations in prices with a view of destroying competition needs little argument to sustain the wisdom of it. * * * Every concern that engages in this evil practice must of necessity recoup its losses in the particular communities or sections where their commodities are sold below cost or without a fair profit by raising the price of this same class of commodities above their fair market value in other sections or communities. * * * In seeking to enact section 2 into law we are not dealing with an imaginary evil or against ancient practices long since abandoned, but are attempting to deal with a real, existing, widespread, unfair, and unjust trade practice that ought at once to be prohibited insofar as it is within the power of Congress to deal with the subject. This we think is accomplished by section 2 of this bill."

During the course of the debates, Senator Walsh, of Montana, in referring to the Clayton bill, said: "The purpose of the legislation of which the pending bill forms a part is to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields."

In the course of congressional investigations during 1935, Congress found that discriminations practiced to favor mass buyers presented such a threat to the continuation of free competition that a number of proposals were introduced for strengthening the antitrust laws against price discriminations. Mr. Utterbach, in reporting for the House Committee on the Judiciary, on one of the proposals which was finally enacted into law, stated:

"The purpose of this proposed legislation is to restore, so far as possible, equality of opportunity in business by strengthening antitrust laws and by protecting trade and commerce against unfair trade practices and unlawful price discrimination, and also against restraint and monopoly for the better protection of consumers, workers, and independent producers, manufacturers, merchants, and other businessmen. * * *

"Your committee is of the opinion that the evidence is overwhelming that price discrimination practices exist to such an extent that the survival of independent merchants, manufacturers, and other businessmen is seriously imperiled and that remedial legislation is necessary. * * *

"It is the design and intent of this bill to strengthen existing antitrust laws, prevent unfair price discrimination, and preserve competition in interstate commerce. It is believed to be in the interest of producer, consumer, and distributor."

Notwithstanding the wealth of factual information heretofore considered by the Congress concerning the practical and economic significance of the practice of price discrimination, much argument has been advanced, recently with vigor, to the effect that the practice of price discrimination is a competitive practice and should be encouraged. Some of that argument has impressed persons in high places. The argument has provided a basis for the proposition that legislation against price discrimination is legislation against competition and therefore contrary to the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act and the national policy to protect competition. It appears that those contentions are at issue with the national public policy as expressed in our antimonopoly laws and the legislative history concerning them. Until that issue is resolved uncertainty hangs as a pall over everyone with respect to the meaning of a considerable area of our antimonopoly laws. We should not waste words here explaining how vitally important it is that the issue be resolved properly. However, discussion and consideration should not be spared concerning ways and means to fully, fairly, and clearly present the issue.

It is obvious that we should not jump to any conclusion in this matter without a sound, logical, and unimpeachable basis.

It is suggested that judgment in the form of an ultimate conclusion of what changes should be made in our antimonopoly laws be reserved unless and until underlying reason has been examined and found to support the ultimate conclusion. In other words we should examine the underlying propositions concerning the nature, extent, and significance of the trade practices in question. If upon proper examination the propositions are found to be valid, then it would appear that legislation in accordance with them would be sound. How are we to accumulate a sound, logical, and unimpeachable basis for consideration and action in that respect? It is suggested that the duly elected representatives of the people make a full-fledged investigation of trade practices about which question has been raised concerning their legal status and from such investigation the Congress determine whether any or all of such practices are in accord with or contrary to the expressed national public policy for a free competitive enterprise system. We should have more of what is good and less of what is in fact found to be bad.

It is my firm belief that it can be determined best what trade practices should be prohibited as contrary to our antitrust public policy and what trade practices should be permitted as promoting that policy by a congressional examination of factual evidence of the acts and practices in question.

It is quite important to study firsthand the effects of a practice before concluding whether the practice should or should not be legalized. Often victims of a practice are able to present more evidence of its effects than others who are not victimized. It is suggested that it would prove helpful if the Congress should study and resolve any questions we have regarding that aspect of this problem. By that method, the Congress would be enabled to determine what practices are used and what are their effects. My faith in the Congress leads me to believe that once it should make those determinations, it would legislate to prohibit those acts and practices which injure competition and to permit those which in fact promote competition. It is my belief that if the Congress should become convinced that the practice of price discrimination in fact promotes competition (as a few claim) instead of monopolistic conditions, it will vastly modify, if not repeal, section 2 of the Clayton Antitrust Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act.

Certainly I do not believe that a private group of persons who for the most part have been representing antitrust law violators should determine the public policy of our country. They seem to forget that under our Constitution the people delegated that to the Congress and to no other group.

In addition to the problem regarding the so-called rule of reason my preliminary reading of the report discloses that it contains other proposals for weakening the antitrust laws.

For example, commencing at page 115 the report discusses the problem of mergers. In that section it is proposed that enforcement of the Federal law against mergers take the course presently pursued by the Eisenhower administration of the Federal Trade Commission. (P. 120–125.) It is pertinent to ask: What is the result of following that course? The result is no enforcement. By virtue of following that course the Federal Trade Commission has not completed a single case under the antimerger law. It is a safe prediction that when it does complete such a case the issues therein long since will have become moot.

Is that the kind of law enforcement our taxpayers pay for when we in Congress vote funds for the operation of the Antitrust Division and the Federal Trade Commission?

The report in a section commencing at page 137 discusses exclusive dealing agreements which Congress sought to outlaw through the passage of section 3 of the Clayton Antitrust Act. The report between pages 127 and 147, advances proposals that standards used by the United States Supreme Court in determining whether a particular exclusive dealing agreement is violative of section 3 of the Clayton antitrust law, not be used, but instead that use should be made of standards being used by the present administration at the Federal Trade Commission. Such proposals are advanced despite the fact that the courts only a few months ago (2d Cir. 217 F. 2d 821) in the

Dictograph case and (7th Cir. CCH Trade Cases 67921) in the Anchor Serum case repudiated the view of the present administration held at the Federal Trade Commission regarding cases arising under section 3 of the Clayton Antitrust Act. The Commission had held and is still holding to the view that it should not act until after the damage is done. The Attorney General's report (p. 148) in discussing that point states: "The essence of unfairness in an exclusive arrangement as a marketing tactic is the actual foreclosure of business * * *." However, it is gratifying to note that one member of the committee, Louis B. Schwartz, dissented from the "actual foreclosure test" espoused in some portions of that chapter (p. 149).

It is also noted that this group of private lawyers and private economists that the Attorney General named as members of his committee have made their own private determination that the fair-trade laws are not in accord with public policy. (The report, pp. 149–155.) However, that group of defenders of private monopolies apparently disregards the fact that the Congress of the United States by an overwhelming vote in both Houses decided the opposite, and did so quite recently.

The report at page 155 undertakes a discussion concerning price discrimination. In the succeeding pages it attempts to analyze what the Federal Trade Commission and the courts have done in interpreting the antidiscrimination laws in each of a number of the important cases which have arisen under the Robinson-Patman Act. In quite a number of those cases, particularly the *Morton Salt* case (334 U. S. 37), the United States Supreme Court and various appellate courts have held that price discriminations, practiced under circumstances which reasonably could be expected to give rise to injury, presented an adequate basis to the Federal Trade Commission for finding that the effect of such discriminations may be to substantially lessen competition and create a monopoly. However, in a decision by the Federal Trade Commission in Docket No. 5675 in the matter of General Foods Corp., the Commission retreated from the view which it and the courts had expressed in other cases. In the *General Foods* case the Commission, in effect, held that Government counsel supporting the complaint had the burden of producing evidence of actual injury and dismissed the complaint in that case. Many who have knowledge of the facts of record in that case contend that evidence of actual injury was presented to the Commission in that case. For example, Commissioner James M. Mead, who dissented from the decision of the Commission, wrote a vigorous dissent, in which he made the following statement:

"The record in this case shows that General Foods increased its share of the market and that the competitors of General Foods had a decreasing share of the market * * * in 1939, the year immediately prior to the initiation of the deals, General Foods controlled 62.2 percent of the national market in pectin. * * * General Foods' share of the market increased during the 'deal' years to 1946, when its share was 80.5 percent of the market. * * *

"Economists may differ as to what particular percentage of the national market a concern may have before it may be classified as a monopoly. A concern having 35 percent of the market may not be a monopoly; but certainly when a concern begins to obtain over 50 percent of the national market in any particular commodity, then such concern, because of such share, is in the position to exert a very significant effect on the market. An area price discrimination by a concern having 35 percent of the market may not have as great an adverse effect as a discrimination by a concern controlling 80 percent of the market. * * *

"It is admitted that Government counsel did not offer in evidence in this case the scalps or the hides of the small-business competitors of General Foods. We do not have in evidence pounds of flesh or buckets of blood. We should not expect the type of evidence that Salome is said to have asked of Herod—the head of John the Baptist on a silver platter.

"In lieu of sanguinary evidence, let us review what the victims of General Foods' price-discrimination practices had to say about this particular brand of competition. * * * We do not have here only one competitor testifying that he has been victimized by a discrimination in price, but we have substantially all of respondent's competitors on the west coast testifying that they have been victimized. * * *

"I believe it is obvious that the use by General Foods of these deals not only resulted in a reasonable probability that competition in these Western State was injured but on the basis of the present record the Commission could reasonably find that competition was injured in fact. * * *

"The Robinson-Patman Act promotes hard, fair competition. For illustration, General Foods, the dominant seller, encountered a degree of competition on the west coast. Competition is vitalized by any one or more of the following: (1) lowering prices; (2) raising quality; or (3) better selling methods. General Foods chose to use a deal offer which was in fact a price reduction. But did this Goliath march bravely on the field of battle and compete with these little Davids by making this deal available to all of its customers? That would have been a choice by General Foods for hard and fair competition between General Foods and the small-business competitors. But General Foods did not so choose. It chose instead to have its customers in the other sections of the country, who did not enjoy the fruits resulting from this competition by the small competitors, to be charged higher prices so that General Foods would have a war chest to beat down the small-business competition. For General Foods—it was soft competition. For the small competitors—it was unfair competition. * * *

"If the dominant seller continues to suppress its smaller competitors and continues to obtain by means of price discriminations a larger and larger share of the market, the probable result would be a monopoly and then perhaps a Sherman Act case for dissolution. * * * It is the duty of the Commission to act in the incipiency of the monopolistic tendencies before the monopoly matures and a dissolution suit is the only effective remedy."

Despite the strong showing thus made in that case of the need for the Federal Trade Commission to act in stopping a monopolistic practice before it blossoms into full flower, it under the present administration refused to act. Now that failure is bad enough, but the Attorney General's report adds insult to that injury, because at page 163 in reference to the Attorney General's committee there appears the statement: "All but a few members believe that the Federal Trade Commission's General Foods decision reflects a sound and accurate reading of the (Robinson-Patman) act." Even while the Attorney General's report was in preparation, the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Mead's Fine Bread* v. *Moore* (348 U. S. 115) upheld the Robinson-Patman Act and condemned price discrimination in a situation far less aggravated than the one that was before the Federal Trade Commission in the General Foods case. From that set of facts it is not difficult for anyone to see that the report of the Attorney General's committee, and particularly that part of it dealing with price discrimination, proposes a weakening of the sections of our antitrust laws directed against price discrimination.

At page 177 the report of the Attorney General's committee disapproves of another section of the Robinson-Patman Act. That section is known as the quantity-limit proviso. It authorizes and empowers the Federal Trade Commission to take action against price discriminations based upon quantity discounts, but only after the Commission finds as a fact that the challenged discount system is unjustly discriminatory or promotive of monopoly. Yet the Attorney General's committee in its report at page 177 states: "We deplore this singling out and penalizing of the quantity-discount system." In other words, this Attorney General's committee, composed for the most part of lawyers and economists who make their livelihoods representing private monopolies, strongly recommends against a law designed to prohibit practices unjustly discriminatory and promotive of monopoly.

At page 181 the report of the Attorney General's committee contains the statement: "This committee approves the result of the Standard Oil decision." What is referred to there is a decision in the case of the *Standard Oil Company of Indiana* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (340 U. S. 231) in which it was held that the antitrust laws should not be construed as prohibiting the Standard Oil Co. from practicing discriminations promotive of monopoly when the Standard Oil Co. could show that in its discrimination in price it was meeting competition in good faith. Now briefly that means simply this—the giant Standard Oil Company of Indiana was thus licensed to discriminate in price even though it would have the effect of driving out of business a small independent businessman who was trying to serve his customers at a low nondiscriminatory price. I have introduced in the House a bill, H. R. 11, and Senator KEFAUVER has introduced in the Senate a bill, S. 11, to close up the loophole in the antitrust laws which was found by the Court to exist when it decided the Standard Oil case. We are hopeful of favorable action on that pending legislation at this session of Congress. However, we find that this Attorney General's committee instead of supporting us in our fight against monopoly in that respect is actually approving of the loophole found in our antitrust laws by the Court when it decided the Standard Oil case.

In 1936 when Congress was considering antidiscrimination legislation it found that many devices were being used by large sellers and buyers to effect discriminations. Not all of those devices resulted in direct price discriminations. Some took the form of bogus brokerage allowances. Others took the form of allowances for advertising and other services. Subsection (a) of section 2 of the Robinson-Patman Act was designed to prohibit direct price discriminations. It was not tailored to challenge indirect price discriminations. Subsections (c), (d), and (e) of section 2 of the Robinson-Patman Act were tailored to stop harmful indirect price discriminations. For example, we learned during the course of our investigations in 1935 and 1936 that the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. had employed the practice of using one of its employees as a purchasing agent and in demanding that sellers from whom it bought allow that employee a brokerage fee of 5 percent on all the purchases made by the A. & P. Those demands were based upon the claim of A. & P. that the action of its employee, the purchasing agent, saved some of the sellers the time and trouble of looking up one of the regular brokers to handle the transactions between the seller and the buyer. Consequently, A. & P. claimed that its employee, its purchasing agent, was rendering a service to the seller and should be paid for it in the form of a brokerage allowance. The net result was a discrimination in favor of A. & P. of about 5 percent on its purchases. Hence

Congress enacted section 2 (c) of the Robinson-Patman Act, commonly known as the brokerage section, prohibiting outright the payment of brokerage under such circumstances. The report of the Attorney General's Committee at page 188 recommends that section 2 (c) of the law be changed so that a seller may be permitted to pay brokerage fees to any buyer when it is claimed that such buyer has rendered services to the seller. In effect the report recommends that we return to the dark ages antidating the Robinson-Patman Act and the nefarious practices of the A. & P. Co. of that date. Likewise the report commencing at page 189 undertakes a discussion of subsection (d) and (e) of section 2 of the Robinson-Patman Act, which discussion leads to the statement on page 191 that "the Committee disapproves the present disparity in the statutory consequences which attach to economically equivalent business practices." Following that the suggestion is made that those indirect price discriminatons be made subject to the law in the same way as the direct price discriminations.

One of the most devastating blows dealt to antitrust legislation in recent years was a holding by the Supreme Court in the case brought by the Federal Trade Commission against the Automatic Canteen Co. of America, in which that company had been charged with knowingly inducing and receiving preferred treatment not accorded to its competitors by sellers from whom it purchased merchandise. In that case the Trade Commission had charged, proven, and found that the effect of the practice of the Automatic Canteen Co. substantially lessened competition and was promotive of monopoly. Yet, because of a technical defect in the law, the United States Supreme Court failed to affirm the Commission's decision. The holding of the Court in that case has opened the way for huge buying combinations, such as Sears, Roebuck & Co., Safeway Stores, Inc., the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., and others, to engage in practices promotive of monopoly without anyone being able to turn to a law that can be used to stop them. Yet the Attorney General's committee, in its report at page 196, has the audacity to say: "We approve the Automatic Canteen decision." Perhaps it should be noted in passing that the attorney for the Automatic Canteen Co. in that case is the present Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission. He is also a member of the Attorney General's committee. Therefore, perhaps one should not wonder that the decision in the Automatic Canteen case has been so favorably regarded by that committee.

The Attorney General's committee has singled out price fixing through the use of delivered pricing system as a special pet that it seeks to protect from the application of the antitrust laws. In that connection I cite pages 209–219. On page 219 the committee takes the position that our antimonopoly laws should not be used against price fixing through the use of delivered pricing systems "unless the elements of conspiracy appear." At pages 214 and 215 of the report the committee cautions against the giving of very much weight to evidence of the conduct of corporations as circumstantial evidence to prove the existence of "the elements of conspiracy." Moreover, at page 212 of the report, in an effort to justify its criticism of a case brought a few years ago against price fixing through the use of delivered pricing systems, omitted a discussion of a vital factual situation involved in the case in question. The case referred to is the *Rigid Steel Conduit Case* (168 F. 2d 175, 336 U. S. 956). What the report fails to point out regarding that case is that the Federal Trade Commission made findings of fact to the effect that the delivered pricing system as used was destructive of competition and promotive of monopoly. The Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court of the United States affirmed that finding of fact.

At page 377 of the report, a recommendation is made for the removal of the mandatory threefold damage provision from the antitrust laws. Therefore, the report recommends softening the penalties for violations of our antitrust laws. Also at page 350 a recommendation is made for a maximum fine of only $10,000 for a violation of the antitrust laws, which is only 20 percent of the maximum fine recently approved by the House of Representatives as the penalty for such violations.

While the report of the Attorney General's Committee throughout a discussion covering 385 pages presents arguments, conclusions and recommendations for weakening the antitrust laws as to big corporations, it nevertheless, on page 304, presents recommendations for strengthening the antitrust laws for use against organized labor.

Likewise, I find on page 310 a recommendation by the Attorney General's Committee that laws passed by the Congress to assist farmers and to permit them to engage in cooperative enterprises for the marketing of their products should be strictly construed as exceptions from the antitrust prohibitions. In fact, there it is stated: "These statutory exceptions should not reduce antitrust prohibitions to a ghostly residuum."

As to the big corporations, the recommendations add up to a protection from competition and to a freedom from the rule of law which restrains the abuse to great aggregations of economic power. As to small business, labor, and farmers, the recommendations are to make these groups open targets for the abuse of monopoly power, and to enlarge the antitrust laws against the organized efforts of two of the groups, labor and farmers, by which these segments of our population have in the past sought some measure of protection from the abuses of the big corporations.

---

## ASIAN-AFRICAN CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on April 18, in Bandung, Indonesia, representatives of three-fifths of the world's population will gather together the first world conference of free nations representing the colored peoples of Asia and of Africa. The United States naturally has not been invited. This is an Asian-African Conference. But I believe that someone from the United States should be at that conference, unofficially, of course, but nevertheless as a person of good will. Other nations not invited are sending representatives as observers. The conference is of such earthshaking importance that close to 40 members of the press, radio, and television of the United States are already on their way for a meeting within the next few days. I requested the administration that we send an all-American team as observers, spectators, visitors, ambassadors of good will, whatever you want to call them. The Department of State did not agree with my proposal. While they were not opposed to the conference, yet their attitude was one of benevolent indifference. I want to very frankly say that I do not believe that we or any country is strong enough to be indifferent to a conference representing three-fifths of the earth's population. Therefore, I am going to this conference, at my own expense, entirely unofficially. I hope that my presence there as an American and above all as a member of the colored peoples of the United States will be of some value for the peace, understanding, and strengthening of brotherhood of our world.

This conference might well mark the most important event of this century. Even if nothing is accomplished by their coming together for the first time in the history of the world, these people will represent a tremendous event.

It is estimated that at least 1,000 people will attend the conference as delegates or correspondents. This estimate is based on the expectation that each delegation will consist of a maximum of 20 persons and that about 400 correspondents will attend.

The conference at Bandung, which is now officially called the Asian-African Conference, instead of the Afro-Asian Conference, will tackle many problems of a comprehensive nature. As listed in the joint communique issued at the close of the conference at Bogor, the main purposes of the Asian-African Conference are:

(a) To promote good will and cooperation between the nations of Asia and Africa, to explore and advance their common interests, and to establish and further friendliness and neighborly relations; (b) to consider social, economic, and cultural problems and relations of the countries represented; (c) to consider problems of special interest to Asian and African peoples, for example, those affecting national sovereignty and of racialism and colonialism; (d) to view the position of Asia and Africa and their peoples in the world of today and the contribution they can make to the promotion of world peace and cooperation.

Section (d), above, has been cited by Prime Minister Ali Sastroamidjojo as the major objective of the Asian-African Conference.

### BACKGROUND OF THE ASIAN-AFRICAN CONFERENCE

The preliminary conference at Bogor and the impending conference at Bandung are mainly the brain children of Premier Sastroamidjojo, who attended the first conference of the five so-called Colombo Powers—India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, and Indonesia—in Ceylon last spring and proposed then that a conference of the Asian and African nations be held to consider the major problems confronting the areas. His proposal was endorsed by the other four premiers, and it was agreed that a preliminary conference would be held at Bogor in Indonesia to plan the major aspect of the larger one.

At Bogor only three formal sessions, lasting a day and a half altogether, were held. The premiers had to decide which countries to invite to the Asian-African Conference, and what would be the general scope of the conference. The meeting at Bogor was necessarily brief since the prime ministers had urgent commitments in their own countries.

President Soekarno keynoted the Bogor Conference and voiced the hopes of Indonesia as follows:

The nations of Asia have awakened after centuries of domination by foreign powers. I hope that all in Asia, without exception, will now be free to shape their own destiny

and, by switching over from a passive to an active role, play a part in directing the course of world history into the channels of peace and human welfare.

International reactions to the Bogor Conference and the forthcoming one at Bandung have varied from enthusiastic endorsement and support to suspicion and disapproval. The following comments made by one Western observer—Frank Jordan, of United Press—are especially noteworthy:

Indonesia joined the major league of diplomacy in December. * * * She had pushed herself to the forefront in the field of foreign relations by sponsoring two major conferences. * * * The two conferences illustrate how far Indonesia has progressed in the field of foreign relations since the Dutch relinquished control over the island chain 5 years ago. With the exception of India, no other nation recently independent has made such progress in foreign relations in such a short time. * * * The achievement has been all the more remarkable because, unlike the British in India, the Dutch did not train Indonesians in the art of diplomacy. The Indonesians had to learn for themselves. * * *

Indonesia has not been wavering or hesitant in making known her views; she has a policy for the struggle between East and West. It is embodied in her independent foreign policy. It calls for strict neutrality between East and West and a constant attempt to lessen the tension between the Western Powers and the giants of communism. Because of this policy, Indonesia has come under fire from both extremes.

Shortly after he returned to India from the Bogor Conference, Indian Prime Minister Nehru made an official statement in which he said:

The Asian-African Conference is not aimed against any other country or group of nations and is not intended to form a bloc. It represents the urge for self-expression and desire to know each other better and to cooperate with each other in the tremendous tasks which these countries have in common. In order to succeed in these tasks peace is an imperative necessity.

By way of further clarification of the purposes of the conference and to dispel the apparent misgivings of some Western leaders regarding it, Premier Sastroamidjojo had made many official statements at press conferences and on other occasions. Regarding the assumption in some circles that the conference might develop into a regional rival of the United Nations, he stated that this assumption was wrong, adding that the aims of the conference were in line with those of the U. N. As to the five principles of coexistence outlines in the treaty between India and China and the relation this matter had to the Asian-African Conference the Indonesian Prime Minister said that these principles were not discussed at the Bogor Conference but that this question would probably be dealt with in the Asian-African Conference. The five principles are: (i) mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty, (ii) mutual nonaggression, (iii) mutual noninterference in each other's internal affairs, (iv) equality and mutual benefit, and (v) peaceful coexistence.

Premier Sastroamidjojo has also stated officially that too many people tend to believe that anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism are merely Communist slogans and that placing emphasis on those principles indicates a pro-Communist attitude. This belief is very erroneous and ignores the reality and intensity of the feelings of the masses of people of Asia and Africa. These nations of Asia and Africa that have only recently emerged from colonial status into independence are anxious to see the last vestiges of colonialism eradicated from their areas. This desire exists apart from any aspects of the present cold war. It is therefore wrong to anticipate that the conference will develop into any alinement against or for any bloc in the world.

Mr. Mohammed Ali, Pakistan's Prime Minister, said shortly after the Bogor Conference that he hoped the results of the forthcoming Asian-African Conference would have the same world impact as those of the Colombo powers meeting last April on the Geneva Conference on Indochina, Reuters reports from Karachi. In his monthly broadcast to the nation, he said the conference to be held in Indonesia next April was "unique in composition and importance. It is the first attempt of its kind at promoting cooperation and understanding among countries of Africa and Asia."

"It is high time that the Asian nations settle their own problems without Western interference," observed Sao Hyun Kio, Burmese Minister for Foreign Affairs, in a statement to newsmen in Calcutta on his way home from London recently. He is of the opinion that the Asian-African Conference should help the people of those countries to understand each other and come more closely together.

COUNTRIES INVITED TO ATTEND THE CONFERENCE

As announced after the Bogor Conference it was agreed among the five Colombo Premiers that the conference at Bandung in April should have a broad and geographical basis and that all countries in Asia and Africa which have independent governments should be invited. With minor variations and modifications of this basic principle, they decided to invite the following countries: Afghanistan, Cambodia, Central African Federation, China, Egypt, Ethiopia, the Gold Coast, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Nepal, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Vietnam—North, Vietnam—South, and Yemen, in addition to the five sponsoring countries.

Why is not the United States sending observers or spectators or visitors to this conference? Is it because we do not want to be anywhere that Red China is? If so, then we might as well transfer the Great Wall of China to our own country and isolate ourselves from the rest of the world. The countries of Asia and Africa do not approve of communism nor of Red China. But Red China is an important country in their part of the world, and it is going to be a part of this conference and other conferences even though the people attending do not believe in its philosophy. We cannot afford, therefore, to stay away from meetings because 1 out of 30 of the nations is a country to whose philosophy we are diametrically opposed.

Are we staying away from the conference because we are afraid of what Red China will try to do? Most assuredly Red China is going to try to manipulate the conference to sell a bill of goods for communism. But fear on our part of such a propaganda move will not be the counterpropaganda necessary. Many countries friendly to us, notably the Philippines, will be present. They will assuredly stand up to present the view of democracy. Somewhere at that conference there should be members of the United States Government showing by their presence that this country is sympathetic to the aims for peace of the peoples of Africa and Asia. Showing by our presence that we are not committed to a foreign policy that is one way for the Western World and another way for the Eastern World. Let us also not fear that Red China will be able to so dominate the conference that it will impose the philosophy of communism on other countries. In a speech delivered before members of the University Women's Club on Wednesday, March 16, the Indonesian Ambassador to the United States said:

The form of government and the way of life of any one country should in no way be subject to interference by another by the conference discussions.

He said that this point had been agreed on by the Prime Ministers of the five sponsoring powers. The Ambassador stated further that—

Any view expressed at the conference by one or more of the participating countries would not be binding on, nor be regarded as accepted by any of the others unless the latter so desire.

Surely, we are not using as an excuse that we were not invited, for we have sent observers through the years to many conferences to which we were not invited. At our own Inter-American Conference held last fall many countries of Asia sent observers although they were not invited. Australia for instance is not invited, but the leader of the Labor Party, Dr. Herbert Evatt in Canberra, on March 21 said:

There is an urgent need to exchange visits between Asian and Australian peoples on every level.

He announced that he would have his own observers at the Asian-African Conference in Indonesia.

I firmly believe that greetings should be sent from the President of the United States, greetings of good will. It would take away some of the propaganda sting of the presence of Red China. For this, the world's greatest democracy to at least extend its best wishes to the 2 billion people represented at Bandung. When the SEATO Conference was held in Bangkok last month, we as one of the signatories did send greetings to the Bandung Conference. The CIO, should send greetings, for they already have made a very positive statement in connection with the general aims of the conference.

Officers of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial

Organizations concerned with international affairs met February 25 at the Mayflower Hotel and issued a statement "opposing reduction in our national armaments and weakening of our national strength just as we oppose the administration failure to provide for an adequate economic aid program to the friendly peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America."

Heading the respective delegations were President George Meany, of the AFL, and President Walter P. Reuther, of the CIO. They were accompanied for the CIO by Jacob Potofsky, chairman of the CIO international committee; CIO Vice President Frank Rosenblum; Arthur J. Goldberg, CIO general counsel; Victor G. Reuther, director of the CIO international affairs department; and George L-P Weaver, assistant to CIO secretary-treasurer, James B. Carey. For the AFL: William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers; David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers; William McSorley, president of the International Union of Wood, Wire, and Metal Lathers; Lee Minton, president of the Glass Bottle Blowers Association; and Jay Lovestone, secretary of the AFL free trade union committee.

The statement issued in the names of Presidents Meany and Reuther follows:

American labor is proud of its support of free-trade unions in such colonial countries as Tunisia and Morocco, whose aspirations and allegiance to the cause of freedom stand in shining contrast to the shabby colonialist policies of French imperialism. American labor has consistently supported the concept of technical and economic aid for the less developed countries in Asia and Africa, and we call for further effective aid in these areas.

The Americans for Democratic Action have sent very positive greetings to the conference:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED MARCH 20, 1955, AT 80TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

The Asian-African Conference presents an opportunity to give encouragement to the uncommitted nations which have taken the initiative in convening the meeting, and to other democratic forces which will be represented there. In addition to the friendly greetings already dispatched by the SEATO powers, our Government should, before the meeting convenes, make clear its position on the vital issues to be considered there.

The United States should reiterate its firm opposition to the continuation of colonialism and imperialism; its intention to assist the new nations to make rapid economic and political progress; and its endorsement of their right to play their part in the solution of world problems. The United States should make clear that it not only opposes communism but also fights for progressive goals, that it is not wedded to the support of reactionary elements in Asia, Africa, or any other part of the world, and that it seeks no dominion for itself.

By so doing, the United States will recognize the intensity of the feelings of the masses of people in Asia and Africa, to whom anticolonialism and opposition to Apartheid and other forms of racial discrimination are vital principles, and to whom anticommunism and the democratic way of life are still slogans without significance in their struggle for freedom and justice. It should help them to understand that international communism is the most menacing new thrust of colonialism, and endangers the national aspirations of all free peoples. Thereby it can strengthen the democratic elements at the conference, and limit the power of the Communist representatives to distort its position and to influence the conference toward alinement with the Communist world.

I have before me a very fine letter coming from 16 outstanding American citizens. A group of 14 leading figures in the fields of science, religion, and literature, including Nobel peace prize winner, Emily G. Balch, and Nobel prize novelist, Pearl S. Buck, has forwarded a letter to Premier Ali Sastroamidjojo expressing the hope that the prospective meeting with other Asian and African leaders will fulfill his highest expectations.

The text of the letter is as follows:

We hope your prospective meeting with other Asian and African leaders will fulfill your highest expectations. Many people in the world are in desperate need, many are full of fear, many are zealous for partisan causes. Amid the pressures and perplexities of this situation, we write to urge upon you, not caution but fearlessness, not calculation but wisdom, not effusion but discipline, not a partisan program but the development of universal ideals.

We shall be watching you, because any solution you discover should help us all. The world is tired of oppression, dogma, and war. It is tired of the efforts of various governments to dominate, or to build defensive associations. We count upon you to develop independent solutions—to enunciate the principles of a new society.

Deeper than the need for bread among starving people is the need for a new confidence in man—the confidence upon which democratic institutions can be established, the confidence upon which liberating philosophies can be developed, the confidence upon which men can aspire toward economic brotherhood.

Because of great wealth, our own country continues in ancient superstitions which you can no longer afford to tolerate. You are aware of our weakness—our people in large measure still adhere to political, religious, and economic institutions based upon survival interests rather than upon fulfillment. Survival is important, but survival is not growth. Survival effort breeds conflict, division, and stagnation. In contrast, evolution and progress depend primarily upon a capacity of energy to integrate and harmonize—to fulfill potentials.

The way of Caesar, of grasping for survival strength, is failing in Moscow and Washington as it has in Rome. We have need that you shall be the Asokas to reintegrate our world into a community of love, a matrix in which people of understanding, of technical skill, and of artistic genius may mature.

Signatories of the letter are: Emily G. Balch, Nobel peace prize winner; Roger Baldwin, American Civil Liberties Union; Pearl S. Buck, Nobel prize novelist; Henry Hitt Crane, Methodist minister; Kermit Eby, sociologist, University of Chicago; Henry Pratt Fairchild, sociologist, New York University; S. Ralph Harlow, professor of religion, Smith College; James Hupp, dean, West Virginia Wesleyan; Homer Jack, minister and author; Philip Mayer, minister; Lewis Mumford, philosopher; Howard Thurman, dean, Boston University; and David Rhys Williams, minister and author.

We might as well face the truth that we have no foreign policy for Asia and Africa. The only thing we are stumbling around with is the slogan "Let's stop communism." If communism is defeated the West will thrive and go forward. But if communism is defeated what will happen to Asia and Africa? Asia and Africa will still be confronted with its problems of colonialism, illiteracy, hunger, and disease. The main problem in the eyes of the East is not communism but is strictly economic. I do not for one moment advocate that we cast aside our fight against communism. It should be pushed forward, relentlessly. But I do say, very emphatically, that fighting communism and fighting communism alone is not going to get us allies and win us friends in Asia and Africa. I gravely doubt whether we can continue much longer as a first-class power without the peoples of those two vast continents on our side. Marquis Childs on March 12 wrote:

The United States lacks an adequate plan to stop Red subversion by economic development. Our plans for a big Asian program were repudiated by Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey. Our stress has been shifted to military aid.

The people of Asia cannot understand why Formosa, with a population of 8 million got $90 million, while Indonesia with 80 million people only got $7 million. They cannot understand why Pakistan, with 75 million people got $70,800,000, while India with 356 million people received only $84,500,000. To many Members of Congress this seems perfectly logical to help those who are standing with us. But to Asians, in the great uncommitted countries of India, Burma, Ceylon, and Indonesia they are taking literally what we say about wanting to help all free countries. Therefore, this has the look of rank discrimination. The question being asked is this: "Is your aid really to help underdeveloped peoples raise their standard of living, or is it a carrot being held out to persuade us to go along with your system of military alliances?"

Donald Grant, writing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, March 13, had this to say:

The peoples of Asia and Africa are now clamoring to be admitted to the fraternity of modern mankind.

Membership in this fraternity is recognized by the fact that members wear decent clothes, have medical attention when they are ill, know how to read and write, have enough to eat, and an adequate shelter over their heads.

Nonmembership is clearly recognized, also—by the all-too-familiar patterns in the underdeveloped areas of the world: poverty, disease, illiteracy, and the constant, burning insult of the white European's—and American's—vastly superior power.

Communism represents the back door of admission to the fraternity of modern mankind; guardian of the front door—as the Asians and Africans see it—is the United States of America.

All of the Asians and the Africans—and the Middle Easterners and Latin Americans—who are now outsiders—are determined to enter the great fraternity of modern mankind, by the front door if it is opened, by the back door if need be.

Yet, despite all this, the peoples from the East in the United Nations continue to vote with the United States. The past year 34 times they voted on our side.

While it is true they voted 27 times on the side of Russia most of those votes were on the question of colonialism. In other words, if the United States had taken a strong stand against colonialism they would have voted with us even with those 27 votes that they cast on the side of Soviet Russia.

Writing from Jakarta, Indonesia, January 17 and 19 of this year, Joseph Alsop expressed many keen insights, mainly about the Indonesian people but applicable to the whole picture in the East and in Africa:

> The fact remains that there is little in the picture here to justify the pessimism about the Indonesian future that is so often voiced in Washington. On the contrary, if world communism is not flabbily permitted to take over the rest of Asia there is every reason to feel hopeful about this remarkable new nation of 80 million people. Here in Indonesia, just as much as in Thailand, the political tidal wave started by the Communist victory in Indochina is the great future danger. Halt the wave now, and the Communist task here is all but hopeless. Let the wave roll, and Indonesia will eventually be engulfed.

And so will the rest of Asia and the rest of Africa.

How can we stop this tidal wave. Assuredly, not through force alone. But most assuredly to help solve the unsolved problems of the Asian revolution.

First, let us consult with the Asian and African nations on every aspect of our Eastern policy. This means a complete revaluation of the importance of the East in world politics. We can hope to achieve the solution of their problems only by establishing a relationship of full equality. Even when we proffer aid we must not seek to dictate, although, naturally, we have the right to withhold aid if certain fundamental terms are unattainable.

Second, recognize that the social and political changes in the East mean more than simply supporting a nation against communism. The nationalist revolution of the East cannot succeed without, at the same time, being an economic revolution.

Third, supply adequate assistance for social change. How stupid it is for us to say that we can afford $100 billion a year for armaments but not a few billion for building independent and stable economies that can withstand the lure of the slogans of communism and the menace of Soviet aggression. Such a program would be compatible with the needs of our American economy. Vast new markets for our products would be opened up in the undeveloped areas of the world. Increasing the productivity of the lands of the East by grants-in-aid and loans would lay the basis for a permanent independent demand for our own products.

Fourth, we should channel as much of our aid as possible into international organizations. We know the United Nations has a limited role, but we should seek to build its strength through a concrete demonstration of our belief in its principles. The people of the East in turn would know the source of this aid and would appreciate the demonstration of our belief in internationalism without strings.

Fifth, we should stage an all-out offensive through public and private funds against economic exploitation, illiteracy, poverty, social degradation, forced labor, unemployment, lack of labor standards, housing, sanitation, and medical care.

Lastly, we should sell—and I mean sell in the Madison Avenue advertising concept of the word—sell the fact that this is not a white man's country. The United States of America is the only power in Western civilization that has a very large minority of colored people, including our Puerto Ricans, Mexicans, and Negro people. There are 23 million American citizens who are colored, who are a racial link between this country and the people of Asia and Africa. Let the people of Asia and Africa know that we are rapidly eradicating second-class citizenship. Let them know what we have done. Let them know, specifically, what we are going to do and let them know we are going to do it as soon as we can.

Let us not forget that Soviet Russia is an Eastern power. Therefore, the people of the East have an emotional drift toward Soviet Russia. We can stop that emotional drift by pointing out that here in the United States full and complete equality is the immediate aim for all of our citizens.

So as I leave for Bandung, I ask your prayers. I ask your best wishes. I ask that God may give us the strength to make democracy work here at home in every way so that we will have in Asia and Africa, brethren of peace and good will who believe in the United States because we believe in them.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman from New York has rendered a service in directing attention to the Bandung Conference. We should all be grateful for the enlightenment he has given us on the background in which these discussions will take place. I have not studied the State Department's conclusions and do not wish to express a view on that point. From what the gentlemen has said, I judge that they have advised against the presence of observers, official or unofficial. I think we could all agree, however, that there should be great interest on the part of the American people in what the Bandung Conference produces.

The gentleman is right in focusing attention upon the aspirations of the people of Africa and Asia and their identity of interest; and it is an entirely logical thing that has taken place as they come together as people who have opposed colonialism. We must continue to fight the propaganda of the Communists which seeks to equate colonialism with Western democracy. We ought to accept the tough task of acquainting the people of Africa and Asia with the ideals and policies of the Western World and to express the sympathy that we of the West have with their aspirations. There will be at Bandung more friends of democracy and of the West than there will be enemies.

Mr. POWELL. That is right.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am not fearful of what the Red Chinese will do as they bring their sordid message to the representatives that are gathered there. They cannot succeed.

I was quite impressed with what a citizen of a young nation in Asia said when asked by a Westerner, "What do the people of your country expect of the United States?" He lives in a country that has a food deficit and he put it like this. He said, "Respect and rice, and in that order."

So we are challenged to find a balance between those two interests, of supplying economic help which deals with the rice and of supplying encouragement and aid and sympathy in a vastly more important area of life. When those things are understood and when we find effective means of making them understood, we will be able to outdo the Communists in every ideological battle. The gentleman is quite right in saying we must take an interest in what comes out of Bandung. It is essential that we follow those discussions carefully, and I hope that the executive department will make their facilities available to bring to the Congress a full report.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. POWELL. I thank the distinguished Member of the Arkansas delegation for his very, very fine comment.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. SAYLOR. I commend the gentleman from New York on his excellent statement. I think he is doing the people of this country and the free people of the world a favor by personally going to this great conference as an observer. I commend him for his statement, for undertaking this journey, and join my friend the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] in congratulating the gentleman from New York and I wish him Godspeed on his journey.

Mr. POWELL. The gentleman is very kind. I thank him.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. FASCELL. I would like to add my commendation of the gentleman for personally undertaking to make this trip. I would add additional emphasis to the fact that we must do more than just be interested. We must be positive in our action. We have relied too long on military alliances and economic assistance. Everyone admits that the entire problem is an ideological one, and we, in the United States, must ask ourselves what in the world have we done to capture the minds of men and women throughout the rest of the world.

Mr. POWELL. The gentleman is correct. We have the best ideas in the whole world—it is the idea of democracy. If we would just let it work.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. BOLLING. I, too, would like to commend the gentleman on his very important and useful statement. Other Members have commented on various

aspects of the gentleman's statement, but it seems to me that one of its most important aspects is the fact that the gentleman has highlighted for the country and for the Congress the fact that the anti-Communist foreign policy of this Government in recent years has been largely a sterile and negative policy of reliance to too great an extent on purely military means. I think it is evident, if anything can be, that that policy has not been a great success and that only through a more positive and effective policy which will appeal not only to the bellies of people, but to their minds and hearts and spirits can this country hope to succeed in winning to the side of freedom and maintaining on the side of freedom those 2 billion of people who are now in the process of making their choice between democracy and communism. I thank the gentleman for his effort to make this problem more clear to the country and to the Congress.

Mr. POWELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I too, would like to commend the distinguished gentleman from New York for his able presentation. More and more the thinking of the Members of this great body is being crystallized in the direction that the gentleman has suggested. Only a short while ago, in recognition of what I believe to be some of the facts, I called the attention of the Congress to the fact that SUNFED, the special United Nations development program for underdeveloped countries has been neglected. I expressed the hope that the administration would do something about it so that we could raise the economic level and standards of living of millions of our friends in these underdeveloped countries, particularly among the peoples of Asia and the colored races who look to us for worldwide leadership and who look to our culture and our ideas. I wish you well on your trip and commend you for your courage.

Mr. POWELL. When the gentleman mentions culture and ideas that is highly significant. The official language of this conference, even though it is to be a Pan-African and Pan-Asian conference, is going to be English. The official language is not Russian.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I realize that. I think that is a significant factor.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. UDALL. I, too, would like to commend the gentleman for his most timely and forceful message. Does the gentleman feel that the State Department still might reverse its position and send an official observer to this conference?

Mr. POWELL. It would be presumptuous to state that for the record here, but off the record I think the State Department is changing and it might even change by next Friday, April 8, although the conference is scheduled to begin on the 18th.

Mr. UDALL. I would like to express the hope that it does change. I think the point has been amply made that we should not fail to show these people the sympathy and understanding which our country feels for them and their causes. The gentleman, I am sure, will convey to them the feelings of our country, but our people should do it officially, too. I think we would be better off, so far as this conference is concerned, if that were the case. I would like to express the hope that there is a reconsideration of this matter by the State Department people.

Mr. POWELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I thank the gentleman for sending a note to my office telling me that he intended to make this address today. I feel he has given tremendous thought to his subject and I, for one, am very glad that I was here to hear him.

Mr. POWELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. Gladly.

Mr. DIXON. I am sure the gentleman will be interested in knowing that the Legislature of the State of Utah has just passed a joint resolution reaffirming equal rights of all citizens of the United States.

Mr. POWELL. Very fine.

Mr. DIXON. With the gentleman's permission I will insert this in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. POWELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include at this point the resolution of the Utah State Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

(The resolution referred to follows:)

Senate Joint Resolution 8

Joint resolution reaffirming equal rights of all citizens of the United States and of Utah and congratulating President Dwight David Eisenhower and Congress and the Supreme Court for accomplishments upon this subject

*Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah:*

Whereas the Government of the United States, through its legislative, judicial, and executive departments, is making great strides toward the fulfillment of the American dream that equal rights be accorded to all citizens of the United States; and

Whereas citizens of so-called minority groups have and are continuing to distinguish themselves in all fields of endeavor, and especially in government, science, art, music, the theater, industry, and in athletic effort; and

Whereas the principles of equal rights, which are declared to be self-evident in our Declaration of Independence, and which are guaranteed by the Constitution of this great country, and which are also stated in the constitution of our own State; and

Whereas America's future greatness may depend in part upon the ability of all of her citizens to harmoniously live and work and fight together to meet the challenges of any foe or adversary, from within or without our shores: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the people of Utah, through their legislature, in session assembled, be cognizant and mindful of the fundamental rights and privileges guaranteed to all citizens of this great State; and be it further

*Resolved,* That President Dwight David Eisenhower, the Congress and the Supreme Court be complimented for the progress which has been realized during the past 2 years to help guarantee and perpetuate, to all citizens, equal rights in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, be it further

*Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be transmitted by the Secretary of State to the President and Vice President of the United States of America, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, and the 4 Members of the congressional delegation from Utah.

## JUSTICE FOR ALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DIGGS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to add my commendation to those of our colleagues who have spoken of our distinguished colleague from New York and commended him for his tremendously significant remarks and his courage in making this momentous trip he is about to undertake.

Mr. Speaker, the principle of justice for all is deeply rooted in the American way of life and guaranteed by the Constitution. Yet the guaranty becomes a gigantic fraud unless our civil rights are fully protected against a powerful antagonist. There is a new eclipse which has begun in Mississippi, and the already limited light of liberty in that ignoble State is growing dimmer and dimmer. Just as darkness ordinarily produces fear, so the unprotected, whether they be inarticulate or vocal, tremble and sweat in anxious concern. Just as darkness ordinarily provides cover for those who would exploit the unprotected, so they grow bolder and bolder in the absence of governmental action.

In the March 22, 1955, edition of Look magazine, the distinguished Pulitzer prize-winning editor of the Greenville, Miss., Delta Democratic Times, Mr. Hodding Carter, graphically lays before the world, for all to see, one of the most revolting pictures ever portrayed on the American scene. It tells the story of so-called citizens' councils, which have been germinated in Mississippi to circumvent the Supreme Court ban on segregation in public schools. It describes the leadership in these councils as otherwise intelligent men who are generally respected in their community, but who are seriously dedicated to a racially separated theory supported for generations by most white southerners. Their only redeeming feature thus far is a nonviolence pact seeking to forestall hotheads.

As these councils expand, however, the burning question is whether they can keep the hotheads out or under control. As the foundation of the segregation walls cracks and crumbles under the weight of its own stupidity; as the forces of the prosegregation movement instinc-

tively stiffens its resistance; as they witness the failures of their mortar and cement to restrengthen the base, in consideration of the combustible material that is being used, the sparks of freedom can ignite a flame that will light up almost every street and countryside in Mississippi and spread its hot fingers into other like areas.

In the meantime, prosegregationists are resorting to a diabolically clever plan of economic, political, and social reprisals against all who dare oppose or expose them. They have compiled a notable array of victories. They were the principal lobbies in the Mississippi Legislature for constitutional amendments to further stifle the Negro vote by requiring more stringent qualifications and to permit the abolition of the State's public-school system to counteract the eventuality of integrated education. They have withdrawn from and refused credit privileges, based on usual good security, to so-called obstinate Negroes, resulting in a long list of individual hardships. They have threatened especially those who are known to be active in the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Mississippi Regional Council of Negro Leadership until many are fearful for their very lives and are forced to use plain envelopes when corresponding to keep from being singled out for financial ruin, and to be cautious about telephone calls, especially in areas where a dial system is not in use.

In addition, the Mississippi Legislature recently passed a resolution which jeopardizes a basic constitutional guaranty by barring antisegregationists from speaking at any State-supported educational institution. These incidents, plus a score more, cause us to believe that the citizens' councils and their counterparts in certain other States, notwithstanding their nonviolence pledges, are at the gatepost, fidgeting nervously and prepared to ride again like their Ku Klux Klan predecessors, kicking up clouds of terror dust.

If their amazing successes continue unabated, if they continue to silence most vocal opposition, drunk with power, they will undoubtedly become more daring and can become instruments of interracial violence. As Hodding Carter states:

> The ingredients are there. The incentive and the incendiary spark are lacking—so far. If and when these should appear, I say, soberly and in warning, that the men in white robes will seize control.

Call it exaggeration if you wish, but these apprehensions are founded upon sad past experiences.

I agreed with Mr. Carter that we cannot be blind to the dilemma of the South today but that the councils' way is not the right way, that it is not American to bully the near-defenseless and the minority of dissenters, that it is not American to invoke the doctrine which recognizes the existence of a master race. The Federal Government by its silence, however, is abdicating its responsibility for the protection of the victims of these aforementioned reprisals.

As an immediate solution, the executive department can, at the direction of the President and through the Attorney General and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, indicate strongly the administration's intolerance of these nefarious practices by a sweeping investigation of the fast-growing anti-Negro citizens' councils in the South, beginning in the State of Mississippi. The Congress of the United States should make a separate inquiry. These actions alone may be an effective deterrent to further misdeeds.

As a long-range solution, I am certain that the examination of facts will inspire them to support various proposals before Congress designed to strengthen the protection of civil rights. We must recognize that the national security and general welfare of our country call for more adequate safeguards of individual rights. As informed people have continually stated, our actions in this area are reflected in the esteem in which America is held by the preponderant darker peoples of the earth.

---

## ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: KEY TO FREEDOM IN ASIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I think the speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] and the colloquy that followed will be important for the people of this country to consider at this point. I think that as a statement of the needs particularly of the people in Asia and as a statement of the problems we have before us now we need to begin the work of trying to meet those needs and to meet those problems. In a moment I would like to suggest some specific things that I would respectfully urge on my colleagues as possible answers to some of the problems in our efforts to meet the needs of the people who are yearning for freedom around the world. Further amplifications of my thoughts on this matter are contained in the current issue of the Reporter magazine.

Mr. Speaker, a vigorous foreign economic program is a vital and essential part of our overall defense against Communist imperialism. The agency administering this effort, the Foreign Operations Administration, is scheduled by law to expire on June 30 of this year—3 short months away.

Despite the pending expiration, no plans for continuing the administration of the essential activities such as technical assistance, which undoubtedly will be continued, has been forthcoming from the administration. Now, I realize that traditionally, specific recommendations regarding these activities have been late in reaching the Congress. However, there is a major difference this year which is that no administrative structure exists or has been proposed for carrying on these programs. What is the effect of this uncertainty?

I am advised that it is having a devastating effect on the efficiency of FOA. Many experienced people are looking elsewhere for jobs. Morale of those remaining is suffering. In general, efficiency is at a low ebb.

This aspect of the morale problem in FOA is added to an already bad personnel situation created by the present Administrator's injection of partisan considerations into all levels of FOA activities.

### THE PORK BARREL

To put it bluntly, political and patronage considerations have had a grievous effect on the operations of FOA.

Last year, I sponsored an amendment to the Mutual Security Act specifically prohibiting the application of political tests to FOA appointments abroad, including technical assistance positions. Despite this legal restriction, FOA filled more jobs by the patronage method in the last half of 1954 than did the entire Departments of Defense, State, Treasury, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare combined. As a matter of fact, about 25 percent of all those given Federal employment under the jobs-for-Republicans program found a haven in Mr. Stassen's supposedly nonpartisan and relatively small agency.

This is not speculation on my part. The details are contained in the February 11 issue of the nonpartisan Congressional Quarterly on the basis of an interview with Charles Willis, patronage aide to the President.

In a 6-month period, FOA found 237 job openings to refer to the Republican National Committee. Furthermore, funds appropriated for economic development and technical assistance have been diverted to pay for observation trips of clubwomen. "Operation Reindeer" sent four prominent women and their husbands to Europe during the Christmas season of 1953—at a cost of $19,000—to observe the Christmas package program.

"Operation Crewcut" brought 16 young men into FOA last October to study local investment opportunities around the world. All 16 appointees were cleared with party leadership. At this writing, only three of the young men have been assigned. Thirteen remain on the payroll in Washington. The reason is simple. Small FOA missions abroad fight against the assignment of relatively unnecessary personnel whose salaries will cut into their meager staff allowances. The total cost of this program to date has been close to $60,000 and the only benefit of it seems to have been to the Republican National Committee.

Since political affiliation has become an important criterion for recruitment and promotion, many competent technical and administrative people have left the agency, and those who remain constantly find politics interfering with their work. Efforts to find a Republican for a particular job frequently holds up important projects. It has never been easy to find qualified specialists who are willing to go abroad; the intrusion of partisan considerations makes it even more difficult.

With the shifting of Mr. Stassen to other fields, perhaps we are on the way to a solution of this problem of partisanship in this supposedly nonpartisan aspect of our foreign policy. However, it is apparent that the demise of FOA on

June 30 should be receiving immediate attention. Whatever new organizational structure is determined to handle foreign economic policy and administration should be determined far enough in advance to permit a smooth transition. Action on our part, even today, would require hasty administrative planning. To continue to put it off will cause confusion and waste—yes, waste of taxpayers' money. Since the administration has not seen fit to face up to this problem, I suggest we in the Congress should begin to move now, even though such action on our part is without clear precedent. We did determine that FOA should expire on June 30. The fact that the administration has failed—to this date—to indicate its plans behooves us to begin to move, if necessary, on our own.

With this in mind, I would like to submit some thoughts on what our foreign economic policy should be—particularly with respect to southeast Asia—and also to submit some thoughts on what administrative structure seems to be most desirable.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. The gentleman has said that, under the present law, FOA will expire on June 30, 1955. Does the gentleman know what will happen to the FOA personnel now that the FOA offices are being discontinued?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. No. We have not had any recommendations from the executive department. There has been some speculation and some guessing, but no program has been presented in spite of the fact that the administration has been asked repeatedly for suggestions as to what they want after June 30 when FOA expires.

Mr. McCARTHY. I assume we can hope that the new Office of Disarmament will not be used in the same way with respect to political appointments?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I join the gentleman in the very sincere hope that will not happen, and I hope that the Congress will be vigilant in watching this, too.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOLLING. I would like to tie down a little more tightly a couple of things that are implied by the gentleman's statement. I get the impression that it is a well documented fact that the patronage machine of the Republican Party has used the FOA as a choice field?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. BOLLING. I would like to understand more clearly the way in which this operates. Mr. Stassen, of whom the gentleman spoke specifically, was appointed by the President, was he not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. BOLLING. This was a job that required presidential appointment, to be confirmed by the Senate?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That was an appointment that had to be confirmed; yes.

Mr. BOLLING. He was appointed, and confirmed by the Senate. Is there any reason to believe that President Eisenhower, who is obviously responsible for the appointment of Mr. Stassen, has been apprised or should have been aware of the fact that this very important agency is being used as a dumping ground for Republican patronage seekers?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I think there is every reason to believe he was apprised of it and should have known. Last spring the abuses of the agency had become so apparent to most of us that the amendment I mentioned earlier was sponsored to eliminate political tests in FOA. That amendment failed in the House, but was passed in the other body, then it prevailed through conference, and was made the law of the land last summer.

Mr. BOLLING. So, of course, in effect, despite the fact that Mr. Stassen has been the Administrator of this program, the responsibility for this condition cannot be escaped by that person who has the highest executive authority in the land; in other words, the President, in effect, under our Constitution, is responsible for this condition.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is certainly correct.

Mr. BOLLING. I would like to pursue this business about Operation Reindeer and Operation Crewcut a little. What purpose was served by the expenditure of $19,000, which the gentleman points out was spent in Operation Reindeer? What purpose did these prominent Republican women and their husbands in their trip to Europe serve in the interest of the United States?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The ostensible reason for this group of 8 people, 4 couples, going to Europe was to observe the operation of the Christmas package program, a program designed to give Christmas packages in areas where Christmas needs were not being met except as we met them. That was the ostensible purpose. I have not seen any report from this group that would indicate that "Operation Reindeer" was necessary, and it seems to me, knowing the personnel that made up the trip and where they come from and what their occupations and political positions are, that the only real purpose served was patronage for Republicans.

Mr. BOLLING. I thank the gentleman.

Now, one further question. This Operation Crewcut which the gentleman says brought 16 young men into FOA last October to study local investment opportunities around the world, I gather from the title of this "Operation Crewcut," that relatively young people were involved in this.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I think the average age is what I would like to think young, 23 to 40. "Operation Crewcut" was not coined by the gentleman. That was coined in the agency, as I understand it. I do not believe they were all young college people, however.

Mr. BOLLING. Now, these, then, were not people who would necessarily all be fully qualified to study local investment opportunities around the world. I would gather that this was a rather technical, complicated, and difficult problem about which there would be relatively few people who would be most proficient. I got the impression from the gentleman's statement that these people who were sent out to do this very important and perhaps difficult task were not necessarily the best qualified except from the point of view of their politics.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I think there is ample evidence to support that feeling.

Mr. BOLLING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. Of course, any changes would have to be made by the Congress; is that not so?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Yes; that is so.

Mr. MARTIN. Then, if there is any delay, of course, the responsibility is with those in control of the Congress; those who have the program to carry out.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I would reply to the gentleman that traditionally, the Congress, as I understand it, has waited for the recommendations of the Executive in this field before it acts.

Mr. MARTIN. There is no reason why they should, if they felt they had the right answer.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I personally, might agree with the gentleman, but there has been a reluctance to move without some thinking from the agency and from the Executive who have the responsibility for administering the program.

CHINA VERSUS INDIA

Development-loan assistance to Asia is both a necessity and an opportunity for American policy. The final answer to communism is not tactical atomic weapons, but democratic alternative solutions to Asia's economic problems. The contrast is already there—in the respective means by which China and India are trying to catch up with the industrialized nations of the world.

In China, the Communist leaders are trying to squeeze the wherewithal of an overambitious industrialized program out of those who have the least to give—the peasants. That, of course, is exactly what Stalin did in Russia. His Chinese followers face the same stubborn fact he faced. No police state has ever figured out a way to force farmers to grow more food.

In Russia, where the Communists started with food surpluses, it took a generation for Stalin's policies to catch up with his successor, Malenkov, who was fired, in large part, for the failure of the Soviet agricultural program. It should not take nearly as long for Mao Tse-tung, applying Stalin's theories in a country that has long suffered from large food deficits, to produce a severe food crisis in China.

What we know already of the bitterness, oppression, and despair in China is better propaganda for our system than anything the Voice of America may have to say about how wealthy our own farmers are. It is now becoming clear, even to the overseas Chinese scattered throughout southeast Asia, that Communist land reform is strictly a phony, that the tenants who thought they were getting land of their own wound up as sharecroppers for the Government. No wonder the Communists are beginning to complain in their own newspapers about dangerous spontaneous tendencies toward capitalism among the peasants.

The Indian method is to build up the agricultural sector of the economy rather than to exploit it. Nehru's 5-year plan still has a year to run, but it is already possible to talk of its success. Aided by good weather, better fertilizers, more irrigation, some technical advice, and a widening participation in village community projects, India's farmers have already increased grain production by 21 percent, substantially doing away with a deficit that ran close to 5 million tons before the plan got underway. According to a New Delhi dispatch in the New York Times:

It can be said now that India is self-sufficient in food.

Nehru's government still has many problems to face, but it has clearly demonstrated for the rest of Asia to see that a democratic state can make a success of economic development plans.

The nations in the non-Communist crescent of Asia must create the conditions for economic growth—one way or another. And so all of them are watching this competition between India and China.

JAPAN KEY TO A DEMOCRATIC EAST

If we look at Japan, we find that a solution to that nation's economic distress also lies in rapid development of south and southeast Asia. Japan's problem is simple: An island crammed with industrial machinery and skilled workers, it needs markets for what it produces, and has to import a wide variety of food and raw materials. The Japanese would like to increase their trade with us. But even if we had no tariff at all, the United States would be a good market for only a small part of what Japan has to export. The Japanese would like to increase their trade with Red China, too. But here again, the potential amount of such trade has been vastly overrated. The Chinese would certainly be eager to buy what Japan has to sell, but China cannot offer much in return except coal and a few odd commodities like tung oil and hog bristles. Of course, in addition, overriding political considerations dictate against promoting Japanese economic dependency on Red China. What would provide a real answer to Japan's trade problem is the rapid economic development of the rest of Asia.

Thus, considerations of both politics and economics lead us inevitably to the same conclusion: A vigorous program of technical development and loan assitance to Asia should be at the core of United States foreign policy.

THE COLOMBO PLAN

How can the program be carried out? A new and hopeful means is now available to us. The Colombo plan, which was originally a family affair within the British Commonwealth, has now been expanded to take in practically all of non-Communist Asia.

The Colombo plan is not just an idea any more. It is a real meeting place for a dozen national development plans, and, what is more, it is a politically acceptable channel for western assistance in helping the Asian plans to success. The Asians themselves are spending $1.5 billion a year on the Colombo plan, and loans and grants from the United States, Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand have amounted to $1 billion since 1950. Alongside this investment program, there is a thriving program of technical assistance. Five thousand Asians are being trained, and 2,500 British and Commonwealth experts are building dams, making geological surveys, applying the West's skills to the East's problems in a hundred fields.

This existing association of Asian nations could be expanded into a source of investment capital for the entire region with the backing of United States funds. A unilateral United States program might be called imperialism; a multilateral program under U. N. auspices might be sabotaged by Soviet participation. The Colombo plan avoids both dangers.

An idea seems to persist in the present administration that private investors can meet most of the need for capital in the economically underdeveloped areas of the world. It is an attractive idea, but the simple truth is that right here at home, to say nothing of mushrooming Canada, the investor finds more lucrative, less complex, and far safer investment opportunities than are to be found in any underdeveloped area. Foreign countries are now paying us half again as much return on past investments as American citizens are currently investing abroad—despite exhortations and special guaranties of years standing designed to change this situation. I am afraid that the continued efforts by the Government to entice American investors abroad will have little effect. Private investors will go into the less developed areas only after some advance has been made on the basic problems of transportation, communication, and health. For these purposes, some form of public investment is essential. Of course, we should continue to encourage private investors to go abroad, but we should stop closing our eyes to the fact that the private avenue of investment offers little hope in the immediate future.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development does part of this job—the part that a strictly banking operation can appropriately do. The Export-Import Bank exists to promote United States trade rather than investment in other countries; so it too can meet only a limited need on a limited scale.

The proposed International Finance Corporation would be an excellent further step in the right direction. By investing in enterprises that Asians themselves start and manage, helping to get new private industries on their feet, and then selling off its holdings locally, such a corporation could promote industrial development and help create a capital market at the same time. It would, however, leave still unsolved the problem of where money for basic economic development is to come from.

For too many years, our Government has suffered from a dichotomy of thinking in grappling with the whole problem of public investment in less developed areas. Only two forms of assistance have generally been thought feasible: direct grants, which are onerous to the recipients as well as to United States taxpayers; and dollar loans that have to be repaid directly in dollars—a requirement which drastically limits its usefulness in areas with serious dollar shortages.

And yet there are other forms of dollar assistance that could be used. We need to learn to use them in Asia.

Suppose we should adopt a program to help finance a regional development bank under the Colombo plan. The United States could provide the bank with a major share of its initial capital, and loans to the participating countries could then be paid back to the development bank in local currency. This money could then be loaned out again for further development projects. Such scheme would have several advantages:

It would create a long-term revolving fund to meet the need for continuous investment in such fields as public health, education, agriculture, and communications.

It would avoid the immediate difficulty of repayment in dollars.

It would avoid the onus of charity for the recipient and some of the equally onerous giveaway implication for United States taxpayers.

It would clearly indicate a permanent interest on our part in helping Asians to realize their economic aspirations.

WHAT ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE?

Turing to the question of administration, in my opinion, there are a number of reasons why it is desirable to keep the operating parts of an economic program separate from the regular duties of the State Department and the Foreign Service. The diplomatic responsibilities of Foreign Service officers require that they do nothing which could be considered interference in the internal affairs of other countries. They cannot be expected to perform their primary duties effectively while operating a program, even one requested by the participating country, that by its very nature is involved in changing the internal affairs of that country.

But some kind of central direction is required to prevent the administrative difficulties that were encountered by other agencies in this field, particularly the Technical Cooperation Administration. The experience of the TCA indicates that although it is essential to use all the facilities and knowledge of other Government agencies, the program cannot be farmed out section by section to

various old-line agencies—Commerce, Labor, Agriculture, Interior, and so on. Unified administration is essential: The best plan would seem to be a separate agency under an Administrator who is responsible to the Secretary of State.

PROPOSALS

We tend to let ourselves be preoccupied these days with purely military solutions to the problems that beset us—the Koreas, the Indochinas, and the Formosas. But our military actions will secure lasting peace only if in cooperation with our Asian allies, we use the time so acquired to offset the phony but powerful appeal of communism in Asia.

To this end, I propose that the Congress enact the following legislation:

First. Establish a permanent Technical Cooperation and Economic Development Agency under an administrator responsible only to the Secretary of State. Under this plan, economic and technical assistance programs would be separated from military aid activities, which would be transferred to the direct control of the Defense Establishment. Unified administration would be retained and, at the same time, the Secretary of State would retain overall policy direction.

Second. Authorize the continuation of the technical-assistance programs for periods of at least 4 years. Some degree of long-range planning is absolutely essential for any degree of success.

Third. Authorize a regional fund for Asia, loans to be repaid in local currency. The funds should be used to further economic development through an agency like the Colombo plan.

I would like to note that these proposals are within the broad recommendations contained in the report submitted to Congress on March 24, 1955, by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] and a senior member of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]. The one point of difference might be in the administrative arrangements—although that is not entirely so since my proposal would put the policy-making function in the Department of State.

One final point, I believe the Congress should make sure that all the facts about the administration of FOA are brought to light before new funds are appropriated. If we meant what we said last year about keeping politics out of economic and technical assistance, we should impress this attitude upon the new chief of whatever agency is assigned to handle these matters.

Such a program will certainly not solve all our problems. It is only the beginning of a long process. But since so many of the obstacles we face are of our own making, the creation of an effective program in Asia must necessarily begin right here in Washington.

## SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLLING). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

## FEDERAL SCHOLARSHIP AID

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to set up a program of financial aid to students who desire to continue their education after graduation from high school, but are unable to do so for financial reasons. I introduced substantially the same bill in previous Congresses. The need for the legislation is now greater than ever before.

We have reached the point where the Federal Government must take a more active interest in the education of our youth. Many factors have contributed to the situation we now face, but let it be sufficient to say that we must have dynamic leadership in our Nation if we are to successfully overcome the propaganda poison which pours from inside the Iron Curtain.

Dynamic leadership comes from an educated people. This Student Aid Act will assist in the development of the strong and enlightened leadership which we continually need to match the unending flow of words and ideas that communism places before the world in this age of the cold war.

Many of our youth are qualified to accept this challenge and to contribute to providing the leaders we must have. However, they are financially unable to continue their education past high school.

State and local support is often not available to provide these young citizens with the post-high school educational opportunities they desire. Federal funds, such as provided in this bill, are needed to help us solve the problem.

A summary of the provisions of the bill follows:

This bill authorizes annual appropriations beginning fiscal year 1956 for $32 million and increasing each year by $32 million until the fiscal year of 1959 when the authorization will amount to $128 million.

This act, to be known as the Student Aid Act of 1955, provides that this money shall be used for certificates of scholarship awarded to high-school students for pursuit of higher education.

The State quota of these scholarships is determined thusly: One-half of the total number of scholarships shall be allotted among the States in percentages equal to the percentage of the State's high-school graduates as compared to the national total of high-school graduates for the same year; and the remaining one-half is to be allotted in the proportion that the State's population between ages of 19 and 21 bears to the national total population of that same group.

The number of persons aided would depend, of course, upon the amount of money appropriated by Congress.

States desiring to participate in the administration of this scholarship program may do so by establishing a State commission on Federal scholarships. The State commission shall, in accordance with tests prescribed by the Commissioner of Education, make its selection of students on the basis of intellectual capacity and financial need. The scholarship stipend shall be uniform and will not exceed $800 per year. The duration of the scholarship will be a maximum of 4 years. After once being granted a scholarship, a student must, if he or she is to continue receiving the aid, have a continuing financial need, must maintain full-time attendance and must not receive scholarship aid from any other source. Attendance may be at a higher institution either in the United States or in another country, if the applicant is acceptable to the institution.

The bill further authorizes $10 million for the insurance of loans made to students in higher institutions of learning. No loan in excess of $600 shall be covered by this insurance in any one year nor an aggregate unpaid balance exceeding $2,400 for the entire period of the scholarship. Eligibility of students for such loans under this act depends upon full-time educational work, the signing of a note or some other type of agreement which is payable by installments which will begin the fourth year after a student ends full-time study and requires full payment plus interest within 6 years after the first payment is made.

Interest rates are set at 1 percent per annum until the first installment is paid and thereafter at a rate of not to exceed 2 percent per annum until the entire loan is repaid. The students are given the operation of accelerating their payments if they so desire.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] may proceed on his special order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

## ETHICAL FINANCIAL PRACTICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, on March 23 I addressed the House on the subject of ethical financial practices.

I said then and I repeat now that my interest in this matter arises out of a growing concern about the milking and liquidation of a considerable number of American businesses and industries. And most importantly, the potential danger to our defense production and to our national security.

On March 28, my able colleague and good friend from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement in which he sug-

gested that I was either knowingly or unknowingly being used by one side in the dispute which surrounds a company in my district known as the Niles-Bement-Pond Co.

I respectfully urge my colleague from Colorado to again read my remarks.

I have no interest of any kind or character in the Niles-Bement-Pond Co.

I do not own one share of stock in it and never have.

I have never had any association with its management, and as a matter of fact, I know very few of the individuals in the management personally and none of them intimately.

This is also true with respect to the Penn Texas Corp.

I still believe that my position is right, and I have received a large number of communications in the form of letters and telegrams from businessmen, from shareholders, and from employees approving my action.

It is interesting to note that only two adverse communications were received by me.

I am glad that the gentleman from Colorado has given us some information about the Penn Texas Corp. and its officers. He has helped to clear up some of the obscurity about which I complained.

I tried to obtain such information from the usual business sources but I was not able to get any more than I reported to the Hcuse when I made my statement.

During the past week, representatives of the Penn Texas Corp. have called upon me and have assured me that if their group wins control of Niles-Bement-Pond Co., there will be no milking or liquidation of that corporation. I am happy to receive this assurance and I make this statement as a matter of record on the floor of this House today.

I accept this statement as one made in good faith and I know it will be good news to the employees of this company, to the individual shareholders and generally to the citizens in the greater Hartford area.

Perhaps my friend from Colorado will better understand my motives when I tell him that in Torrington, Conn., a group headed by Frederick Richmond, to which I made reference in my speech of a week ago, took over the Hendey Machine Co. in 1952.

At the time of this takeover, the people of Torrington and the employees of the company were publicly assured there would be no milking and no liquidation. However, in 1954, 2 years after the takeover, the company was liquidated and hundreds of employees in that city were thrown out of work.

Not long ago, a company known as Peck, Stow & Wilcox Co., of Southington, Conn., was absorbed by this same Richmond group. As of today it appears that it is about to be liquidated and as with the Hendey Co., at the time of the takeover, there were assurances given the employees and the people of Southington that Peck, Stow & Wilcox Co. would not be liquidated.

This is the kind of thing that I do not want to see happen again. And it is precisely the kind of situation that prompted me to make my speech on the floor of this House.

I have also been assured in writing by representatives of the Penn Texas Corp. that there is no money in the Penn Texas operation from other than the free world. I am happy to make this a part of my report today. I did not carelessly raise this question. Many people are suspicious about the source of some capital moving in our economy today. The investigation which I have asked for should look into this matter carefully.

As a matter of fairness and of accuracy, I have also been advised by the Penn Texas representatives that Mr. Virgil Dardi is no longer a member of the board of Penn Texas because his resignation was requested when the management of Penn Texas discovered his associations and the activities to which I made reference in my speech.

In addition, I think it is fair to say that Penn Texas management disputes the fact that there has been any secret buying up of Niles stock and it has asserted to me that it acquired its holdings in the normal and usual way.

My colleague from Colorado and representatives from Penn Texas have both complained that my general remarks about several situations are being used to create misleading impressions and to give an unfair advantage in a private dispute.

I have carefully examined all of my facts and I have found that nothing I have said has been claimed to be untrue.

If unfair or false impressions have been created by persons other than me, I can only say that this is most regrettable.

My purpose in offering the resolution and the legislation is to clear up what I believe to be an increasingly bad situation.

I am not concerned about private business disputes except as they fit into the pattern of what I believe to be a growing problem for the American people.

On March 23 I tried to make perfectly clear that I did not believe that either Congress or the Government should meddle with or interfere with the normal free play of our competitive enterprise system.

On other occasions, I deplored the use of Congress and of Government to advance private business interests.

To demonstrate my attitude and to cite a bad example of Government interference, let me report about a meeting which took place yesterday.

I was invited with other members of the New England delegation to a meeting in the Capitol.

Before going to the meeting I was told that Commissioner Monroe Johnson, of the Interstate Commerce Commission would appear at this meeting to give the New England Members of Congress some information concerning a dispute involving the management and control of the Boston & Maine Railroad.

At the meeting I learned that the Interstate Commerce Commission has ordered an inquiry to open in Boston on next Monday.

When I asked Commissioner Johnson the purpose of the inquiry, his answers to me were, in my judgment, evasive and not convincing.

Commissioner Johnson claimed that because there was fear of a consolidation of the Boston & Maine Railroad with another railroad, the Interstate Commerce Commission had ordered this inquiry.

I suggest to this House that this is an outrageous attempt to influence the stockholders who are to have their annual meeting on the 13th of April.

If any agency of the Government has a proper interest in a proxy fight, it is the Securities and Exchange Commission and not the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I pointed out to Commissioner Johnson that the Interstate Commerce Commission should at least wait until after the annual meeting and until some application is made for consolidation of two carriers.

Certainly nothing will be lost to the Government nor will the public interests suffer if the Interstate Commerce Commission takes jurisdiction when it is entitled to jurisdiction.

The haste with which the Commission has ordered this inquiry at this hour, 9 days before this meeting, causes me and others to be suspicious about the motives for the calling of this inquiry.

This reminds me of the days when the Government and its agencies were used by powerful business interests in the United States and this is precisely the kind of interference that I object to.

I have today written to the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of both the House and the Senate, and asked them to ascertain the facts with respect to this highly irregular conduct on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The complaint which I made to this House about raids has no bearing upon legitimate business competition.

If the agencies of Government will do something about the matters which I have discussed, they will be constructively helping the people of the United States.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish to commend the gentleman from Connecticut for taking the floor at this time and giving the statement which he has. It is another example of the fairness which always prompts him in his activities, especially here on the floor of Congress. I know the gentleman understands that I associate myself with him in the objective he has in mind. I am glad that the explanation has been taken care of so that we can again meet on common ground.

## POSTAL PAY RAISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES] is recognized for 59 minutes.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time so that the minority group on the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee

and others who care to can more fully express their reasons for their opposition to the pending postal pay legislation, H. R. 4644. I am sorry that there are not more Members present, but I hope they will have a chance to read the RECORD today to get our views.

Furthermore, we wish to place responsibility where it belongs for the utter confusion that prevails and for the unjust delay in the enactment of a fair and reasonable pay bill.

Unfortunately, for postal employees—and for other Federal workers, too—there seems to be little sympathy at the White House or among administration leaders to give them an adequate pay increase.

We need but look to last year when the President vetoed a bill which called for only a 5-percent increase. Now, we are being told that if Congress passes a bill calling for more than a 7.6-percent increase the President will again veto it. I doubt whether the President realizes how unfair and unjust some of the provisions are in this bill. It is difficult for me to believe that he would suggest a pay increase of $210 as being fair or adequate for a family man who now gets $3,270 a year and at the same time suggest an increase of $4,900 for those in the high-pay brackets of the postal service. I doubt if he is fully acquainted with all the facts about this bill.

Just think, only $4 a week more for the fellow who needs it most and almost $100 a week more for those getting big salaries; 6 percent for the most needy and 58 percent for others. It is the trickle-down philosophy all over again.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. I think it might be helpful if some of the facts are put in the RECORD at this point so that we know exactly what is being discussed. I know that the gentleman has in the past few weeks read, as I have, many very interesting and somewhat misleading statistics regarding the type of proposal which those of us who subscribe to the minority views have offered to the House in a real, sincere effort to achieve a compromise.

In the first place, the amendment to salary schedules which we have proposed would increase the total cost to the Post Office Department by $12 million a year; $12 million related to a payroll of almost $2 billion; $12 million, however, that would go to the majority of the employees of the postal field service.

In an effort to be absolutely certain as to the accuracy of the figures that I am going to give at this time, I spent the morning with a member of the staff of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Under H. R. 4644, the bill which now appears to be—or so we would be led to believe—the final administration position, the regular carriers would receive a 6.84-percent salary increase, not an 8-percent increase as was stated on this floor by the distinguished chairman of our committee. If you apply to that increase all of the premium wages which might or might not be paid in the course of a year—such as the overtime differential, night shifts, substitute carriers and clerks—the total would be brought, under H. R. 4644, up to only 7.48 percent. In our proposal—the compromise offer which is contained in the minority report and which we have supported since that report was issued, contrary to the statements in the press that we were working for a lower compromise—the total cost for the increase granted overall to the regular carriers would be approximately 7.6 percent. If all of the possible premium payments and the substitutes were included, it would rise to approximately 8.25 percent.

This same theory of confusing by statistics has brought forth in recent days some rather interesting studies relating to the cost of living and the salary adjustments which have taken place since 1939 in the postal field service. Here, again, we have heard that the administration proposal would finally result in a total salary increase of around 114 percent. That is not the fact. The postal field salaries have increased since 1926 an average of 98 percent. The cost of living index has increased since 1939 by 92.4 percent. There is no instance where the averages could be proven as high as 108 or 114 percent, and I have read both of those figures in the past few days. Since 1945 the salary of a postal field service worker has increased 65 percent. The cost of living has increased an additional 48 percent. At no time has the Congress acted to give any consideration to the great lag-time period during which the Federal workers, not only the postal field service employees, but the classified workers of the Federal Government as well, were underpaid. As I mentioned before, from 1926 until 1945 they had no measurable pay increase. In 1945 an increase was finally voted, but there was a long period when salaries were way behind the salaries paid other workers of this Nation.

On that point I would like to bring to the attention of the House the fact that the average industrial salary increase in this Nation since 1939 has been 207 percent. That figure is taken from Basic Pay Data, a publication of the United States Civil Service Commission, on page 94. Additionally, the national income from 1935 to 1945 increased by 300 percent. Personal incomes from 1935 to 1945 in this Nation increased 275 percent, and from 1947 until 1955 the national income increased an additional 200 percent, bringing a total increase since 1935 of 500 percent in national income. Personal incomes increased an additional 200 percent. Relating that increase to the increase for the entire period from 1935 to 1955, a total increase of 475 percent is apparent. The postal workers, in addition to having problems of increased living costs—if they are to share at all in the increased standards of living which we have come to recognize as an American right—must have a better increase than that proposed in H. R. 4644, as it is presently written and apparently as the administration intends to insist that it be written.

Is it not true that our position among the minority members who signed our report has been one of attempting to secure compromise? We have at no time taken the extremist view of all or nothing, even though most of us are sincere in our belief that at least a 10-percent increase is necessary to do justice. We have given consideration to the fiscal condition of our Government. We have tried to arrive at something that the President could in good conscience sign. The proposed increase in our amendment gives just about as fair a deal, in give and take, as we can expect to secure in a body of 435 Members.

I thank the gentleman for permitting me this opportunity to put these figures in the RECORD. They are accurate. They are completely at variance with many of those published in recent weeks.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I want to thank the gentleman for his contribution. What the gentleman stated is absolutely correct. We have gone far out of the way to try to arrive at a fair comprise. I want to say for the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] that he has a background in his own State and a great experience in dealing with problems of Government employees and Civil Service. He has been a valuable man on our committee.

In connection with the gentleman's statement I want to again point out that the administration bill would give 6 percent to the most needy employees and 58 percent to others.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing wrong or evil about an honest disagreement. But I just cannot go for that kind of thinking and philosophy. I hope that the President will give more serious thought and personal attention to this bill for I sometimes think that he is not getting very good advice. But no matter what the President finally decides, I do not believe that Members of Congress should surrender the right to think for themselves on this important issue.

All of us remember the charge of a rubberstamp Congress when the majority supported social reform legislation recommended by a Democratic President. We do not have to go back very far when it took a lot of courage to stand up and defend the President of the United States. A hostile press made it quite popular to denounce the President.

I do not want to see a return to anything like that, but I think it is equally bad when we are put in a position where we must always agree with the President, where we must not criticize him, even though we may sincerely believe he is wrong and is being influenced and advised by folks whose thinking and philosophy are in conflict with the common good and the public welfare.

I know there are Members on the other side of this House who want to be fair with the postal and Federal workers. The vote against the effort to suspend the rules on this bill last week was a good indication of this. I know that it takes a lot of courage to stand up and express their honest views when the heat is turned on. To those Members, however, we look for support for our viewpoint on this legislation. I appreciate the pressure they are under, but I hope sufficient support will come from the other side so

that we can get a bill passed that is fair and just.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentlewoman from Idaho.

Mrs. PFOST. After listening to a great deal of testimony and after receiving hundreds of letters from the postal employees themselves, I am convinced that they deserve and need a 10-percent raise. The vast majority of postal employees are in the low-salary brackets and their present pay checks are not substantial enough, and they will not stretch far enough to pay for the essentials of life for themselves and their families. Their request for a 10-percent raise is a wholly reasonable one. They are simply facing up to the fact of the high cost of living and they are asking Congress to do the same.

It is my sincere conviction that most Members of this body feel as I do—that they want to give the postal employees a 10-percent increase, and that if they had only to answer to their own consciences, they would vote for such a raise without hesitation. But the threat of an administration veto hangs heavy over their heads.

Those of us who are trying to secure a realistic pay raise for the postal employees should learn a lesson from this administration's attitude. We must not allow ourselves to be euchred into a position that is equally as unyielding, equally as disdainful of compromise as the position adopted by the administration. We cannot afford to lose the whole battle just because we are unwilling to retreat a single yard. We must consider at all times what is in the best interest of the postal employees. In other words, we must find some way to get a postal pay raise bill through the House this year. We must not end up with no pay raise bill at all. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentlewoman from Idaho who is a very valuable member of our committee.

As the gentleman from California has so well said, we who oppose the administration proposal have gone far in seeking a fair compromise. Some of us have a lot of misgivings about the reclassification feature in this bill, yet we have indicated a willingness to go along if a few improvements could be made.

We would like to give low-grade employees a better increase. We would also like to add a few safeguards on reclassification.

The minority in the committee showed good faith in seeking to correct some of the provisions of the bill which we believed a threat to the merit and civil-service system. When the bill first came before our committee it was a bill far worse than the one voted by the committee. A very important improvement was made when an amendment introduced by my colleague [Mr. Moss] gave rights to employee organization leaders to represent individuals or groups when grievances arise.

But there is still much doubt and suspicion about the bill in view of some of the experiences encountered. There is the fear that under the guise of reclassification political favoritism will replace merit in the postal service and that promotions or demotions will be based on the employee's willingness to conform to arbitrary or capricious decisions of those in authority.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, I put into the RECORD a letter posted in the Scranton, Pa., post office by the acting postmaster. The postmaster may have slipped and let the cat out of the bag when he revealed, in effect, that the pending reclassification bill could be used as a discriminatory political weapon against some postal employees by downgrading them on the excuse that they are inefficient.

Is it any wonder that postal workers are concerned? Even those postal workers who may receive what looks like a good salary hike, may later find that the better jobs will be the reward for something other than merit, and loyal and faithful work in the postal service.

It is evident that this so-called reclassification is more important to the administration than a pay increase. We have no assurance that a 7.6 increase would get approval of White House advisors if it did not contain this questionable reclassification feature.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. In discussing the question of a compromise, I was rather interested in reading this morning in the Washington Post and Times Herald a statement in the column by Mr. Jerry Kluttz, contending that we have not compromised, that it has been a one-way street, and that all the compromises have been on the part of the administration. Is it not true that as far as showing the need—not the desirability, but the need—for reclassification, little or no case was made either last year or this year by the administration?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. MOSS. They did say they needed the authority in order to bring about the changes which might be desirable in the overall relationship of supervisory personnel to those whom they supervised. Despite our misgivings—and they are very fundamental in many ways—we did yield point after point on the question of reclassification. During this week, we offered to support a rule which would permit only one amendment to be offered affecting the classification procedures in the bill. That amendment would give a simple right to the Civil Service Commission to review the decisions taken by the Postmaster General or those to whom he might delegate the authority contained in the legislation. Is it not true that that right of review is held by every other executive department of this Government, and that under H. R. 4644 a new precedent is being created which could effectively cripple the merit system?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is right. I am sorry to say that while I have always had a great deal of respect for the Washington Post and Times Herald I do not think its readers are being given an accurate account of this controversy, and particularly of the position of the minority. It was quite evident again in the newspaper report this morning.

Mr. MOSS. In view of the fact that the chairman of the committee and the administration have taken the position—which is now quite clear and a matter of record—of not yielding, and in order to prevent any loss of income to those employees because of the policy of studied procrastination which seems to prevail at the moment, we will offer an amendment to make the salary retroactive to the first of March. That is the date our own salary increase becomes effective, and that amendment will be offered when the bill comes to the floor of the House after the recess.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. That would be a meritorious amendment. I think it would be a real test as to where the Members stand on this legislation.

Mr. MOSS. It is not our intention to delay action, nor did we contribute to the deadlock which resulted in this matter going over until after Easter. We tried every means possible to get this matter before the House so that the Members of the House could work their will.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. FASCELL. I think while we are hanging the goose, we ought to get it in the open so that everybody can get a good smell of it.

I would like to address myself to the question of the delay of the consideration of this bill. I am one of the Members who signed this minority report. I am convinced that the minority view is correct; that it is within the proper fiscal policies of this country; that it has the endorsement of the citizens of our country; and that it is in the best interest of the postal employees who are affected. I am willing to stand on the floor of the House and debate the matter with any person as to whether my view is right or wrong. I think if I get the opportunity to do that, the minority view will prevail.

But the thing I object to, and object to strenuously—and I think we ought to tell the whole country about it—is that despite the fact this bill has been thoroughly considered by a committee of the United States Congress, that divergent views have been expressed in its report, and that it has been reported to the floor of the House in an attempt to suspend the rules and pass it, and that attempt was defeated overwhelmingly, and despite the fact that the bill could then have been presented to the House for consideration for amendment pursuant to the rules, such action has not yet been taken. I think we ought to emphasize and point out again that the minority in an effort to speed the passage of this legislation went to the chairman and said that instead of taking up all the amendments that had been set forth in the minority report they were willing to hang their hat on two, and let the House decide whether or not the minority view should prevail.

Do you know what the response was? It was: "We will have to take this matter

up with the Postmaster General and the White House."

The next query was what action would be taken if the reply is negative, if they did not agree to this compromise. The answer was that the bill might be brought up after the Easter recess. Word was not long in getting back on this final effort at compromise. The point of view of those trying to speed this beneficial legislation for so many employees was not accepted. The question was asked again: "When are you going to bring the bill up?" The answer was that the bill would be considered some time after the recess. The purpose is all too clear on this course of action. Its effect is to "Let the employees starve a little longer. Let them wait 3 more weeks or more. They are losing $1 million a day. Maybe when they starve long enough they will come around to the administration viewpoint."

Mr. Speaker, I submit that such tactics cannot be longer put up with. I think that when the postal employees and the people of this country realize the arm-twisting tactics that have been used in delaying the passage of this legislation that they will be justifiably disgusted, disillusioned, and righteously angry.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I want to thank the gentleman from Florida for his contribution. What he has stated is absolutely correct. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that I will support the compromise sponsored by my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], but my first preference will be for the Senate bill.

I believe the Senate bill is a far more realistic measure because it gives a more adequate boost to those who need it most, and whose income has not kept pace with the increased national income, and the tremendous advance in the Nation's productive capacity.

The Senate bill dumps the questionable reclassification provision and permits an adjustment to be made without the question being tied on to a pay bill.

Mr. Speaker, we who take this stand are among those who have always supported a strong merit system, and the kind of treatment and adequate pay that wins the confidence and respect of people in the Federal service. This we believe, results in the most efficient type of Government service. We are not influenced, in any way, by the reckless statements that are being made, charging us with deliberately holding up a pay raise, or of playing politics on this important matter.

We take our stand as a matter of deep principle. I would feel unfaithful to my trust if I failed to speak out against what I believe is evil and unjust in this administration bill. I would not be true to myself if I did not speak out against the trickle-down philosophy and the strong-man theory which is so evident to me in this proposal.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Gladly.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from California who represent the minority opinion of the committee on the postal pay raise. I think the action of the Congress thus far on the postal pay raise might very seasonably be described as the Easter egg that did not hatch. I hope that the fine work of the minority members of the committee will soon be joined by the majority of the House and that the Easter egg will be hatched with the postal employees getting an adequate pay raise.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his contribution and support.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening with intense interest. I am glad to be here among the tried and proved friends of the postal workers and to note the presence also of my colleagues from Illinois [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. BOYLE]. We are commissioned by the dean of our Illinois Democratic delegation [Mr. O'BRIEN] and other Members unable to be here to give assurance that the solid Democratic delegation from Illinois has enlisted in the fight for decent treatment of the postal workers for the duration and will not quit the fight until the victory has been won.

I cannot be happy in voting an increase for the postal workers of this Nation of one whit less than 10 percent. That is little enough.

I am thinking of that Federal building in the heart of Chicago, the building where the humble postal workers toil, the building where also the judges of our Federal courts of justice hold forth. I think of these humble postal workers entering that building denied, at this Easter season, an increase in their small salaries. I think also of the judges in those courts of justice entering the elevators in the building where postal workers and judges alike are in the public service of this Nation. The judges justifiably were voted increases of salary. Most of us in this Chamber voted for increased compensation for the judges because we thought that was in the public interest. Why are we not permitted to do the same for the postal workers? What kind of philosophy is this, what brand of political thinking is it, that denies equal consideration to the just claims of the postal workers? Is it that always Old Man Economy must hang his hat on the little man's head? What have we come to? I know, everyone knows, that the Members of this body, if left to the guide of their own conscience, would vote an increase at least 10 percent. But they are held back by pressures, threats, the intimidation of a veto. They are told that unless the Congress surrenders its power to make the laws of this country and accepts orders from the Postmaster General then no bill passed by the Congress of its own free will can hope for the approval of the White House.

No, Mr. Speaker, I am standing for a 10-percent increase for these humble postal workers, and not one cent less. I think the other body acted wisely and well. If we can find the money for other things we certainly can find it in the name and cause of decency to relieve the underpaid postal workers of some of the distresses their inadequate wages have caused their wives and children to endure.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES], the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], and the other members of the committee who signed the minority report have earned the gratitude of the postal workers, their familes and their friends. Judging from the large correspondence that comes to me, I feel safe in saying that overwhelmingly the public sentiment of the country is behind them. It could not be otherwise. Americans always stand up for fair and decent treatment and while they want proper economy in the conduct of their Government they insist that a reputation for economy should not be built up by swatting little people.

I commend the gentlemen on the able and convincing presentation they have made today. It is crystal clear that they have done everything humbly possible and within the limitations of honorable negotiation to affect a compromise that would have brought the pay increase bill to the stage of enactment before the commencement of our Easter vacation. Their legislative deportment has been marked by the highest statesmanship. I wish also to commend the leaders of the postal organizations who at all times have shown respect and restraint in negotiations with those in opposition. They have made every effort possible in honor and in the interest of the people they represent to bring about the enactment of a pay increase law before Easter.

The reason we are going on the Easter recess with the postal pay increase bill hanging in the bag is because the opposition was determined to have it that way. Rather than do the decent thing by the postal workers it is attempting to starve them out.

By all means, when the bill finally is permitted to come up in this body let us see to it that it is made effective as of March 1. That is the way to answer the starve-out strategy to which the opposition has resorted.

I read in the newspapers, and with indignation, these articles coming apparently from inspired sources. They are geared to the threat that when a pay-increase bill is passed it will not be retroactive, therefore the workers are actually losing money every day they refuse the crumbs patronizingly tendered. That is a pretty contemptible strategy. It is borrowed from the worst practices of an era antedating better labor-management relations, the vicious practice of forcing workers to quit just complaints by starving out their wives and children. It is beneath the dignity and the honor of the Government of the United States. It is the last desperate resort in a campaign of pressures and intimidations to stop the exercise by the Congress of the United States of its responsibility under the Constitution to make on its own determination and of its own free will the laws of this land of ours.

Mr. Speaker, the fight for a decent pay increase for the Federal workers will go on until it is won.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. He has always been a real champion of the little people. I know that I speak for my colleagues when I say that we deeply appreciate his statement and the stand he has taken in support of our point of view.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LESINSKI. It seems to me that when the military-pay bill came up there was no problem at all; everyone recognized the problem of keeping our trained career men in the military services. There was also no problem when the congressional pay and the judges' pay bill was presented to this body. But now, when the time comes to give a long justified pay increase to people who have spent all their lives in the Government service in the matter of distributing mail, the administration, in spite of the consideration given the military, arbitrarily disregards the appeals of the postal employees. I think the administration has been very unreasonable and drastic at this point. I believe that we, as Members of this Congress, should exert our prerogatives in this matter and vote the way we think proper, regardless of who may be President. The President has said that our salary recommendation is too much. No. 1, he is wrong, because originally we asked for only a 10-percent increase. It should have been 12½ percent. And then the administration offers a bill that provides only for a 5-percent increase. Why that is only a small part of the needed increase to which they are justified. That was purely intimidation on the part of the administration, and it should be corrected. We know, as Members of Congress, what is proper.

However, we have been backtracked, and we have been asked time and time again to come to some sort of an agreement. Furthermore, we have had this matter jammed down our throats, to take it or else. Mr. Speaker, we are sitting here as judges to give what we believe is proper to the employees of the Federal Government, and I believe we should follow through on that line.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Michigan, a valuable member of our committee and one who has signed the minority report.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Is it not true with respect to the postal pay matter that all issues are clearly drawn and settled?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

Mr. FASCELL. Is it not true that all that remains to be done is to present the issues of this bill to the House of Representatives?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. That is correct, so that the Members of the House might be clearly informed.

Mr. FASCELL. And is it not also true that the minority members of the committee have expressed their desire and anxiety with respect to getting this matter cleared by the House within this past week prior to the recess?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

Mr. FASCELL. And is it not further true that for no reason to our knowledge the matter has been arbitrarily delayed until some indefinite time in the future?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. That, too, is correct, and I want to thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, this need not be a partisan bill. Although there is some difference in views and philosophy, there is no good reason why we cannot arrive at a fair compromise. It is not a personal matter as I have a high regard and deep respect for committee and House Members with whom I disagree on this subject. I think they are wrong and I hope the majority in the House will also come to that conclusion and vote out a fair bill.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. Is it not a matter of fact, now, that as the result of the delay encountered in the consideration by the House of the postal-pay bill, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has delayed consideration of a bill to increase the compensation for the classified employees of the Federal service?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. As yet nothing has been scheduled; that is true.

Mr. MOSS. I am certain that the gentleman will join with me in a fight in our committee to amend the classified pay bill, when it is ready to be reported, to make it also retroactive to March 1 so that no employees will be penalized because of the continued wrangling which has occurred following the reporting of the postal pay bill.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I shall wholeheartedly support the gentleman in seeking that worthy objective.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable misgivings that I view the temporizing conduct of some of the individuals who are patently out of step and out of sympathy with the postal increase. Only too often have we seen wonderful legislation robbed of its true status by unwarranted and inexcusable delay.

I am very happy, as a Member from the 12th District of Illinois, to join with my Illinois colleagues who are in favor of the 10-percent postal raise and I am happy to be associated with all those individuals who feel in this particular economy that it is almost unpardonable if one segment of our economic society is not permitted to stand up proudly and walk along in the same economic tempo as the rest of the individuals. I think any policy that would not warrant the rest of the economy moving along is doing a real disservice to the economy.

It is my studied opinion that this report of the minority should be adopted. I am convinced that the minority Members will do everything to compose and adjust any differences to see that the will of the people as expressed through their chosen leaders is given full force and effect. Our economy can stand a 10-percent raise for the postal employees. I think it would be a shame if we went into a lot of legal gymnastics and lost the ball here with a lot of questions, artificial questions to be sure, of classification and what not.

So it is with pride that I get up here and say again what is the thought and the feeling of my district; and that is that the postal employees are entitled to a 10-percent raise and they are entitled to it just as soon as the orderly process of constitutional and representative government can give them their day on the floor of this House.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE] in his statement that some who are supporting this administration bill are out of step. I say that in all sincerity and with all due respect to their opinions in the matter. I know they are sincere, but I think they are also out of step with the tempo of the times.

## SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

## COMPULSORY LICENSING OF PATENTS IN ATOMIC ENERGY FIELD

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, those who were Members of the House and of the Congress at the last session recall that in connection with the amendments to the atomic energy law, one of the most troublesome features was that pertaining to patents. Because of the pressure of the closing hours of the last Congress, it became necessary on the part of those who were responsible for handling that bill to accept as one of the provisions of the bill an item providing for compulsory licensing of patent applications and patents in the atomic-energy field. That principle of compulsory licensing was strenuously resisted by some of us, but at the time we yielded and accepted the provision as part of the act, we gave assurance that efforts would be made in this Congress to repeal the compulsory feature of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. Pursuant to that assurance, about a week ago I did introduce such a bill. In connection with that, I said I would call to the attention of the House an address recently given by the president of the National Patent Council, Mr. John W. Anderson, before the Cleveland Patent Law Association, Cleveland, Ohio, on December 9, 1954. Mr. Anderson is recognized as one of the outstanding authorities on patent laws

in this country. He has testified on frequent occasions before committees of the Congress on the subject of patents. His judgment, his advice, and his counsel are respected by all who are interested in the subject. I commend to your thoughtful attention the address of Mr. Anderson. His address is as follows:

WHAT FEEDS FREE ENTERPRISE?

(Address by John W. Anderson, president, National Patent Council, at annual meeting of Cleveland Patent Law Association, Hotel Cleveland, Cleveland, Ohio, December 9, 1954)

To have been invited to discuss with you today the primal forces from which our fantastic growth as a nation has come, and to which we must look to keep our children free, brings to me a sobering honor and an inspiring challenge.

Many times in the history of civilizations men have gathered, as we are gathered today, to pause and ask what may be done to help delay, or perhaps forestall, those cyclic changes that brought, at last, destruction to once flourishing civilizations.

The cycle through which civilizations find their growth and their decline is shaped by one unchanging law—a law by which all works of men are made to rise or fall.

The law of self-preservation, our Creator's first and primal law, impels us each to seek, according to his understanding, his own advantage—and to join with others in labors promising advantage to the individual through advantages accruing to a group of which he is a part.

Whenever any man presumes to look with disdain upon a society that recognizes, as its motivating force, God's primal law, that man becomes, perhaps unwittingly, a menace to the civilization that feeds him.

The air today is filled with clamorings by misguided citizens who would have us ignore the fact that man's efforts to create and produce are greatest when he sees hope of the honest winning of extra substance for his rainy day.

PRIMALISM TEACHES SURVIVAL

Our Creator serves, and has always served, His mysterious purposes by giving first to man the command that he survive—that he defend himself—that he labor to provide for his needs of the day—and for his needs to come.

That command to survive, our Creator gives also to every other living thing—to every beast—to every writhing, creeping creature on this earth.

In the competition between species, for power for survival, mankind has won—above all, because he has learned the value of cooperation with others of his kind—according to rules of conduct that untold centuries have taught promote security for the individual and for the tribe.

So long as they thus follow the basic teachings of primalism, nations, races, civilizations, advance in their cultures—and in their strength for survival.

Examine any beneficient law of man and you will find it rooted, however deviously, in the primal law—in the need to inspire men to creative and productive labor through confidence that they will be secure in their enjoyment of a share of their contributions to the welfare of their neighbors.

With what profound reverence for its Creator should any man regard the infinite wisdom reflected in the primal law. With what deep gratitude for divine mercy should man contemplate the eternal truth that there is never permitted the slightest change in any of God's laws.

History teaches that the primal urge, when not intelligently directed along lines of well-considered self-interest, can destroy even the bravest works of man. Channeled by well-defined rules of conduct, the primal urge inspires man to creative diligence that builds strength and security for the tribe—for the Nation—and for the civilization.

PROMISE OF PROFIT INSPIRES

Why do some men preach that we should in effect nullify the one provision of our Constitution regarded by its framers as of such importance as to justify its implementation within the text of the Constitution itself?

What body of men has ever moved closer to God, with clearer vision of His primal purposes, than those who wrote in our Constitution:

"The Congress shall have power * * * to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries."

What more convincing evidence could be asked that the men who laid the foundation for our patent system knew that promise of individual profit induces men to greater effort to produce than does the whip of tyrants?

Can you think of a more stimulating emancipation of the mind of man than comes from assuring him that he may enjoy a share of the fruits of his creative diligence?

Surely, nothing within man so clearly proves his kinship with his Creator as does his power to create.

Inducement to create has generated in America, in the brief span of years elapsed since given effect in our Constitution, more benefits, more advantages, more power for security, than had been created altogether by the untold billions of human beings that had gone before.

PATENT SYSTEM IS NERVE CENTER

Is it any wonder that those who desire to enslave the people of our Nation to false doctrines have recognized our patent system as the very nerve center of our expanding national economy—the prime catalyst of our unprecedented industrial civilization?

By damaging that nerve center they know they may weaken even the most remote of all the interrelated forces by which we build and maintain our strength for defense.

Let us examine some of the attacks made with such frightening success within recent years upon that nerve center of our national economy.

Naturally, the purpose of all such attacks is to destroy individual incentive to create, produce, and fairly possess.

Webster's dictionary defines incentive as "that which incites, or has a tendency to incite, to determination or action." Among synonyms given are: Goad, stimulus, encouragement, and inducement.

Incentive stirs to performance by an inducement offered. Incentive differs from motive in that motive lies within the individual, rather than without. Incentive is something offered the individual from without, to stir him to action in his own interest.

Once the scope and significance of the march toward the destruction of such incentive in America is understood, no God-fearing man can doubt his duty to help stop, at whatever cost, the subtle, purposeful drive to make us a Nation incapable of our own defense.

There are many among us whose philosophy—unwittingly or not—would doom us to unending servitude under soul-crushing tyrants who live arrogantly apart from our Creator and all His works.

Such tyrants—and would-be tyrants—labor today on many fronts to turn useful inventions of man to his enslavement.

GOVERNMENT PRETENDS TO OWN PATENTS

First let us examine a monstrous and growing cartel that hovers over us, flouting our Constitution and attempting to control our industries according to the concepts of an ill-advised bureaucracy.

The pretense of governmental agencies that they may own and manipulate pools of patent rights has no support in law and no justification in any economy relying upon inducements to the individual for its propulsion.

In addressing a meeting of the Dayton Patent Law Association, Dayton, Ohio, on March 11, 1949, I quoted in part from a communication of October 9, 1947, addressed by National Patent Council to the Department of Commerce, Office of Technical Services, Washington, D. C., as follows:

"A patent grants only a negative right. That right is to exclude others, for the limited period of 17 years, from manufacture, sale, and/or use of the invention—at the will of the patent owner, and to any extent he may desire.

"When our Government, which is presumed to be the entire citizenry, acquires a patent, that patent by every constitutional intent automatically expires, because there is none left to exclude.

"To hold differently is to hold that our Government has become a competitive device imposed upon the citizen and deriving its powers arbitrarily from a source apart from any formalized expression of the will of its people.

"The Government, which has granted the patent, in presuming to own it, places itself in the untenable position of having vested in itself, without authority, a right which clearly, by constitutional intent, can be possessed only by the citizen."

A FRIGHTENING CARTEL BY GOVERNMENT

Governmental agencies have not ceased to pretend to own patents.

They consistently represent that royalty-free licenses are available to any citizen upon application—under any patent the Government presumes to own.

However, upon inquiry, addressed to the various governmental agencies pretending to own patents, as to the conditions under which they would issue a license to a citizen, each replied imposing conditions varying from one department to another, such as requirement for cross licenses, the acquisition by Government of know-how, the power of Government to revoke the license at will, and other conditions, all tending to destroy any possible urge on the part of the citizen to invest money and effort in making the invention available to the public.

Government decries cartels, decries combinations, decries monopolies.

And yet here we have governmental agencies, seemingly innocent of any understanding of the destructiveness and unconstitutionality of their machinations, laboring—for their own ill-conceived advantage—to create such pools of patents as will enable them to work their will upon American industry.

Any congressional committee that would at this date undertake to disclose to the American public the astounding maneuvers of such agencies, in control of such patent pools, would find itself perhaps confronted with frantic opposition from a mass of interlaced interests of the cloak-and-dagger variety.

Unrepeatable stories, from impeccable sources, of the ruthless divorcements and divestments that have been worked in the name of such governmental pools of patents, sound so improbable as to expose to expert ridicule, almost with certainty, any man, however sincere, who would repeat them.

Only reasoned and hopeless fear on the part of the corporations and individuals oppressed by men of Government and politics who control such unlawful patent pools could account for their silence under punishment.

THE POWER PLANNERS

So, here we have a huge cartel, cloaked in pretense of public service, offering to the citizen, with impressive futility and superficial generosity, free licenses to patents pre-

sumed to be owned by Government, merely as a smokescreen behind which our industrial system is being weakened in areas in which our security is under severest attack.

Can we afford to do nothing to check this frightening governmental cartel, which is using its presumed power to license as a means for compelling the commitment of more and more patent rights to its growing pools?

The lack of any constitutional right of Government to pretend to own and manipulate patents seemingly is fully understood by the offending governmental agencies.

None of them has ever brought any suit for infringement of any patent presumed to be owned by Government.

It is understood that such agencies, somewhat humorously at times, assure that no such suit will ever be brought.

Eminent lawyers have expressed doubt that we have ever had a United States Supreme Court that would fail—upon competent presentation of the issue—to order the abandonment of all pretense of Government to own United States patents.

Can we escape belief that governmental agencies pooling patents have launched upon a deliberate plan for enhancing their power to exploit industry and to serve their own political purposes, knowing full well that their activities are as unlawful and as unconscionable as those of any group of mercenaries that ever preyed upon the rights of others?

COMPULSORY LICENSING DESTROYS INCENTIVE

Another incentive-destroying proposal, advanced persistently for many years and long resisted successfully by National Patent Council and its friends, is for compulsory licensing of patents.

The principle of compulsory licensing is uneconomic and is clearly contrary to constitutional intent.

It dulls the spur to invention. It destroys incentive to produce and distribute new and better things—for better living.

Few men would be likely to risk their earnings to build a market for an invention that others might copy and sell in competition—without such others first having incurred any of the costs of developing and pioneering the new product in its market.

Reduce the prospects of the inventor to obtain financing for his invention and you have reduced, if not destroyed, his incentive to invent.

The Constitution empowers Congress to grant the inventor, in compensation for his inventive contribution, an exclusive right—the right to exclude others from making, using, or selling the invention.

Unless the inventor disposes of those rights, in whole or in part, by sale or license, he is presumed to enjoy them exclusively for the period of 17 years fixed by Congress as the life of his patent.

That is his reward for bringing, into the service of the citizens of the United States, an invention that did not before exist.

There is no basis in the Constitution for any compulsion upon the inventor to part with the property he has created.

So why should we destroy, in contempt of God's primal law and in contempt of the Constitution, all incentive—all inducement—of the citizen to create for free enterprise new tools with which to implement its growth?

Is it wise to say to the inventor, "No matter what you may create, it may by force be taken from you—leaving you powerless to determine the price, if any, to be paid you for it"?

A DANGEROUS GRAB FOR POWER

The ghost-written bills that have been presented to Congress over many years attempting to establish compulsory licensing as a fixed principle of our economy all have reflected the paralyzing philosophy of confused men who never cease, behind legislative scenes, to reach for personal power at the cost of destroying the citizen's incentive to create.

The Chicago Tribune, perhaps at least as proud of its enemies as of its friends, in discussing National Patent Council's opposition to compulsory licensing, with reference to the new Atomic Energy Act, stated editorially on November 21, 1954:

"The House had stood for exclusive patent rights. The insistence on compulsory patent sharing came from a small bloc in the Senate which filibustered until it got what it wanted. The objectors, eager for adjournment so that Congressmen could go home to campaign, were blackjacked into submission."

National Patent Council was founded in part to provide help in resisting such ill-advised legislation as proposed in the Kilgore science mobilization bill of 1943.

Aided by a few friends of the patent system, your speaker helped defeat that bill.

The council, formed 2 years later, fought to amend the patent provision of the original atomic-energy bill.

The House, by an overwhelming majority, adopted the amendment supported by the council.

The Senate, in joint conference committee, sent the bill back to the House in its original form, with no chance for a record vote as the bill was finally adopted. Events since, including Lilienthal's admissions published by Collier's, have proved the council's opposition to the bill to have been well founded.

THE BIKINI TESTS AND PANIC

The original Atomic Energy Act made virtually impossible any application of atomic energy to civilian needs, under incentives that had brought out of nowhere such phenomenal inventions for application of the power of steam, electricity, and petroleum.

Bureaucracy has presumed to suppress, under pretense of necessity for national security, all urge to convert atomic power to the building, for civilian industry, of added strength upon which we must rely for national security.

Pretense that atomic secrets could be hoarded by our governmental divisions and bureaus has proved fallacious.

Enemy nations bent upon destruction of our American way of life have seemed almost completely free to appropriate and apply to civilian, as well as military uses, all of our hard-earned discoveries in the basic science of atomic energy and in the mechanisms, systems, and methods invented and developed by us for the application of atomic energy to military uses.

Now Russia stands mockingly with a claim that she has been first to apply atomic energy in the production of power for civilian uses. In the meantime our inventors continue discouraged and our civilian industry remains hog-tied by ill-advised legislation vesting absolute power in a bureaucracy not clear of suspicion of deep infiltration by secret servants of that godless and lawless larceny which bears the name of communism.

While the Atomic Energy Act was pending in 1946 National Patent Council said to Congress and the Nation:

"The McMahon atomic energy bill (S. 1717) reflects the blind arrogance of bureaucracy gone mad. The bill would drive American inventive diligence underground. It would create a vast black market in dangerous atomic inventions. Subversive task forces have been endeavoring for years to get past Congress legislation that would destroy all incentive for American inventors and manufacturers to continue to advance American industry. In this atomic bill, those subversive forces would deal a disastrous blow to American security."

Commenting upon Senator Vandenberg's statement that the passage of the Atomic Energy Act, without amendment, was "necessary until Russia (1) agreed to international control of atomic energy and (2) agreed to internal inspections in Russia," Fantus Chase, writing in Invention News and Views for March 1948, said:

"Why should Stalin now so agree if to do so might inspire, in our Atomic Energy Act, a change which would remove the now-proven power of that act to suppress atomic invention in America? And why should Stalin wish, or work, for any change in the type of thinking, either in our foreign or domestic affairs, that has given, however innocently, to him and his hopelessly enmeshed German scientists, this priceless advantage in their race to rob us of our supremacy in the field of atomic energy?

"With such an obvious risk of losing a perhaps decisive edge, in what he seems to have chosen to make a world war for universal human enslavement, much dumber men than Stalin would be expected to do nothing but stand pat."

David Lilienthal, the first chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, in his article, Free the Atom, in Collier's magazine of June 17, 1950, stated: "When this (atomic energy) law was enacted 4 years ago no one could see that there was any alternative to an airtight Government monopoly; certainly this was my own view at that time."

In a publicity release of September 20, 1948, National Patent Council stated: "Instead of hastening the day of effective international agreement to outlaw atomic energy in war, and the day of Russia's consent to internal inspection and control of atomic energy in that country, our Atomic Energy Act so sorely disables atomic development in this country that Moscow, in the light of the Kremlin's known objectives, would not be likely to agree to anything that might release our atomic energy development for propulsion by the traditional incentives of our patent system."

What—and who—prompted such desperate pressures upon Congress to disregard clear warnings from American industry and walk this Nation into the greatest of all communistic traps from which we may not—after 10 years—be able to extricate ourselves in time to regain the strength we have lost in the race for civilian application of atomic power?

More strength to Congressman COLE, of New York, and all those who support him in his valiant fight to turn our Nation back from the dangerous path our Congress chose in 1946, in disregard of warnings, voiced by stanch Americans in Congress, that NPC was right—and that the House was right when it, by overwhelming vote, adopted the NPC substitute for the sovietized patent provisions of the atomic energy bill.

PATENT SYSTEM FEEDS FREE ENTERPRISE

Not all who oppose the patent system, or advocate compulsory licensing, consciously would destroy America.

They simply do not understand how God's primal law, working through the patent system, functions to feed free enterprise new inventions—new tools by which it implements its growth.

It is hoped that all men of the patent law profession present here tonight will go all out to persuade their friends and clients to support vigorously efforts in the next session of Congress to repeal the first provision for compulsory licensing ever enacted—in all the 164 years of existence of our patent system.

Otherwise, the principle of compulsory licensing, which is the kiss of death for our patent system and for the free economy it feeds, may spread as a manifestation of tyranny which, in the language of the London Times of August 11, 1846, "Generations of wise and good men may hereafter perceive and lament and resist in vain."

WHY STARVE THE PATENT OFFICE?

As if pooling of patents by Government, aided by licensing compelled by law, did not carry enough promise for the eventual slowing down of our economy, we are confronted with constant efforts to reduce the amount of the appropriation for the operation of the Patent Office, to a degree that quite definitely tends to restrict its functions and thus discourage inventors.

The appropriation is already so limited as to have prevented adequate provision for much-needed reorganization of the Office, for the expeditious handling of patent applications in the Office and for the expeditious preliminary study of the various arts by patent lawyers desiring to determine, for a client, the patentability of an invention.

The persistent battle on the part of the Patent Office to reduce through competent procedure its backlog of pending applications receives scant encouragement as operating funds are limited without regard to the vital part the Patent Office must play in translating into industrial momentum the intent of the Constitution.

HAZLITT SUGGESTS WATCHDOGS

May I commend for your early reading an editorial entitled "Watchdogs for Congress" by Henry Hazlitt on page 97 of Newsweek for December 6, 1954?

Mr. Hazlitt presents forcefully the futility of subsidizing the "fairy godmother" hallucinations of some of our officials abroad—who are engaged naively in the work of "buying gratitude and dependable allies" through the reckless distribution of billions of dollars exacted from the American taxpayer.

Mr. Hazlitt points out that "There is no clear evidence, in spite of constant reiteration, that the postwar recovery of Europe has been any faster than it would have been without our aid."

Mr. Hazlitt says that if a "private year-round 'watchdog' committee were appointed by Congress to study the work and recommendations of say, every Federal agency that spent more than one hundred million a year, the effect would be to restrain the present alarming expansion of spending programs and to save the taxpayers billions of dollars a year."

EXALTATION BY DISSIPATION?

Why do men preach that we, as a nation, can best exalt ourselves by dissipating our substance in vast gratuities to governments of foreign nations—which gratuities many believe bring more harm than good to the people of those nations.

What an amazing spectacle is presented by a Congress that would quarrel with our Patent Office about a single million dollars of appropriation denied the Office, below its stated minimum needs, and then would continue an expanding program of tossing billions of our taxpayers' dollars across the big waters, perhaps to no purpose except to pamper and weaken nations on whose strength we may some day want to rely.

Don't blame Congress—blame the man in your own shoes.

Why permit yourself to become so preoccupied as to be inactive in the defense of our patent system? Why not help vigorously those who see clearly the danger to our national security through attacks upon our patent system.

This is no occasion for extended arguing of questions as to the wisdom of vast donations to foreign governments. The need for facing those questions will catch up with us—inevitably.

CONGRESS MUST UNDERSTAND

However, what chance has our incentive economy to survive when even the men we send to Congress have so little understanding as to starve the very system that feeds free enterprise?

What chance do we have under the kind of legislative philosophy that encourages throwing with one hand, by billions, the fruits of free enterprise much farther than George Washington threw that mythical silver dollar—while the other hand chokes the institution that is the prime catalyst of our entire industrial economy?

Can you think how even skillful planning could devise a more effective scheme for national suicide?

Will our legislators ever learn that in applying pressure to the goose that lays the golden eggs the neck should be avoided?

Possibly we should seek some miracle by which to transmit to governments of favored foreign countries an understanding of what feeds in America the free enterprise that in turn feeds them.

Such understanding might prompt those governments wisely to reverse slightly their own traditions.

To prevent collapse of the source of their benefactions, might they not wisely volunteer to remit to our Patent Office, out of the bounty it has generated for them, the comparative pittance that would enable that Office to enhance propulsive incentives in our economy?

Such acceleration would produce constantly greater wealth for our friends abroad to share with our citizens, already bewildered by stories of wastes committed, in the name of Government, within our own borders.

Since foreign rulers seem always to have great influence with our leaders, perhaps they could persuade those leaders to put an end to misguided efforts to throw the biggest possible monkey wrench into the machinery of our patent system—which feeds the American brand of free enterprise.

PART 2

WHAT IS FREE ENTERPRISE?

The term "free enterprise" too often is understood to mean enterprise free from all restrictions—free from all law except the jungle law of tooth and claw.

Any economy subjected to that concept of enterprise would leave no incentive, no inducement, to any man to create, to produce, or to accumulate.

In a land so cursed, few gardens would be planted—for want of police protection. Government would of necessity be one of force for loot.

A nation grows in strength only as its enterprisers have imposed upon them restraints that protect the individual—restraints that assure the citizen that what, by diligent effort, he may lawfully accumulate, will not be taken from him by force.

The power of our Nation's enterprise today has grown from its defenses of the citizen against various forms of incentive-destroying thievery.

THE POWER TO TAX IS THE POWER TO DESTROY

Abuse of the power to destroy by excessive taxation has, alone, persuaded many normally creative citizens to abandon productive effort and join the ranks of those who would take much and give nothing.

Let the carefree dispensers of the fruits of your labors and mine be warned that, while this Nation may survive their spending sprees, it can do so only if creative diligence, which feeds free enterprise its means for growth, is stimulated somewhat in proportion to the wanton waste of what it produces.

WHY DISCRIMINATE AGAINST INCOME FROM INVENTIONS?

National Patent Council is proud to have initiated the discussion that led to the enactment of the first legislation providing for more liberal treatment, from the standpoint of taxation, of patent income.

Much remains to be done in this direction.

The incentive toward invention and development decreases as confiscatory taxation of patent income increases.

In many instances, where a share in corporate ownership provides the income from patented inventions, double taxation decreases the inventor's incentive to create and develop new things useful to our people.

INCREASED PATENT OFFICE FEES WOULD DETER INVENTORS

Now, let's take a look at another prospectively punishing attack on inventive incentive and upon the patent system.

And in this connection I must, at the risk of offending some very good friends of National Patent Council, insist that many patent lawyers and some patent-law associations, have most surprisingly demonstrated a seeming lack of understanding of the true economic function of the patent system they so faithfully serve when they recommended an increase in the fees charged inventors for the privilege of offering their contributions to feed the fires of free enterprise in America.

Any such increase in fees could serve only to increase available funds for distribution to foreign governments, some of which might someday welcome the weakness in our economy that must follow further stifling of its vital catalyst, which is the patent system.

In the interests of generations of Americans yet unborn, I beseech all patent lawyers, as accredited midwives at the delivery of inventions in America, to renew allegiance to God's primal law, to the Constitution, to the patent system, and to the industrial economy that it feeds for growth.

And may you and all other citizens give active allegiance also to every other law and institution in America devoted to the promotion of individual incentive to create and produce for a modest share of the wealth and advantage thus made available to others.

COURTS CAN HELP FREE ENTERPRISE

Among all the ill-considered blows struck at the heart of our incentive enterprise system in recent years perhaps none wounded and deterred creative leadership more than misguided assaults upon the patent system at various levels of the Federal judiciary.

Out of the Supreme Court, for example, have come adverse majority and minority opinions, sometimes going so far as to hold that only revolutionary inventions providing a foundation for an entire new and important art were entitled to patent protection, ignoring the fact that discoveries in basic research have required implementation by myriads of inventions providing practical applications to human needs.

The flash-of-genius theory—holding that invention, to be worthy of patent protection, must have resulted from some supernatural visitation—would deny reward to that inventive diligence that almost invariably precedes the creation of any new and useful thing. That unrealistic theory has disturbed and discouraged many men capable of the persistence necessary for creative achievement.

When judicial assaults upon our patent system culminated in a Supreme Court Justice remarking that the only patents the Supreme Court had not invalidated were those upon which it had not been able to get its hands, piratical manufacturers—of whom we have always too many—were emboldened to copy, at their pleasure, any patented invention, or inventions in the process of patenting, that may have suited their thieving purpose.

Courts have made wanton infringement a much more attractive thing for well-financed copyists—a crushing thing for the smaller competitor.

So let history record that in our time alien philosophies designed for subversion of our incentive economy were well disguised and were most subtle.

Let it be written that subversive concepts have proved most salable to men farthest removed from practical experiences that provide the only sure guidance toward con-

structive application of those inexorable, primal forces that can be made to build for our security but which, when not enough restrained, induce predatory men to destroy faster than others can build.

Contemptuous castigation by the courts, to whom they had looked traditionally for even-handed, understanding protection, has discouraged many inventors—and those who, with reasonable basis for confidence, would finance their inventions. It has discouraged manufacturers who might otherwise have been willing to assume the risks of the usually costly job of refining an invention for the market and of producing and distributing it.

Fortunately, not all of our Federal judges have too far forgotten that "patents make jobs"—that incentive-inspired inventions have built America—and that the fires of free enterprise must be fed by our creative leaders or American industry, the decisive factor in two world wars, must slow down.

May our courts endeavor to revitalize and hold intact that great industrial catalyst—that feeder of American incentive enterprise—that builder of our national security—which is our patent system.

WRITERS CAN HELP

Besides sound and helpful writers like Henry Hazlitt, whom we have quoted above, we have, influencing legislative and judicial opinion in America, the type of opinion-molding author who writes brilliantly—but who gains his perspective by looking hastily through keyholes at stages often carefully set to influence him.

May I please remind you of what I consider to be a very significant reflection of a corresponding lack of understanding on the part of many of our industrial people—and certainly on the part of those who write and publicize for them—as to the economic significance of our patent system?

You no doubt have seen on television—with increasing frequency—stories of individual industries—usually a presentation, in chronological sequence, of events and periods marking milestones of growth of the particular corporation.

Often these so-called documentaries are pitched to glorify the management.

No doubt the management quite often is deserving of great credit which perhaps has not been fully accorded publicly.

However, I have not seen—and I doubt that you have seen—a single one of these great films that has made any mention whatever of the fact that without contributions of inventions inspired by our patent system the industry glorified by the film could not have had the growth it now may proudly boast.

Quite recently was seen such a television presentation intended to promote appreciation of outstanding contributions to the public, and to our economy generally, by a rather well-known manufacturer of photographic equipment.

What writers call an "interesting twist" in the story was the decision of the founder—many years ago—that the market for the company's products was saturated and that further progress would be at a minimum and uninteresting.

So the founder sold the business.

The story then proceeded to dramatize the stages by which the company moved new products into new uses—broadened its field times over—and grew into proportions never dreamed of by the founder.

Why should the American public be denied the most vital truth ever wrapped up in one of those stories of phenomenal industrial progress?

Should not the people of this country be told that, except for the incentives offered by the patent system to inventors to spend sacrificial hours, perhaps years, bringing forth a new invention of impressive value to the public, industrial growth would really end at about the point where the founder of that company thought it had ended?

No citizen who once understands how our patent system functions to provide incentive to create and produce for better living and greater security for all of us can ever be twisted to serve the purposes of communism.

One of the contributions of National Patent Council to be added, when adequate funds, and the added personnel that such funds will finance, are available, is the convincing of writers and producers who dramatize in pictures such industrial progress, that it does not detract from its stature to admit, in effect, that management couldn't have done it without the help of the inventor seeking a chance for personal profit offered by the patent system.

SUSTAINED INCENTIVES MAKE FOR GROWTH

The inventor may work independently in a basement, bedroom, garage, or other one-man shop.

Or he may be salaried by a corporation, and in addition may share in proportion to the value of his contributions to the corporation.

Much of my time these days is spent in directing the invention, development, production, and distribution of devices that lend competence to one of the most prevalent of major mechanical assemblies to be found in America.

I refer to the more than 50 million motor vehicles, with all their functional components, most of which components have originated and have been perfected and produced outside the great research and testing laboratories of large corporations.

The manufacturing business that I founded in 1918, and of which I remain the active administrative head, is operated on the principle of motivation by incentive.

Its salaried inventors and their estates are given in addition a liberal and permanent share of what their inventions produce, in royalties from licenses issued, or in assumed royalties on products embodying their inventions and made and sold by the company.

Incentives in some form are provided for everyone who works for the company.

Into such incentive arrangements goes, before Federal taxes, more cash than the company ever retains after taxes.

If any of your members want to see the extent to which the primal law may be permitted to build momentum, happiness, and good will into a modern manufacturing organization, he is privileged to see me at our factory in Gary on any mutually convenient date.

I shall appreciate the opportunity to show to any of you how we team together—how our sound growth is achieved.

Such a visit might be justified alone by your opportunity to see the headquarters of National Patent Council, to meet its staff, and to understand more about how it functions and what it has achieved for you and for the Nation.

PATENTS MAKE JOBS

One of the primary purposes of the founding of National Patent Council was to correct—in the public mind—the impression created so expertly by propagandists long having access to vast communicative facilities of the Government, that patents were instruments of monopoly and were bad for the Nation.

Through almost 10 years of efforts of National Patent Council, reflected primarily in its clipsheet, Invention News and Views, and in its research reports (all reaching, by request, editors whose publications in turn reach regularly an estimated readership of about 100 million people), the public now understands that "patents make jobs"—that inventions feed free enterprise—and that the patent system fires incentive to invent and to produce.

The public has been challenged more than once to identify a single product of American industry that does not have embodied in it patentable invention or that has not been made cheaper and better because of patented or patentable inventions employed in its manufacture.

From baker's bread to building brick, we predict that you won't find anything coming out of any American factory that is not so qualified.

WHAT CAN WE DO?

To sum up, let us all band together to help our Government out of the business of pretending to own patents.

That can be done only by definite legislation.

Be prepared for an almost overwhelming barrage of deceptive adverse propaganda when that is undertaken.

Next, let us get rid of all compulsory licensing—before the concept spreads to eat the heart out of inventive incentives upon which our economy has relied for growth.

And let us persuade Congress to give a fair trial to generous financing for the Patent Office so that it may hold its most valued employees and attract other men of high competence. Let us provide that office with money with which to modernize its equipment and facilities. Thus may it add even greater impetus to our industrial economy.

Let us abandon any thought of increasing Patent Office fees—at least until long after we have quit coddling vote-getting projects with lush appropriations and have quit donating multiple billions of dollars to purposes of foreign governments.

Let us add impetus to invention and development in America by giving the inventor and his investors—as to Federal taxes—treatment at least as liberal as that given other groups in the matter of depletion of resources and in the matter of capital gains.

Let us free atomic energy for competitive application under the American brand of free enterprise—with full incentive to invent, develop, and produce under the unhampered inducements of our traditionally productive patent system—supported understandingly by each of the three great divisions of our Government.

And let us encourage legislation to invalidate United States patents owned or controlled by any foreign government.

THE PUBLIC WILL HELP, BUT ONLY IF YOU LEAD

Thanks to persistent educational work by National Patent Council, over many years, the American public, we believe, is ready to support any well-publicized movement in any of the various directions above suggested.

What the American public will support, its representatives in Congress will support, if the issues are clearly and impressively presented.

National Patent Council has earned, and intends to retain, the confidence of editors, commentators, columnists, educators, and the public. Its sincerity and the soundness of its philosophy command growing respect at legislative and judicial levels.

With the help of enlightened Americans, may our people be persuaded to discourage devotion to larceny as a principle of personal, corporate, and governmental policy.

Let us all support unfailingly all men willing to consecrate themselves to the task of persuading our people to return to the constitutional principles of God-fearing primalism—from the orderly practice of which our facilities for better living—and for maintaining our security as a nation—must continue to come.

## PAUL V. McNUTT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the late Paul Vories McNutt, former Governor of Indiana and first American Ambassador to the Philippines, will be known as one of the great public servants of our time. He has been conspicuous in the ranks of the Democratic Party.

The public career of Paul McNutt extended over critical years in our country's history—years that literally reshaped the political and economic life of the United States.

The son of an Indiana judge, as a child his goals were high. He became Governor of Indiana and then High Commissioner to the Philippines. He then became Federal Security Administrator, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, and head of other important Government agencies. His final services were performed as the first Ambassador to the Republic of the Philippines.

He was born on July 19, 1891, in Franklin, Ind. He was graduated from Indiana University in 1913 and from Harvard Law School in 1916. He returned to Indiana to accept a professorship in the law school of the State university, although there was a brief interim period when he worked with his father in the family law firm.

He served his country in World War I and rose to a colonel's rank in the Army, spending his military time training troops in artillery. After the war he returned to the Indiana Law School and in 1925 became its dean.

It was when he became national commander of the American Legion in 1928 that the way was paved for his political strides forward. Subsequently he became Governor of Indiana. He completely reorganized the State government, consolidating the 169 departments into 8 and pushing through a broad program of social security, which was one of his favorite subjects.

Throughout his public career, Paul McNutt was noted for his keen understanding of public problems, the sincerity of his convictions and the fine sense of public service which prompted his official acts.

During World War II, his one goal was winning the war. He was dedicated to that task. He contributed greatly to our success.

I personally mourn the passing of a greatly beloved friend whose fidelity through long years has never wavered. Those who knew Paul McNutt best recognized in him the qualities of true Americanism. Mindful of the needs of the underprivileged, he was devoted always to the improvement of mankind.

In his passing Paul McNutt has left a record as high in achievement as it was faithful in performance. He never temporized nor bargained where the public interest was the issue. But, day by day, through long service in high office he brought to the Nation and to the world the contribution of learning and sound wisdom.

Paul McNutt will be remembered by his fellow countrymen as a great American. His accomplishments will be an inspiration to those who believe in democracy as the best instrument for advancing the cause of world peace.

To his loved ones, I extend my deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

## BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 30, 1955, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4259. An act to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4720. An act to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances;

H. R. 4941. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4951. An act directing a redetermination of the national marketing quota for burley tobacco for the 1955–56 marketing year, and for other purposes.

## SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1436. An act to preserve the tobacco acreage history of farms which voluntarily withdraw from the production of tobacco, and to provide that the benefits of future increases in tobacco acreage allotments shall first be extended to farms on which there have been decreases in such allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend, was granted to:

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois on the subject The Easter Egg That Did Not Hatch.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTERSON in three instances.

Mr. WOLVERTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINO.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DORN of New York and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILLINGS and to include extraneous matter.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 4, 1955, 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:

617. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1956 involving a decrease in the amount of $75,900,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission (H. Doc. No. 122); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

618. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1956, involving an increase of $466,462 for the legislative branch, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 123); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

619. A letter from the Deputy Executive Director, Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, transmitting Report No. 11 prepared by Federal Facilities Corporation, the operating agency, with respect to its expenditures for repairs, replacements, additions, improvements, or maintenance of the Government-owned rubber producing facilities during the 8-month period for fiscal 1955 ending February 28, 1955, pursuant to section 15 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 408); to the Committee on Armed Services.

620. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report to the Congress on the liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the quarter ended December 31, 1954, pursuant to the provisions of the RFC Liquidation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

621. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the Report of Progress on General Accounting Office Recommendations To Improve the Financial Management of the Post Office Department for the period April 25, 1953, through February 28, 1955, pursuant to the Post Office Department Financial Control Act of 1950 (30 U. S. C. 794); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

622. A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the annual report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 10 (b) (4) of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12 (1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

623. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army and Air Force, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## 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. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3092. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice; without amendment (Rept. No. 318). 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. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 193. Resolution providing that the bill, H. R. 2266, and all accompanying papers shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 319). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 874. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anne P. Perceval; without amendment (Rept. No. 320). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 947. A bill for the relief of Carl E. Edwards; with amendment (Rept. No. 321). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1002. A bill for the relief of L. S. Goedeke; without amendment (Rept. No. 322). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1025. A bill for the relief of Osborne W. Rutherford; with amendment (Rept. No. 323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1202. A bill for the relief of Robert H. Merritt; without amendment (Rept. No. 324). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1535. A bill for the relief of Cabrillo Land Co., of San Diego, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 325). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1751. A bill for the relief of Priscilla Louise Davis; without amendment (Rept. No. 326). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1974. A bill for the relief of Shirley W. Rothra; without amendment (Rept. No. 327). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2052. A bill for the relief of the United States Fidelity and Guaranty Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 328). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2470. A bill for the relief of T. C. Elliott; without amendment (Rept. No. 329). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2893. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Graphic Arts Corp. of Ohio, of Toledo, Ohio; with amendment (Rept. No. 330). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2924. A bill for the relief of David J. Dazé; without amendment (Rept. No. 331). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3022. A bill for the relief of Frank Michael Whalen, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 332). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3036. A bill for the relief of George P. Provencal; without amendment (Rept. No. 333). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3152. A bill for the relief of Waymon H. Massey; with amendment (Rept. No. 334). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3180. A bill for the relief of William Frederick Werner; without amendment (Rept. No. 335). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3359. A bill for the relief of Raymond George Palmer; without amendment (Rept. No. 336). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3958. A bill for the relief of Louis Elterman; without amendment (Rept. No. 337). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3975. A bill for the relief of the Reverend Boniface Lucci, O. S. B.; without amendment (Rept. No. 338). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4182. A bill for the relief of the Highway Construction Co., of Ohio, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 339). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4249. A bill for the relief of Orrin J. Bishop; with amendment (Rept. No. 340). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4418. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States, and to enter judgment thereon; without amendment (Rept. No. 341). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4454. A bill for the relief of Rosezella Marie Preston Curran; with amendment (Rept. No. 342). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4506. A bill for the relief of J. A. Ross & Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 343). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4536. A bill for the relief of John J. Cowin; without amendment (Rept. No. 344). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4637. A bill for the relief of Mr. William Henry Diment, Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment, and Mrs. Gladys Everingham; without amendment (Rept. No. 345). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4714. A bill for the relief of Theodore J. Harris; without amendment (Rept. No. 346). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4865. A bill for the relief of Stanley Rydzon and Alexander F. Anderson; without amendment (Rept. No. 347). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5078. A bill for the relief of the estate of Victor Helfenbein; without amendment (Rept. No. 348). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5196. A bill for the relief of the Overseas Navigation Corp.; without amendment (Rept. No. 349). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 880. A bill for the relief of Paul Y. Loong; without amendment (Rept. No. 350). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 935. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marion Josephine Monnell; without amendment (Rept. No. 351). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 943. A bill for the relief of Luzie Biondo (Luzie M. Schmidt); with amendment (Rept. No. 352). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 995. A bill for the relief of Frieda Quiring and Tina Quiring; without amendment (Rept. No. 353). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 997. A bill for the relief of Irmgard Emilie Krepps; with amendment (Rept. No. 354). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 998. A bill for the relief of Meiko Shikibu; without amendment (Rept. No. 355). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1155. A bill for the relief of Solomon Wiesel; without amendment (Rept. No. 356). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1047. A bill for the relief of Armenouhi Assadour Artinian; without amendment (Rept. No. 357). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1083. A bill for the relief of Robert Shen-yen Hou-ming Lieu; without amendment (Rept. No. 358). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1157. A bill for the relief of Milad S. Isaac; without amendment (Rept. No. 359). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1158. A bill for the relief of Emanuel Frangeskos; without amendment (Rept. No. 360). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1205. A bill for the relief of Cynthia Jacob; without amendment (Rept. No. 361). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1247. A bill for the relief of Carol Brandon (Valtrude Probst); without amendment (Rept. No. 362). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1252. A bill for the relief of Olivia Mary Orciuch; without amendment (Rept. No. 363). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1299. A bill for the relief of Miss Toshiko Hozaka and her child, Roger; without amendment (Rept. No. 364). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1300. A bill for the relief of Luther Rose; without amendment (Rept. No. 365). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1357. A bill for the relief of Chin York Gay; without amendment (Rept. No. 366). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1467. A bill for the relief of Stijepo Buich; without amendment (Rept. No. 367). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1468. A bill for the relief of Barbara V. Taylor; with amendment (Rept. No. 368). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1472. A bill for the relief of Victor Manuel Soares De Mendonca; without amendment (Rept. No. 369). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1487. A bill for the relief of Rosa Marie Phillips; without amendment (Rept. No. 370). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1655. A bill for the relief of the Wojcik family; without amendment (Rept. No. 371). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1684. A bill for the relief of Rev. Zdzislaw Aleksander Peszkowski; without amendment (Rept. No. 372). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1954. A bill for the relief of Ingrid Samson; without amendment (Rept. No. 373). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2933. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Berta Mansergh; without amendment (Rept. No. 374). 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. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 5392. A bill to amend section 203 of the National Housing Act to reduce the rate of interest which mortgages insured thereunder may bear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 5393. A bill to permit certain repatriated citizens of the United States to obtain certified proof or documentation of their repatriation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 5394. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a widow who loses her widow's benefit by remarriage may again become entitled to such benefit if her husband dies within 1 year after such remarriage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. R. 5395. A bill to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be paid compensation at the rate of $2.50 per day for each day spent in hiding during World War II or the Korean conflict to evade capture by the enemy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 5396. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide price support at more than 50 percent of parity for certain basic agricultural commodities in case producers disapprove marketing quotas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 5397. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 5398. A bill to increase the efficiency of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 5399. A bill to extend to uniformed members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 5400. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 5401. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 5402. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 5403. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 5404. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 5405. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 5406. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 5407. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 5408. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 5409. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 5410. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 5411. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 5412. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 5413. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 5414. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 5415. A bill to provide for the sale of all the real property which has been acquired by the Secretary of Commerce for the construction of the Burke Airport, Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5416. A bill to amend section 48 of the Bankruptcy Act, approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5417. A bill to amend section 1721, title 18, United States Code, relating to the sale or pledge of postage stamps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. R. 5418. A bill to prohibit the transmission through the mails of communications intended to incite hostility among individuals and classes and groups of individuals on account of differences in race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 5419. A bill relating to the imposition of a tax on the importation of lead and zinc; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5420. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5421. A bill for the relief of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 5422. A bill to establish a program of financial aid to students in higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 5423. A bill to authorize use of receipts derived from donated national forest and other lands administered for forest research purposes in continued research activities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 5424. A bill to further define self-employed individuals for purposes of the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5425. A bill to provide that services performed by agricultural employees who are not employed by the same employer for more than 60 days in a calendar year shall not be considered to be "employment" for the purposes of coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 5426. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act to permit an individual with 40 years' service to retire regardless of his age, and to increase certain annuities by providing a new alternative base for computing monthly compensation in the case of service before 1937; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 5427. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937 so as to provide for exemptions from inheritance tax, on a reciprocal basis, for transfers to charitable, educational, and religious organizations outside the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 5428. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that chapter 71 relative to transferees and fiduciaries shall apply with respect to any tax imposed by the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 5429. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for

amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 5430. A bill to authorize the construction of Shelbyville Reservoir on the Kaskaskia River in Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5431. A bill to extend coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to individuals engaged in the practice of dentistry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 5432. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 5433. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Folsom South unit, American River Division, Central Valley project, in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 5434. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 5435. A bill to amend further the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize the Federal Civil Defense Administration to procure radiological instruments and detection devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 5436. A bill to repeal the Federal taxes on gasoline, lubricating oils, and diesel fuel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 5437. A bill to provide for the granting of career-conditional and career appointments in the competitive civil service to certain qualified employees serving under indefinite appointments; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 5438. A bill to provide for the burial near the Marine Corps War Memorial at the northern end of Arlington National Cemetery of the participants in the famous flag raising at Iwo Jima; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 5439. A bill to provide for the promotion and elimination of women officers of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve on the same basis as male officers of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 5440. A bill to include the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the list of officers eligible to act as President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5441. A bill to increase the maximum amount of certain loans which can be insured by the Federal Housing Commissioner under title I of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 5442. A bill to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 5443. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. R. 5444. A bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled, "An act to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and for other purposes", approved August 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 720); to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution to authorize the Joint Committee on the Economic Report to investigate and report on the economic problems connected with the loss of employment in the textile industry; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that, in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, the President should create within the Department of Defense a civilian Department of Civil Defense and transfer all functions of the existing Federal Civil Defense Administration to such new Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution authorizing the appointment of a congressional delegation to attend the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. Res. 203. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations, and make inquiries relating to housing; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 204. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 203; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. Res. 205. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House to require the yeas and nays in the case of final action on appropriation bills; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Senate Resolution No. 120 of the State of New York, memorializing Congress relative to the barge canal system of New York State; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation and make an appropriation for the construction of Buttes Dam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing that the State of Arizona and the United States share equally any income inuring to the United States Government from federally owned lands in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting that favorable consideration be given the recommendations in the survey report of the Kaskaskia Valley project, as soon as such report is submitted to Congress by the Corps of Engineers, and that funds be appropriated for the construction of the Carlyle and Shelbyville Dams at such times as they can be economically used by the Corps of Engineers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the barge canal system of New York State; to the Committee on Appropriations.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 5445. A bill for the relief of Augustus W. Strazza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 5446. A bill for the relief of Pavol P. Diacon-Zadeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 5447. A bill for the relief of David and Lynda Harden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARRIGG (by request):

H. R. 5448. A bill for the relief of Tadeusz Ostrowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 5449. A bill for the relief of Clelia Cusano Puglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 5450. A bill for the relief of Nijole Virginia Brazanas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5451. A bill for the relief of Henry G. Mathusek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H. R. 5452. A bill for the relief of Ingeburg Edith Stallings (nee Nitzki); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H. R. 5453. A bill for the relief of the estate of Robert Bradford Bickerstaff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 5454. A bill for the relief of Saida M. Elfassi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5455. A bill for the relief of Gerlando (Gino) Mangione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. R. 5456. A bill for the relief of Emil Arens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 5457. A bill for the relief of Edward Lawrence Lynch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 5458. A bill for the relief of William R. and Alice M. Reardon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 5459. A bill for the relief of Herbert Strauss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW (by request):

H. R. 5460. A bill for the relief of George Hodge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 5461. A bill to confer authority upon the Secretary of the Army to pay certain claims of Ottinger Bros.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

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

182. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of August J. Molnar, chairman of the department of Hungarian studies, Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, Ill., urging the Congress to request the President of the United States to proclaim a Colonel-Commandant Michael Kovats Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

183. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the grand knight, Baron DeKalb Council, No. 1073, Knights of Columbus, Sheepshead Bay, Brooklyn, N. Y., expressing their support of the principles of the proposed Bricker amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 1, to the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Emergency Hurricane Warning System Needed for North Atlantic Seaboard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

**HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON**
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 31, 1955*

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in Congress an independent appropriation bill, H. R. 5260, asking for $5 million, providing for an emergency hurricane warning system based upon a special study prepared by meteorologists specializing in hurricane phenomena. I have requested this special study.

Few people realize that the property damages of hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel last fall amounted to $1 billion and killed over 150 persons in the devastation wrought along the North Atlantic seaboard.

Meteorological experts tell us that these last three big storms were not freakish sea storms straying inland off their regular paths. The scientists say that distinct changes in the worldwide upper wind patterns is creating a new cycle driving inland the great sea storms and may afflict heavy damages on the New England coast again this season and for years to come.

The United States Weather Bureau, operating under a drastically cut budget, is doing the best it can to detect the movement of hurricanes and issue warnings. In fact, the Weather Bureau has done a great job with limited mechanical equipment operated by overworked staff personnel. During the last big storm weather forecasters worked continuously 18 hours without relief. But there is a limit of human endurance. Budget cuts forced the closing of weather stations at Eastport, Maine; Bangor, Maine; Cape May, N. J.; Ocean City, Md. The Eastport station had been in operation since 1891. Also, forced reductions in the Bureau's working force resulted in only limited operation at offices at New Haven, Conn.; Bridgeport, Conn.; and eight other weather stations.

I recently appealed to President Eisenhower to act favorably on the recommendations of the Interagency Hurricane Research Conference for a more effective hurricane research and warning program. This was a long-range program.

The President advised me that he shared my concern for adequate safeguards against hurricane disasters, and said, "You may be assured that thorough consideration will be given to such additional research activities as may be proposed."

I am now proposing a short-range emergency hurricane warning program to be financed by a special appropriation of $5 million. I am appealing to 36 Senators, 18 governors, and 177 Congressmen to join me in the drive to secure necessary Federal funds to enable the Weather Bureau to set up a really effective hurricane warning system to save human life and property.

It is impossible to accurately determine in advance what the projected hurricane task program will accomplish in dollars and cents; but experts estimate that potential savings of 25 percent damages to property and 90 percent savings in human life will result if advance warnings from 7 to 21 hours can be widely disseminated via newspaper, radio, and TV news bulletins.

OBJECTIVES OF THE PROPOSED SPECIAL AND IMMEDIATE HURRICANE WARNING PROGRAM

First. To reduce unnecessary loss of life and property in all coastal States from future hurricanes.

Second. To reduce unnecessary interruptions, costly protective action, and time-consuming precautionary measures of thousands of business firms and millions of citizens in fringe areas of expected hurricane paths.

Third. To reduce unnecessary fear and apprehension in areas in or close by the expected paths of future hurricanes.

Fourth. To increase the value of hurricane forecasts to the people of 19 coastal States who need better and more precise information as to expected wind speeds, water levels, and times of hurricane occurrences.

Fifth. To enable the Weather Bureau (a) to provide an improved hurricane warning service immediately; (b) to give locations, speeds, directions, and intensities of future hurricanes with more accuracy than has been possible for past hurricanes; (c) to describe present and expected weather conditions in and surrounding future hurricanes more accurately than has been possible for past hurricanes; (d) to provide alerts and warnings of future hurricanes 6 to 12 hours further in advance than has been possible for past hurricanes; (e) to distribute essential hurricanes reports and warnings with greater speed, efficiency, and certainty than has been possible for past hurricanes; (f) to give complete and accurate forecasts of high-water levels for all occupied coastal areas subject to inundation.

HOW THE ABOVE OBJECTIVES CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED

(a) Secure appropriations to carry out a special and immediate hurricane warning program of the United States Weather Bureau starting June 1, 1955, and as long thereafter as may be necessary to avoid unnecessary loss of life and property from hurricanes.

(b) Secure the above appropriations in addition to the funds contained in the budget estimates for the Department of Commerce Weather Bureau submitted to Congress in January 1955 for fiscal year ending June 30, 1956.

(c) Secure appropriations for both of the above programs, and also for a hurricane research and development program for fiscal years 1956, 1957 and 1958.

WAYS IN WHICH REQUESTED FUNDS ARE TO BE EXPENDED BY THE WEATHER BUREAU

First. To provide staff sufficient to keep Weather Bureau offices open 24 hours a day in 10 coastal cities from Maine to Texas where existing weather bureau offices are now open only part time.

Second. To provide technically trained staff sufficient to reopen Weather Bureau offices in five coastal cities from Maine to Texas where formerly existing Weather Bureau offices have been closed.

Third. To operate special teletypewriter, facsimile, telephone, and radio networks for the prompt relay of meteorological information used in forecasting hurricanes and major storms, and used for instantaneous distribution of hurricane warnings and alerts to all areas and citizens concerned.

Fourth. To provide staff and observing equipment to operate 12 additional rawinsonde stations in the United States east of the 100th meridian and in other selected land areas adjoining the Gulf of Mexico, Caribbean Sea and western Atlantic Ocean; and to provide staff and supplies at existing rawinsonde stations to take required upper air observations at 6-hourly intervals instead of at 12-hourly intervals during the hurricane season.

Fifth. To provide additional weather observations during storm periods from merchant ships traversing the western Atlantic Ocean, Caribbean Sea, and Gulf of Mexico.

Sixth. To provide additional forecasters, additional meteorological chartmen, and additional communicators to provide around-the-clock hurricane forecasting watches at each of the following six hurricane forecast centers: Boston, New York, Washington, Miami, New Orleans, and San Juan.

Seventh. To establish an improved high water warning service to inform coastal areas of approaching high storm tides, damaging waves, and other coastal inundations from abnormal water levels and floods associated with hurricanes and heavy coastal rainstorms.

Eighth. To provide meterological staff and facilities for emergency hurricane warning centers and for mobile storm warning squads to supplement the local Weather Bureau staffs during the intense activity accompanying the approach and passage of hurricanes and major storms; and afterwards to survey and review (a) the quantity and quality of hurricane reports, alerts, and forecasts; (b) the times, places, and amounts of hurricane information distributed by all news media; (c) the protective action taken by all concerned, and (d) the types and amounts of hurricane damage incurred.

Ninth. To reestablish the ocean weather ship station formerly located halfway between New York and Bermuda and maintained there by the United States Coast Guard for 12 years prior to its removal in June 1954.

Tenth. To carry out a cooperative private and governmental public infor-

mation program involving important aspects of hurricane alerts, hurricane warnings, the changing characteristics of moving hurricanes, and the precautions, that should be taken by citizens in the forecast path of future hurricanes to save lives and property.

## The Outlook for the Eisenhower Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 31, 1955*

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a speech delivered by me on March 28, 1955, before the Young Republican Club of Hunter College in New York City.

The topic of my talk was the outlook for the Eisenhower program, and is as follows:

THE OUTLOOK FOR THE EISENHOWER PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman and young Republicans, I wish to thank the members of the Hunter College Young Republican Club for this cordial invitation to speak to you on "The Outlook for the Eisenhower Program."

The focus of the Eisenhower program is of course Eisenhower himself. In coming here to speak to you about the outlook of that program I am beset by certain imponderables. A Government program in our country, depends upon the mind and the will of the people. Those who in the past have had the audacity to predict the public will—even the professional prophets—have had occasion since then to adopt more humble and meeker attitudes. They will not easily forget the Literary Digest poll and the assured election of Alf Landon in 1936. They will even less easily forget what happened in 1948—a catastrophe for the prophecy industry.

Apart from election results, ours is not a country in which a program is laid down and followed. Ours is a country in which a program is debated—after it is laid down. Then it is modified. And then the modification is debated, with quite likely, a modification of the modification, and concomitant debates for each change. The Congress of the United States as well as the administration see to it that the people are informed, a process of public education which on the whole is inescapable under the compulsion of our system. The Congress awaits or acts in anticipation of reaction from the grass roots. There are deliberately intended political irritants in the democratic system to protect our country from the practices that apply in a monolithic state—like Soviet Russia.

The major of these irritants is something rather sweetly called the party in opposition. It seems to some to be the function of the party in opposition to needle, to criticize, to waylay, to ambush and to so puncture, molest and annoy the party in power, that the people will lose faith, elect the critics to power, and put the party in power in the position of being the party in opposition. In the Soviet Union they have an immediate, a summary, and a decisive answer for the faintest sign of a beginning of a party in opposition. Such a party ipsofacto becomes a party of traitors, of enemies of the people, of capitalists, imperialists, warmongers, and just plain and fancy scoundrels.

And, of course, they are shot and disappear from the Soviet scene, and from Soviet encyclopedias and history books.

So, as we can see, in a monolithic state a program is laid down and it is acted upon—or else. This does away with all the nonsense of debate, it cuts through red tape, and it does not bother and baffle the people with details. In fact, Pravda and Izvestia are Soviet newspapers which see no point in printing more information about the government and the news for 200 million people than can be encompassed in something like 6 pages and often only 4. And there is no advertising to distract your attention from the pravda in Pravda—pravda being the Russian word for truth. In fact, in the Soviet Union you can go directly from your bed to the salt mines knowing simply that you are helping to fulfill patriotically the newest 5-year plan to make up for the old 5-year plan that the traitors they shot the day before sabotaged.

But since political science in the United States has not yet evolved to the fine sensitivity that prevails in the Soviet Union, we must necessarily put up with what we've got. So that under our awkward and faltering system when we speak of the outlook for the Eisenhower program we are dealing with imponderables which may very well knock whole chunks of any program into a cocked hat. Yet I believe that this is not going to happen to the Eisenhower program. I believe that the Eisenhower program will sail through to successful fruition mostly intact. And I feel so sanguine about this optimistic outcome, that in presenting it I do not feel that I am putting myself out on a limb, or joining my fortunes to those wretched unfortunates who predicted the election of Alf Landon, the defeat of the Democrats in 1948, or the election of a Republican Congress in 1954.

The basic essence of my faith in the Eisenhower program is Eisenhower.

If you relate the Eisenhower character, the Eisenhower personality, the Eisenhower pattern of action to the Eisenhower state of the Union speech—which is in so many words his program—then you can see the ground for my optimism. It is my purpose to give you a speech of evaluation, not a speech intended to incite or encourage applause. I want to be as objective as may be, in the light of my freely acknowledged bias for the Republican Party point of view. My admiration for President Eisenhower I shall make no effort to conceal. But if I give the effect of making a political address per se, I shall have failed in my aim. Of course, when a Republican discusses the outlook for the Eisenhower program certain political overtones are to be taken for granted. But this is a student group and I want you to enter into this evaluation with me more on the basis of what we both know than on the basis of what I want, or would seek to persuade you to believe.

Now the more I grow in legislative experience the more amazing it becomes to me how much it is really the people who make the decisions. I cannot tell you how that is beyond facts which are commonplace to us all. You decide because you elect. You decide because you write. You decide because Congress reads—but avidly—what you write. The newspapers you subscribe to and the comments you make in them, the meetings you attend, the issues that arouse your pride, your fear, your anger, your approval, all these become straws in the wind that contribute to the direction of legislative decision.

They are the meat and the potatoes that invest congresstional action.

The Congress follows your thinking because for so many of us our official life depends upon doing what it is you want done. Out of this vast imponderable area of the public's mind on what direction the Government should take, the people, it seems to me, have found an extraordinary focus and an incredibly sympathetic reaction in President Eisenhower. They say the President is popular—but what does that mean? What it means is that the President's personality, his thinking or philosophy, his policies have been revealed to the American people in such a way that they find confidence in his leadership and comfort in his personality. They find it a bulwark of strength to the American destiny that this man is in the White House. It means that for the era in which we live this relationship between the President of the United States and the 164 million people of the United States is about the happiest political marriage in the last quarter of a century.

That's what it means.

Suppose we inquire into the reasons for the happiness the American people feel in President Eisenhower. I have spoken about the era in which we live and the tailored suitability with which President Eisenhower meets the needs of this era. For what we seek so much out of our very soul's wish is amity—amity—amity with ourselves and with the world. What we want is a period of reason and reasonableness. We wear the scars and feel the exhaustion of two world wars, a depression and Korea. We seek the peace of untroubled waters. We know the meaning of stress and strain but we want the tensions released. No easement of any of our problems is worth an iota unless our security is intact, our strength formidable, our position mightily fortified. We know the threat from the Kremlin in all its ugly proportions. The question is; can we have alertness without fear, security without nervous friction. The question is can we move forward in our national life to a progressive future without feeling that we are perpetually looking into the mouths of the Kremlin's cannon.

In Eisenhower the people have found the complete answer. He oozes amity at every pore. He avoids the bar room type of brawling that goes with a certain phase of politics. He has the common touch but he stands above the battle. Where other irritate, he reconciles. He is hard as nails and firm as Gibraltar with a proved soldier's knowledge on the complex problems of military strength. But he is sweepingly broad and paternally gentle in matters of the public welfare. Where he walks there is victory. The designs for success are woven into his career. His place, his superiors decided, when he had superiors, was in the foremost place of leadership. Leadership, not only of his own troops, but of the troops and the ships and the leaders of the allies. The judgment to give him leadership, determined by those set over him was afterwards overwhelmingly endorsed by the people. There was a remarkable unanimity of opinion—everywhere—that in a crisis get Eisenhower.

It is a pity there is not time to go into the record of the 83d Congress, Eisenhower's first Congress: Governmental reorganization, veterans' and servicemen's legislation, legislation for the national defense and internal security, termination of economic controls, reduction of excise taxes, revision of the Internal Revenue Code—an omnibus tax revision bill that by itself is a historic achievement. The reciprocal trade agreements extension, and the extension of the Mutual Security Act, the agricultural legislation to give a sound basis for improving the lot of the farmer, all these and more constitute the foundation upon which the current program in the 84th Congress is built. The Eisenhower program in the 84th Congress is an extension logically of the Eisenhower program that went before.

In terms of the earth on which we live and with which we must survive or perish the President wants new billions voted in foreign aid. He wants lower tariffs. He asks that the

United Nations be strengthened. The President wants the United States impregnable with 20th century emphasis on air power and the means to strike back with terrifying impact. In line with the possibilities under military developments he seeks to cut military manpower to 3 million by July 1 and to 2.85 million by 1956. But he wants to continue the power to draft for 2 years' service, building up a big military reserve and making professional military service attractive as a career. There is, of course, the continuation under the Eisenhower program of the stockpiling of strategic materials.

You have all heard about the Eisenhower $101 billion highway plan. We know that while socialistic experiments are being curtailed, the President approves impetus toward partnership between Government and private interests in developing resources. Progress is indicated in the Federal development of major projects and there is the impending help to localities to build schools.

The President wants to raise the minimum wage to 90 cents an hour. Determination is strong to keep the price supports for farmers flexible. The Eisenhower program calls for changes favorable to unions in the Taft-Hartley Act. New housing units for lower-income groups are planned by the tens of thousands. The President feels strongly about health reinsurance. The President's recommendation for raising the pay of the military—and substantially at that—is already on its way through the congressional process. The same is true of salary increases for Federal employees. And the pay of judges and Members of Congress is already law—a long and painfully delayed consummation of elementary economic justice. The President's program also seeks to bring Federal workers and the military under the old-age and survivors insurance program—social security.

If that program has not got the forward look then those who say so suffer from political bias and partisan blindness.

And it is not just a program like so many talking points in a sales pitch. Whole pieces of it are even now, as I speak, going through the congressional process—actively—on the path to the President's signature and to law. Some of it has already been made into law. Of course some of it will not go through entire. And, of course, there will be modifications here and there. The President's plan to have his authority extended to enable him to enter trade agreements passed the House, as I was preparing the material for this address, and is in a committee of the Senate. The same is true of the Universal Military Training and Service Act and the Dependents Assistance Act. The outlook is good for foreign aid especially since Harold E. Stassen, former director of the Foreign Operations Administration, returned with a favorable report after his tour of the Far East.

The amity and the peace I have been talking about are predicated on hard steel and not on some visionary fool's paradise. The President has said that the United States would maintain fighting forces in Europe so long as there is the threat of a Russian attack on the Continent. That is what I mean when I say the President's popularity is not the popularity built up on the basis of a smile and a benign expression, after the manner of an idol in the motion-picture industry. It is built on the faith of the people in a man of good will who knows the score and will not be deluded, cajoled, or softened up. They know he will avoid bloodshed and that he cannot be drawn into costly combat for indefinable ends in distant areas where results can be catastrophic if they go wrong and are of negligible consequence even if they go right. He knows the cost from firsthand knowledge to the other fellow and his kith and kin, as well as to himself and his own kith and kin, and he will reckon with the cost. But above all, the people know that a man with an unbroken record of valor and achievement in combat like Eisenhower does not flinch and the people know that better than they know anything else.

History tells us that people in the mass have—for the most part—an unerring instinctual genius in their choice of leadership. And in a democracy this genius is, to be sure, developed to the finest point of sensitivity and accuracy. In fact I believe that the word "popular" is not the precise term. The word, I insist, should be faith. The word should be confidence. The word should be respect. The people know that they have a strong hand on the helm and that the man in the White House will not fling his fists about in random gestures, or make severe or abusive speeches, after the manner of the propaganda floods from the Kremlin. They know he will not be provoked by an enemy that would like to see him spend—if not waste—his country's substance and its prestige in the wrong place, in the wrong way at the wrong time.

What he insists our country shall have is a powerful economy at home—the most powerful of all time in all the recorded annals of nations—and formidable and prodigious military strength in being. He wants the potential enemy to know and to see both and to beware of their meaning. Behind all this is the moral principle of the West. There are allies tied to us with hoops of steel and integrated friendships founded upon a common faith in God, and a common civilization. We know and the President knows and the enemy knows that this country will not commit the overt act which may precipitate the unbelievable holocaust of world war III. But Eisenhower is letting the enemy know in no unmistakable terms that the Kremlin had better not commit the overt act either. The same hard sense and bold planning the President has combined with understanding in his program for the domestic progress of the country, he has applied with perhaps even more intensity in confronting foreign policy and the half world of communism on the march. The United States has 6 Army divisions in Europe and 18 Air Force wings. The 6th United States Fleet is in the Mediterranean. There are equally mighty deterrent forces in the Pacific and I doubt whether the world has ever seen a more powerful fleet than the 7th which is now prowling the waters around Formosa. We hold the lead in the atomic race.

The peace the world enjoys today is not founded upon soft talk but upon hard muscle.

Of course the President's smile is warm and his expression is gracious. He has a word of praise for Marshal Zhukov, a good soldier's admiration for a good soldier, and this is returned in kind. Maybe good will come of it. But the President does not depend upon that for peace, except insofar as it may be an avenue to world amity. Now taking all these threads together, I think we can see the outlines of an Eisenhower program that makes for peace and I think the outlook for that program is sound, and that we can afford to be optimistic. But we cannot afford to be complacent, and we cannot afford to forget that we must remain forever on the ready.

There you have it.

I cannot pretend to know all the detours and corners that may have to be turned before the Eisenhower program becomes fact. But I hold it will be successful and that it will come to pass because it is a program that is not hitched to the moon. It is not a program that seeks the remaking of America. It is not a program that cuts corners with the Constitution of the United States. It is a program within foreseeable probability. It is not a program that has to be driven through with a sledge hammer to a rubber-stamp Congress. What do the President's critics complain about—the critics of his own party? They complain that he is moderate and they want him to be extreme. And what is the answer to their criticism? The answer is that the President of the United States has become a mighty force inside our country for unity. Just what is wrong with that? When the President put through for congressional action his $101 billion highway plan the complaints against it were not directed at the plan itself—more and better roads, for defense, for economy, for the safety of our people on the highways. The complaint against it was directed at the method of proposed financing, an all-important detail but still a detail. When I spoke of possible modifications in his program it is this kind of modification I have in mind. The basic idea will go through and become reality, like most of the rest of the program. That highway program is a monumental undertaking, an engineering feat comparable perhaps in our time, and in our context, to what the building of the pyramids must have meant to the ancient Egyptian civilization. But here is utility, here is national security, here is convenience, here are bigger and more avenues of communication for a more prosperous economy. I emphasize it because it lends itself to drama and easy explanation and because it is symptomatic of the Eisenhower philosophy.

The President seems to have effected to a considerable degree a cooperative reaction from a Congress the most powerful part of which is politically hostile. Of course there are rifts—here and there—and there would be if every Member of House and Senate were a Democrat and the President were a Democrat, too. And there would be if they were all Republicans. This is a democracy and not a monolithic state and rifts are what democracy is made of. But the President has drawn to himself the threads of divergence and the threads of amity and brought about a harmonious pattern as nearly as that can be done by the genius of man dealing with a world of human conflict.

It is for these reasons that I believe the outlook for the Eisenhower program is solid and that the country in sensing this has achieved a prosperity in the last year that outstrips everything in the past. And the whole world, sensing the vigor of the Eisenhower program for peace, feels likewise a sense of sureness and of security, that, while not total, is at least reassuring and stronger than it has been since the end of World War II. Ladies and gentlemen, we are in the midst of a period of leadership comparable only to the greatest in our history. The future—I thank God—looks to me like an Eisenhower future.

---

## Stop Calling the Dodgers "Bums"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 31, 1955*

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to a most worthwhile campaign started recently by the Brooklyn Bulletin. I quote from the front page of the March 17, 1955, issue of the newspaper:

STOP CALLING THE DODGERS THE "BUMS"

Let's stop calling the Brooklyn Dodgers the "Bums."

Let's start a campaign to urge everyone else to cease and desist from using that uncomplimentary appellation for our favorite baseball team.

The Brooklyn Bulletin herewith begins a drive to rid the Dodgers of that onerous moniker.

The Dodgers are neither ruffians nor individuals without obvious means of support. (Although sometimes our pitchers feel that way about their teammates.)

The dictionary says "a bum is an inebriate, a mendicant, a tramp, and a loafer." Now, I ask you, is that a nice thing to say about the flock? Let's all take the pledge now before the season starts to lay off the word "bums." Besides, think of our children. How can we reconcile our desire to inspire gentlemanly traits with an uncouth burst tossed in the direction of our beloved boys in the Brooklyn uniforms. We repeat, don't call the Dodgers "bums." Save it for the visiting teams.

Mr. Speaker, I endorse these sentiments. The Brooklyn baseball team will win the National League pennant this year, and go on to win the world championship. It is important that the dignity of champions be recognized.

## Report on a Minimum Wage Rate Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 31, 1955*

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a document entitled "What Wage Floor Would Be Necessary To Protect Connecticut's Great Industrial Labor Force Against the Migration of Industries From the State?", which was prepared by Dr. Sar A. Levitan, an outstanding economist on the staff of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress.

I requested the Legislative Reference Service to conduct this survey with a view of determining what national minimum wage floor should be established in order to protect Connecticut's industrial labor force from runaway industries migrating to labor market areas of surplus labor supply, indecent wages, and substandards of living.

The Legislative Reference Service, of course, makes no recommendations. Consequently it would be unfair to read into this study any support or opposition to any specific proposal for the modification of the Federal minimum wage law now pending before Congress. This study is based upon a comprehensive survey and an objective analysis of the facts. I commend Dr. Levitan for his excellent presentation of a vital economic problem.

I hope that this factual study will be of benefit not only to me but to other Members of the House:

WHAT WAGE FLOOR WOULD BE NECESSARY TO PROTECT CONNECTICUT'S GREAT INDUSTRIAL LABOR FORCE AGAINST THE MIGRATION OF INDUSTRIES FROM THE STATE?

(Prepared by Dr. Sar A. Levitan)

MINIMUM-WAGE LEGISLATION TO DATE

Minimum-wage legislation in the United States dates back to 1912, when the Commonwealth of Massachusetts passed the first State minimum-wage law. Since then more than half the States have enacted minimum-wage legislation. Twenty-three of the thirty States and Territories with minimum-wage legislation have limited their coverage to women and/or children. Twenty-two States, most of them in the South, have no minimum-wage laws.

Two of the seven States that have extended the protection of their minimum-wage laws to men as well as women have a statutory minimum-wage rate of 75 cents an hour. These two States are Connecticut and Massachusetts. Connecticut was the first State to set a statutory minimum equal to the current Federal rate. Beside these two cases, State coverage has been largely limited and the statutory minimum wages comparatively low.

The Federal Government entered the field of minimum-wage legislation with the enactment of the National Industrial Recovery Act codes. In 1938 it passed permanent minimum-wage legislation with a 25-cent minimum that became effective in October 1938. This minimum was increased to 30 cents a year later, and during the war a 40-cent minimum became effective. The floor on wages was further increased to 75 cents in the beginning of 1950.

THE CASE FOR MINIMUM-WAGE LEGISLATION

The justification for minimum-wage legislation is twofold:

1. It attempts to raise the standard of living of those who are at the bottom of the economic ladder and tries to provide these with a minimum standard of living.

2. Minimum-wage legislation recognizes that the existence of low wages tends to debase the living standards of workers enjoying higher wage levels and acts as a drag upon the economy. Substandard wages, in the words of the Fair Labor Act, constitute an unfair method of competition in commerce and interferes with the "orderly and fair marketing of goods and commerce."

The Fair Labor Standards Act declares it to be the policy of the United States to try to correct as rapidly as practicable the depressing effects that substandard wages exert upon the overall wage structure. This is to be accomplished, however, without substantially curtailing employment or the earning power of those individuals involved.

REGIONAL WAGE DIFFERENTIALS

Minimum wage legislation normally affects directly only a small percentage of wage earners—those at the bottom of the economic ladder. It apparently has not appreciably reduced wage differentials among the several sections in the country or among different occupations.

Detailed regional information on wage distribution is available for manufacturing. Data published recently by the Bureau of Labor Statistics reveal that in April 1954, there were in the United States some 1,282,000 production workers in manufacturing whose hourly earnings were less than $1 an hour, while more than double that number were earning less than $1.25 an hour. One out of every five production workers engaged in manufacturing in the northeast were earning less than $1.25; in the South a comparable percentage was 50 percent.

TABLE 1.—*Estimated cumulative distribution of production workers in manufacturing industries by straight-time average hourly earnings,[1] United States and regions,[2] April 1954*

[In thousands]

| Average hourly earnings [1] (in cents) | United States | Northeast | South | Middle West | Far West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Under 75 | 23 | 3 | 18 | 2 | [3] |
| 75 and under 80 | 380 | 58 | 283 | 34 | 5 |
| 80 and under 85 | 575 | 111 | 398 | 59 | 6 |
| 85 and under 90 | 817 | 186 | 519 | 100 | 12 |
| 90 and under 95 | 1,069 | 280 | 634 | 138 | 16 |
| 95 and under 100 | 1,282 | 360 | 723 | 179 | 20 |
| 100 and under 105 | 1,656 | 491 | 882 | 250 | 33 |
| 105 and under 110 | 1,925 | 594 | 991 | 301 | 39 |
| 110 and under 115 | 2,243 | 724 | 1,103 | 368 | 48 |
| 115 and under 120 | 2,518 | 838 | 1,194 | 429 | 57 |
| 120 and under 125 | 2,823 | 964 | 1,283 | 504 | 72 |
| 125 and over | 9,767 | 3,534 | 1,281 | 3,874 | 1,078 |
| Number of workers | 12,590 | 4,498 | 2,564 | 4,378 | 1,150 |
| Average hourly earnings | $1.68 | $1.67 | $1.36 | $1.80 | $1.94 |

NOTE.—For footnotes see end of next table.

TABLE 2.—*Estimated cumulative percentage distribution of production workers in manufacturing industries by straight-time average hourly earnings,[1] United States and regions,[2] April 1954*

| Average hourly earnings [1] (in cents) | United States | Northeast | South | Middle West | Far West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Under 75 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.7 | [3] | [3] |
| 75 and under 80 | 3.0 | 1.3 | 11.0 | 0.8 | 0.4 |
| 80 and under 85 | 4.6 | 2.5 | 15.5 | 1.3 | .5 |
| 85 and under 90 | 6.5 | 4.1 | 20.2 | 2.3 | 1.1 |
| 90 and under 95 | 8.5 | 6.2 | 24.7 | 3.2 | 1.4 |
| 95 and under 100 | 10.2 | 8.0 | 28.2 | 4.1 | 1.8 |
| 100 and under 105 | 13.2 | 10.9 | 34.4 | 5.7 | 2.9 |
| 105 and under 110 | 15.3 | 13.2 | 38.6 | 6.9 | 3.4 |
| 110 and under 115 | 17.8 | 16.1 | 43.0 | 8.4 | 4.2 |
| 115 and under 120 | 20.0 | 18.6 | 46.6 | 9.8 | 4.9 |
| 120 and under 125 | 22.4 | 21.4 | 50.0 | 11.5 | 6.3 |
| 125 and over | 77.4 | 78.6 | 50.0 | 88.5 | 93.7 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of workers | 12,590,000 | 4,498,000 | 2,564,000 | 4,378,000 | 1,150,000 |
| Average hourly earnings [1] | $1.68 | $1.67 | $1.36 | $1.80 | $1.94 |

[1] Excludes premium pay for overtime and for work on weekends, holidays, and late shifts.

[2] The regions used in this study include: Northeast: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont; South: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia; Middle West: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin; Far West: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

[3] Less than 500 workers or 0.05 percent.

Source: U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington 25, D. C., February 1955.

Average hourly rates in manufacturing disclose similar wide differentials. Bureau of Labor Statistics data reveal that average hourly earnings for production workers in manufacturing was $1.85 in February 1955. The average hourly rates for States ranged, however, from a high of $2.22 per hour in Oregon to $1.20 in Mississippi. The comparable rate in Connecticut was $1.85, New York $1.88, and in Pennsylvania $1.86. The average hourly rates in the New England States ranged from $1.44 in Maine to $1.85 in Connecticut. Representative rates in the Southern States were $1.20 in Mississippi, $1.27 in North Carolina, $1.31 in Georgia, and $1.44 in Virginia.

The average hourly wage differential in manufacturing between the average rate for the United States, and most of the Southern States ranged between $0.40 and $0.60. The hourly rate in Connecticut whose average rate was the same as for the country at large, was more than 50 percent higher than in Mississippi.

The average rates may, however, be misleading. The industrial mix in the several regions differs widely and low average in the South is due mostly to the concentration of low-wage industries in that area. Studies by the Department of Labor comparing wage rates in similar occupations and industries disclose a much lesser differential. To illustrate, in 1952 wage rates for maintenance workers—7 selected skilled jobs—in Hartford, Conn., were higher than 5 out of 10 communities surveyed in the South, but lower or equal to the rates paid in the other 5 communities. Rates for unskilled warehouse workers, however, were lower in every southern city surveyed than in Hartford. The differential ranged between 10 and 35 percent.

IMPACT OF WIDE REGIONAL WAGE DIFFERENTIALS

The migration of industry to low-wage regions has created the anomalous situation of the existence of depressed areas in the midst of national prosperity and plenty. The low wage areas, in order to perpetuate their economic advantages, have also pursued a consistent policy of keeping out unions in order to retain their low labor cost advantages. A recent Wall Street study (February 17, 1955) surveying the growth of industry in the South, quoted a spokesman for the South Carolina Development Board:

"We don't encourage any company to come into the State if it's going to bring a union with it. Our people don't want unions. They are individualistic and don't want outsiders telling them what to do."

Joseph A. Fox of the Washington Star reached a similar conclusion in a series of articles (March 31 to April 4, 1955) on migration of industry to the South. He seems to agree with the conclusions of a leader in Gaston County, Alabama: "Unless there is a radical change in sentiment, the mills down here will not be unionized in 20 years."

The insidious influence of competition among regions and localities is clearly illustrated by a letter from a mayor in a small southern town to a New England manufacturer: "Then our wonderful labor, 98 percent native born, mostly high school graduates, with lower average hourly industrial wage rates, 6 to 49 cents below other Southern States, and from 50 cents to 95 cents below Northern States." It shows that competition for new industry is not limited between low and high wage areas, but that some communities resort to undercutting neighboring towns, which already are victims of low-wage rates and substandard living conditions.

NEED FOR HIGHER MINIMUM-WAGE LEGISLATION

The need for higher minimum wages is brought into sharper focus by the recent district court decision barring the Secretary of Labor from setting minimum wages on a nationwide basis, under the Walsh-Healy Act. This law requires contractors on Government jobs to pay minimum wages prevailing in the locality for the type of work involved. The Secretary of Labor determined that a single minimum wage would prevail for the cotton textile industry. Separate wage minima for each labor-market area would result in systematic discrimination against high-wage areas. Wide wage differentials in the same industry among the several regions would tend to concentrate all Government contracts in one area, and indirectly make the Government a party in encouraging substandard wages.

It should be stressed that increasing the minimum wage would not effectively limit the competitive forces within the economy. Labor costs account only for about a third of total manufacturing cost and the substandard rates form only a minute fraction of total costs in American industry. Substandard wages do not appear to be a proper factor in a dynamic, free, and competitive American enterprise system.

All people of good will welcome the economic opportunities that new industry is bringing to the people of the South. Defense needs make industrial dispersion desirable. National welfare would, however, require that industrial dispersion should bring with it the blessings of our high standards of living to all the sections of the country. Sound economic growth for the Nation as a whole cannot depend upon "runaway" industry from high-wage areas which reestablish the same business on a substandard wage level elsewhere.

The Congress in the Fair Labor Standards Act has established the policy of Federal responsibility to help eliminate substandard wages. The President in his last economic report endorsed this concept when he declared that minimum-wage laws can assist the comparatively small number of workers who are at the fringes of competitive labor markets. Our experience with minimum-wage legislation would seem to bear out the contention that this type of legislation can be an effective means of raising substandard wages. Six years ago when Congress was debating the increase in the minimum-wage law from 40 to 75 cents an hour, opponents of the increase claimed that this would mean an end to the economic and industrial growth in the newly developing areas. Obviously, these dire predictions did not materialize. The contrary was the fact. The areas that were most sharply affected by the minimum-wage increase enjoyed a greater growth in manufacturing employment than the rest of the country.

IMPACT OF 1950 MINIMUM WAGES

The Department of Labor conducted a number of studies on the economic effects of the 75-cent minimum-wage legislation. A summary of these studies was published in the March 1955 issue of the Monthly Labor Review. The studies disclose that any dire consequences that the opponents of minimum-wage legislation anticipated in 1949 did not materialize. The formal release of the Department of Labor (January 12, 1955) stated categorically the increase in the minimum wages to 75 cents an hour in January 1950 had only minor effects on employment.

The survey concentrated in studying the effects of the minimum wage increase on five low-wage industries: Southern sawmilling, fertilizer, men's dress shirts and nightwear, men's seamless hosiery, and wood furniture. In each of these industries substantial proportions of the employees were receiving less than 75 cents an hour in 1949. The immediate increases in average hourly earnings exceeded the statutory requirements, because some increases were given to employees whose hourly rates were above 75 cents in order to retain historical differentials, though the higher minimum did cause a market narrowing in occupational differentials. It is, however, significant that the minimum wage legislation affected some employees to whom the minimum wage did not apply. A considerable proportion of the fertilizer producers were engaged in intrastate commerce only, and were, therefore, exempt from the new minimum wage law. About half of the employees in the intrastate plants were receiving less than 75 cents an hour in 1949. By 1950 the proportion of those receiving less than 75 cents dropped to 29 percent. "This suggests," according to the Department of Labor study, "a significant, indirect effect of the minimum wage on the employees in plants when the minimum did not apply in an industry predominantly subject to the law." The wage increase had no effect upon employment, which remained stable. The study concludes that industry displayed a very high degree of adjustment to the increased minimum wage.

The Department of Labor asserts that the overall effect of our minimum wage legislation has been "to improve the position of the employees involved by increasing earnings in the affected industries, and that the relative improvement was substantially maintained." But in the absence of minimum wage pressure the relative earning position of the low-paid industries has tended to worsen. The experience during the last few years seems to further support this conclusion. Wages in the above-mentioned 5 low-paid industries has tended to cluster just above the 75 cents minimum. During the same period average wages in manufacturing have increased by about 30 percent.

It would be fair to conclude from these facts that in the absence of a new higher minimum wage the earnings of employees at the bottom of the economic ladder will tend to stagnate.

DETERMINATION OF A PROPER NEW MINIMUM WAGE

Granted that a new Federal minimum wage is desirable, there remains the question what a proper and equitable minimum wage would be at this time. The President recommended a 90-cent minimum as appropriate and consistent with overall economic considerations at this time. In arriving at this conclusion the President apparently considered only the increase in cost of living since the 75-cent minimum was enacted. It appears, however, that current economic conditions could support a higher minimum wage.

The brief review of the impact of the 75 cents minimum wage in 1950 indicated that even the lowest paying industries could absorb that minimum 5 years ago.

The determination of a new minimum wage to become effective probably in 1956, would have to consider not only the increases in cost of living, but the rise in productivity during the 6 years since the last minimum wage became effective. Furthermore, the economy in general is now in a much stronger position than it was 6 years ago.

An equitable minimum wage law, which would take into consideration increases in cost of living and rise in productivity (at an annual rate of 3 percent), would justify an immediate minimum hourly wage rate of about $1.05. Adoption of this minimum would require wage increases to about 10 percent of the manufacturing production workers in the United States. Adequate data for other groups are unavailable. The Department of Labor data indicate that 1,656,000 workers in manufacturing, or 13.2 percent, were actually receiving rates below a $1.05 in April 1954. But increases granted since then (average for the country about 5 cents) would reduce the ratio of those directly affected to about 1 out of 10.

But an hourly rate of $1.05 is still insufficient to provide a family, or even a single person, with an income necessary for a minimum decent standard of living. Such a

wage would also continue to exert a downward drag on the country's wage structure. Most union contracts call for a higher starting rate. The minimum wage should therefore not be allowed to stagnate at $1.05 an hour. Increased wages should stimulate management and labor to increased efficiency and production. The minimum wage might accordingly be increased to $1.15 effective 1 year after the $1.05 becomes effective. The Secretary of Labor should be allowed sufficient funds to study closely the impacts of the new wage minima and report the findings to Congress. If no serious difficulties are encountered, the minimum wage would go up to $1.25 by January 1958.

Ample support seems to exist which would justify the belief that American industry would be able to absorb the higher minima. Prof. Lloyd G. Reynolds, of Yale, averred that available data support the conclusion that economic adjustments necessitated by minimum-wage increases, can be made through increases in the efficiency of workers, management, and equipment:

"Indeed, it was mainly the effects of minimum-wage legislation which caused economists to realize the higher wages need not mean higher costs and prices, but might mean increased efficiency instead. Before the enactment of minimum-wage legislation there have usually been dire predictions of ruin by employers in low-wage industries, prophecies of closed plants, and mass unemployment. These predictions seem never to be realized; one comes along a few years later and finds these industries flourishing as well as before. Investigation usually reveals that the answer is a general overhaul of equipment and methods which enables employers to carry on profitably at the higher wage levels."

CURRENT COVERAGE

Some 24 million wage and salary workers out of a total of about 44 million (excluding Government employees, Government, executive and professional employees) are covered by the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Almost two-thirds of those covered are in manufacturing. Transportation, communication, and utilities accounts for about 3.5 million persons. The balance are engaged in mining, wholesale trade, finance, construction and selected retail trade and services.

About 20 million wage and salary workers are not protected by the minimum wage provisions of FLSA. Almost a third of these are engaged in industries which are normally considered interstate commerce, but are exempted by specific provisions of the act (section 13). Farm workers, employees in retail trade and outside salesmen account for 5 out of 6 of those specifically exempted from coverage. Some 14 million wage and salary workers are not engaged in interstate commerce, as defined in the Fair Labor Standards Act, and are subsequently not covered by their Fair Labor Standards Act. Persons engaged in retail and wholesale trade account for almost half of this group. Domestics and construction workers each account for about an additional 2 million. Services and related industries for some 3 million. A detailed breakdown by industry group of the present coverage of the FLSA and those employees who are exempt from the provisions of the act are presented in table 3.

TABLE 3.—*Coverage and exemptions under the Fair Labor Standards Act, employment as of September 1953* [1]

[Thousands]

| Industry classification | Total employment | Employees not covered (intrastate activities) | Employees covered | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Total | Exempt from minimum wage and overtime provisions | Subject to minimum wage provisions |
| Total, all industries | 43,954 | 13,609 | 30,345 | 6,369 | 23,976 |
| Manufacturing, total | 16,131 | 86 | 16,045 | 597 | 15,448 |
| Food and tobacco products | 1,777 | 50 | 1,727 | 197 | 1,530 |
| Textile, apparel, and leather products | 2,696 | 7 | 2,689 | 35 | 2,654 |
| Lumber, furniture, and wood products | 1,127 | 20 | 1,107 | 120 | 987 |
| Paper, printing, publishing, and allied industries | 1,242 | ---- | 1,242 | 72 | 1,170 |
| Chemicals, rubber, and related products | 1,171 | 1 | 1,170 | 42 | 1,128 |
| Stone, clay, and glass products | 503 | 7 | 496 | 7 | 489 |
| Metal and related products | 7,184 | ---- | 7,184 | 109 | 7,075 |
| Miscellaneous manufacturing industries | 431 | 1 | 430 | 15 | 415 |
| Mining | 768 | 19 | 749 | 2 | 747 |
| Construction | 2,565 | 1,867 | 698 | 84 | 614 |
| Wholesale trade | 2,539 | 262 | 2,277 | 584 | 1,693 |
| Retail trade | 6,928 | 5,558 | 1,370 | 1,140 | 230 |
| Finance, insurance, and real estate | 1,792 | 414 | 1,378 | 330 | 1,048 |
| Transportation, communications, and utilities | 3,956 | 286 | 3,670 | 229 | 3,441 |
| Miscellaneous industries, n. e. c. | 4,188 | 2,995 | 1,193 | 452 | 741 |
| Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries | 3,066 | 101 | 2,965 | 2,951 | 14 |
| Domestic service | 2,021 | 2,021 | ---- | ---- | ---- |

[1] Proprietors, self-employed persons, and unpaid family labor totaling approximately 12 million persons, 6 million Government employees, and 4 million executive, administrative, and professional employees are excluded. Personnel of the Armed Forces are also excluded.

Source: U. S. Department of Labor.

DETERMINATION OF NEW COVERAGE

It is assumed that the present provision to pay wages below the required minimum to handicapped workers and learners will continue in effect.

In addition, the present act leaves some 20 million (nonexecutive, administrative, or professional) employees in private industry outside the scope of the present minimum-wage legislation. Almost a third of these are offered some protection by State laws, though in some cases the applicable minimum is below 50 cents an hour. Undoubtedly a considerable proportion of those now exempt from coverage are most in need for minimum-wage protection. For example, average hourly earnings of employees in general merchandise stores in September 1953 was $1.12, in laundries the average was 99 cents. Undoubtedly these groups will benefit indirectly from an increase in the Federal minimum-wage law, though the "trickle down" effects may not be sufficiently effective to raise the standard of living of those employed in the low-wage industries. It is, however, highly improbable that some of these groups could withstand the impact of a minimum wage of the magnitude discussed earlier. Sound policy would apparently require a lower minimum for some of these groups should Congress determine to broaden the coverage language to encompass all "industries affecting commerce."

Data on wage distribution in the industries currently exempt from Federal minimum wage legislation are inadequate. The determination of an equitable minimum wage for the currently exempt groups as well as the extent to which it is desirable to broaden coverage, require further study before any recommendation can be made in this area.

## The Leading Question: What Should Be Done About Wiretap Evidence?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 31, 1955*

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD a transcript of the CBS radio program, The Leading Question, of March 28, 1955, on which appeared our colleagues the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH]. The program consisted of a most interesting discussion on the subject of wiretapping and its use as evidence in Federal courts.

The transcript follows:

Mr. COOKE. What should be done about wiretap evidence?

The development of electronic knowledge now means that almost any telephone can be easily listened in on without cutting your telephone wire or making clicks or other warning noises to you; and one wiretapper has already testified to a congressional committee that he has tapped over 60,000 different telephones.

Some 30 States have legalized the admission of evidence that you get from wiretapping; but under a 1934 Federal law, the Department of Justice has tapped phones but has not been able to use the material it got in a court of law.

Today the House Judiciary Committee is holding hearings on whether or not the Federal Government should authorize and legalize wiretap evidence.

There are three big questions, maybe two big ones, and a small one, involved here.

First, the most important overall question: Should wiretapping be legalized in any form; if so, who should O. K. it? The Attorney General, the courts, or whomever else?

And then, one other thing the Attorney General is especially interested in: If you O. K. wiretap evidence, should the bill be so passed that past evidence which he has and has not been able to use should be legalized along with future evidence?

Mr. KEATING, you have introduced the bill, you have a firm set of positions on all of these questions.

Mr. KEATING. Yes, Mr. Cooke, I have a bill in this Congress, and my bill, if you want just a word about it, does this:

First, as regard national security cases, sabotage, espionage, treason, and crimes of that kind, some six enumerated crimes, it provides that evidence obtained by wiretapping can be used in court.

As to evidence heretofore obtained, upon the written authority of the Attorney General, that can be used.

As to evidence hereafter obtained, it is necessary to go to a court and convince a court that a crime or crimes have been or are about to be committed in this category, and that these communications may contain information which would assist in the conduct of those investigations.

Mr. COOKE. What about, Mr. KEATING, a question like kidnaping, which is a Federal offense?

Mr. KEATING. Kidnaping is not covered in this bill. That's one of the controversial areas. It has been contended that the bill should be enlarged to include kidnapping and, for instance, another heinous crime that we all abhor, the selling of narcotics to minors.

Now, that's one type—that's one part of the bill.

The other part of it, equally important, I think, Mr. Cooke, is this: that it makes it a criminal offense to do any wiretapping which is not in accordance either (1) with the terms of this bill, that is, by the FBI under that bill, or (2) by the FBI in detecting other crimes, because they have a perfect right under the law now to wiretap; and third, anything done by the authorized agents of the various States or Territories in the 30 States that you have referred to who do legalize wiretapping.

Mr. COOKE. All right, Mr. KEOGH. How do you feel?

Mr. KEOGH. Now, Mr. Cooke, I am delighted to be here with my distinguished colleague, Mr. KEATING, who has made such a great study of this subject.

Mr. COOKE. Be careful, Mr. KEATING, that sounds like a windup.

Mr. KEATING. That's always dangerous with Mr. KEOGH.

Mr. KEOGH. Well, Mr. KEATING has in fact spent a great deal of time on this subject.

I would like, if I could, to divide our question, and take up first whether wiretapping should be permitted; and then follow that with—what should be done with evidence obtained thereby?

Now, Mr. KEATING, I think that this new bill of yours, H. R. 5096, is a successor to the one you had in the 83d, the last Congress, which passed the House but never became law.

You have indicated that you have sought to set up safeguards that would impose criminal penalties upon people not authorized to make the taps authorized under your bill.

Is that not a basic admission that the tapping of wires is inherently dangerous and should, if it is permitted, be confined to authorized agents?

Mr. KEATING. Well, I would agree that wiretapping is, as it's been described, a "dirty business." It is something which we do not like, and the thing that my criminal penalties are seeking to reach are the criminals and the snoopers and the blackmailers and that kind of people that use the telephone wires improperly.

Now, we have to balance that against our national security, and I know that the gentleman, Mr. KEOGH, is equally interested in our national security as am I.

Mr. COOKE. Does Mr. KEOGH agree with Justice Holmes that wiretapping is a dirty offense?

Mr. KEOGH. I do, indeed, and it is from that agreement that my basic opposition to permitting or authorizing anyone to tap wires springs.

Now, you must realize, Mr. KEATING, as I know you do, that the Federal rule of permitting the introduction of evidence obtained by illegal wiretapping sprang from the decision of the Supreme Court in the Olmstead case, which took place in 1927, and involved a violation of the then noble experiment which will go down into history as the Prohibition Act, and as I read the decision of the Court, the Court turned on the fact that no trespass of the property of the defendant had been committed in order to affect the tap. They did not directly pass on the legality or the illegality of wiretapping, as such, but dodged by indicating that since there was no basic violation of the fourth or the now much discussed fifth amendment, that the evidence so obtained could be used to support a conviction for violating the Prohibition Act.

Mr. KEATING. Well, now, in 1934, we passed the Communications Act, and ever since that time it has been generally accepted by every Attorney General, from the time of Justice Jackson down to the present time, under all administrations, it has been accepted that the FBI, upon the written authority of the Attorney General, could tap wires. He cannot use that evidence in court. In other words, the hitch that we are in now is that if over the telephone an FBI agent hears that somebody has stolen or peddled important bomb secrets, or that he is plotting the assassination of a high Government official, or he is about to blow up a strategic defense plant, and hears that over the telephone, he can listen to it, that's perfectly legal, but he cannot use that evidence in court.

If he heard it behind a door or heard it in the next room, he could use it, but just because he heard it over a telephone he cannot use it, and it seems to me that that gives the enemies of our country a distinct advantage with regard to our technological progress in this country, which they are not entitled to have.

Mr. KEOGH. But, Mr. KEATING, when you do, as you so ably point to these types of crimes that you would seek to prevent, I think that you are begging the basic question.

Mr. COOKE. Which is?

Mr. KEOGH. Which is: Should we encourage the violation of the basic guaranties of our Constitution for however high and noble a purpose it may be contended?

Mr. KEATING. No; that's——

Mr. KEOGH. That's our question here: Are not the rights of our people greater than apprehending a criminal?

Mr. KEATING. The only people who would suffer, under the bill that I have introduced, are the traitors or enemies of our country, nobody else.

Mr. KEOGH. That's——

Mr. KEATING. Because all other wiretapping, all this snooping and the—the listening in on one business concern against another, or one union against another, or a business concern against a union, or a uinon against a business concern, or somebody trying to blackmail somebody, all of that is made a Federal crime under this bill.

Mr. KEOGH. That is not true, actually it is not true, and if it were true, I'm sure that no one would oppose your bill.

Mr. KEATING. Well, that is provided right in the bill.

Mr. KEOGH. All the Attorney Generals—but the bill, you know that bills are not self-executing, they have to be administered by men.

Mr. COOKE. Could you make that a little clearer for me, Mr. KEOGH? What do you mean, it isn't true? You mean an Attorney General in courts would not follow out what the bill says, or the bill wouldn't protect us——

Mr. KEOGH. No, I do not contend that any Attorney General will encourage the violation of the basic rights of the people. What I am contending is that permitting wiretapping is permitting an invasion in the basic guaranteed rights of our people.

Mr. KEATING. It is permitted now.

Mr. KEOGH. Permitted? It's suffered; it's not permitted.

Mr. KEATING. Under the Communications Act, it is only made illegal to wiretap and divulge the information; simply to wiretap is not made illegal.

Mr. KEOGH. Well, what is the protection the person whose wires are being tapped has?

Mr. KEATING. The protection is this——

Mr. KEOGH. The protection is that under the Communications Act, no one—no one is authorized to disseminate the information obtained. There is an admission that there is something wrong with the practice.

Mr. KEATING. That is correct, that no one can disseminate it, and this bill only enlarges that in the very limited area——

Mr. KEOGH. That's right.

Mr. KEATING. Of treason, sabotage, and espionage.

Mr. KEOGH. That's right.

Mr. KEATING. And it seems to me in balancing the interest, we must do something to protect our country against that type of activity.

Mr. KEOGH. We must do everything we can to protect our country against saboteurs and traitors and espionage agents, but I contend, Mr. KEATING, that in order to afford that protection, it is not necessary for us to create what is the basis of a police state of our own.

Mr. COOKE. Well, are you saying, Mr. KEOGH, that wiretapping is a basis or intrinsically unconstitutional and contrary to the Bill of Rights?

Mr. KEOGH. It certainly is. It goes directly to the heart of the fourth and fifth amendments. We recognize, Mr. Cooke, the inviolability of the United States mails and we do not permit anyone to interfere with the sending of mails and we place heavy penalties on that.

Mr. KEATING. I would be very interested to know——

Mr. KEOGH. Would not the espionage agent who wants to transmit messages have the protection that the Constitution guarantees everyone?

Mr. KEATING. I'd be very much interested to know what provisions of the Constitution are violated by it because it's been held again and again that the right of privacy, which is an important right—I don't minimize it at all—is not a constitutional right. You've got a right now to place a dictaphone in anybody else's home. You've got a right to wear a radio transmitter under your necktie when you are talking to someone and have him say something which you can then use in court. You've got a right to do all of these things, which are, all of them, violations of the right of privacy, but it is not a constitutional right——

Mr. KEOGH. Oh——

Mr. COOKE. Wait a minute.

Mr. KEATING. All of which have again and again been approved in the courts.

Mr. KEOGH. And all of them——

Mr. COOKE. Let me get one thing clear, Mr. KEOGH.

You mean I can, if I choose, put a dictaphone in anybody's place I choose, and then use any information I get from that in a court of law?

Mr. KEATING. If you get a dictaphone in there, no matter how you get it there, the courts have held that you have a right to use the evidence that's obtained over that dictaphone.

Mr. KEOGH. That's the difficulty. That's why your bills are pending, you want to give legislative sanction to an iniquitous practice that has grown up.

Mr. KEATING. My bill has nothing to do with dictaphones. The dictaphone business hasn't anything to do with——

Mr. KEOGH. Then why talk about it?

Mr. KEATING. Because I am pointing out that the right of privacy has already been invaded in many instances, and legalized by the courts.

Mr. KEOGH. And you——

Mr. KEATING. And mine is limited. There are many objections made to my bill because it does not include kidnaping and some of these other heinous crimes, but mine is limited purposely to those crimes involving our national security. There is no one who can suffer under the provisions of this bill except a traitor or an enemy of our country.

And in addition to that, as a recognition of the necessity of clamping down and tightening up on this wiretapping, is this criminal provision that any wiretapping that isn't done in accordance with this bill shall be a Federal offense.

This bill tightens up on the whole wiretap situation, instead of loosening it up.

Mr. KEOGH. Which, Mr. KEATING, again I repeat, is an admission on your part that wiretapping is inherently dangerous.

Mr. KEATING. Wiretapping is not good, I agree with you.

Mr. KEOGH. Well, if it's not good, do not authorize it. That's my position.

Mr. KEATING. It is not authorized in this bill. That's one of the things that the opponents of this again and again say—wiretapping is today perfectly legal, it's being done every day by the FBI. This does not legalize anything which is not done, it simply legalizes the use in court of evidence that the Capitol is going to be blown up, when it's heard over a telephone, just the same as it would be legal if it were heard behind a closed door.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Keating, do not frighten people with statements that unless your bill to authorize wiretapping is passed the Capitol will be blown up.

Mr. COOKE. Especially when we are sitting in it, gentlemen, talking.

Mr. KEOGH. I have far more confidence in the security agencies of our Government.

But I want to point out to you, without discussing the merits of a pending judicial matter in New York, where a private organization cloaking itself with a pseudo-public character, has contended seriously in court that that quasi-pseudo-public character of the Anticrime Committee vests in it the authority and the power to engage in wiretapping and to seek refuge in not revealing the sources of information.

Mr. KEATING. I am very glad you brought up that New York case.

Mr. KEOGH. I knew you would be, Mr. KEATING; that's why I brought it up.

Mr. KEATING. Because under this bill, under this very bill, it would tighten up on such a situation as the New York situation. It would make it not only a violation of a State crime but a violation of a Federal crime, if it was done, not by the FBI and not to get a traitor or an enemy of our country.

Mr. KEOGH. I question that very much, Mr. KEATING, and I take refuge in my position by the—in the learned words of a great jurist in this country, Mr. Justice Brandeis, whom you referred to earlier, who in 1927, in the Olmstead case, said:

"The progress of science in furnishing the Government with means of espionage is not likely to stop with wiretapping. Ways may some day be developed by which the Government, without removing papers from secret drawers, can reproduce them in court; and by which it will be enabled to expose to a jury the most intimate occurrences of the home. Advances in the psychic and related sciences may bring means of exploring unexpressed beliefs, thoughts, and emotions."

Mr. KEATING. And right today, Mr. KEOGH, it is only the enemies of our country who can use these technological processes, and equally with them we should give that right——

Mr. KEOGH. It's only——

Mr. KEATING. To the proper officials of our Government.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Keating——

Mr. KEATING. Let me read you one sentence from Mr. Justice Jackson, who says:

"That unless the Court starts to temper its doctrine with logic and a little bit of commonsense, you are going to turn the Bill of Rights into a suicide pact."

Now, that applies just as much to our legislative arm of Government as it does to the judicial arm, in my judgment.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. KEATING, you are not contending that the potential enemies of our country are the only ones who have access to developments in science?

Mr. KEATING. I am not, but——

Mr. KEOGH. You said that.

Mr. KEATING. But they are the only ones that are in any way covered by this bill which is before us, because it applies only in those cases of treason and sabotage.

Mr. KEOGH. That's what you think.

Mr. KEATING. Well, it says so, in so many words.

Mr. COOKE. As I hear this discussion, gentlemen, this narrows down to a difference of opinion here over whether or not in one particular category of possible crime, namely, crimes against our national security and subversion, in that area only; as I understand it, the question is whether or not evidence obtained via wiretapping should be submitted in court.

You'll agree, Mr. KEATING, in other areas it should not?

Mr. KEATING. I do, yes.

Mr. COOKE. But in this area it should. Therefore, Mr. KEOGH, it sounds as if Mr. KEATING was saying there was a difference of category here, the fact that it was a national security item raised the importance of changing——

Mr. KEOGH. Of course, Mr. Cooke, the only possible way for justifying our flying in the face of our basic guaranties is to wrap ourselves around such terms as "national security," and "protecting the Capitol from being blown up," and "apprehending espionage agents."

I want to say this, and I think it sums up my position as well as any brief statement could: That the reasons for not permitting wiretapping, and therefore not permitting the introduction of the evidence obtained therefrom, are basic and historical in this country. The reasons for permitting it, that are now being advanced, are, in my opinion, more hysterical, and the Founding Fathers of our country, in my judgment, provided us with a system that can protect the law-abiding and apprehend and punish the criminals, without violating the rights of any citizens.

Mr. KEATING. Our Founding Fathers weren't faced with technological progress that has been made, and which the enemies of our country are now able to use. This whole question has arisen since——

Mr. KEOGH. Then, Mr. KEATING, excuse me.

Mr. KEATING. Just a minute. Let me finish this.

This whole question has arisen since 1934, when the Communications Act was passed. There is nothing historical back of that. That is the only—up to that time you could use wiretap or any other evidence. There was no restriction on it. But here, in this limited class of cases, and this is the reason why it is limited to this, here we've got a lot of subversive zealots dedicated to a cause hostile to the very existence of our Government, who are expertly trained to operate within the confines of our country in secrecy and stealth. They are equipped with all these latest technological devices, and if we do not allow our Federal agents to cope with this problem, then we are putting them at a disadvantage in the use of this technological equipment and letting the enemies of our country have the sole use of it.

Mr. KEOGH. Well, now, Mr. KEATING, you will have to admit I have been pretty patient in letting you finish that last statement; but again you return to the statement that the enemies of our country, or the agents of potential enemies, are the ones who are using these developments and improvements in science.

I maintain that our security agents are just as capable, are just as alert, and are just as diligent; and I return again to the basic question before us, and that is, that I believe far greater harm to our system, and far greater danger to all the law-abiding people of this country, will flow from authorizing the tapping of wires and the intercepting of communications, than the benefits you'll gain thereby.

Mr. KEATING. Again, this bill does not authorize any interception which is not done every day right now, and done perfectly legally.

This bill only says that if you hear this evidence over a telephone, you are not going to give the traitor an immunity over the telephone, you are going to allow that evidence to be used in court. And that's all this bill does.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. KEATING, I have to take exception with—to your statement that it is done perfectly legally. If it were done perfectly legally, you would not have to draft this pending bill.

Mr. KEATING. Oh, yes, you would.

Mr. KEOGH. You wouldn't have to give them the express right. You would not have to make it a crime for any unauthorized person to do it. You—you admit, I'm sure you will admit, because you are a reasonable man, that the difficulties with which your committee have been—has been faced in considering the proper type of bill is an indication of the difficulty that besets——

Mr. KEATING. That's right. There are many details about the bill upon which reasonable men may differ, but this bill does not authorize the wiretapping. This bill recognizes the legality of the wiretapping that is done now, and every other bill we have had before us recognizes that, because everyone that has introduced a bill has recognized that they are doing that all the time, but this authorizes the use of that in court, in the cases of treason and sabotage, and then says anything outside of that will be a Federal criminal offense, as well as an offense in any of these States.

Mr. KEOGH. But, Mr. KEATING, under the Federal rule now, evidence, however obtained, is admissible in Federal cases.

Mr. KEATING. Not—it's not admissible if it's obtained over a telephone.

Mr. COOKE. By wiretapping.

Mr. KEOGH. In Federal cases.

Mr. KEATING. No, it's not. Under the Communications Act, it has been held that not only—that you—if you divulge the information, you are then violating the Communications Act, and it's been held that divulging in court would be the same as divulging elsewhere.

Mr. COOKE. Well, gentlemen, thank you for divulging much material on this rather pertinent question of wiretapping.

## The Easter Egg That Did Not Hatch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JAMES C. MURRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 31, 1955*

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I understand the House is adjourning today for the Easter recess. I hope that all of the Members of the House will have an enjoyable Easter.

In their enjoyment of the Easter holiday I would like to direct the attention of the Members of the House to a few Government employees who will be working to make their holiday more enjoyable. These are the postal workers. They will be trudging muddy streets and sunny streets, delivering Easter greetings to us from our many friends.

This Easter could have been a most joyous occasion for them if this Congress had acted upon their needed pay raise. The spirituality of Easter will, in all likelihood, be enjoyed by all of the postal workers, as well as all Americans, since the spiritual side of Easter discloses the hope of all humanity.

However, there will be no material enjoyment of Easter for the postal workers. Materially, all it will mean is more unpaid bills and fewer Easter eggs in their children's baskets.

I hope that the significance of Easter will instill in the conscience of the Congress a recognition of our obligation to our fellow Government employees—the postal workers—and that we quickly enact legislation providing them with an adequate pay raise.

## The Rose as the National Flower of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 31, 1955*

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on January 10 I introduced House Joint Resolution 102, to designate the rose as the national flower of the United States. An identical measure was introduced simultaneously in the Senate by Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH.

Since then there has been a great deal of public interest in this legislation, but at the same time many misconceptions have arisen. Several of my colleagues have expressed a personal interest in this bill and I understand that most Members of this House have received mail on the subject. To assist them in answering inquiries from their constituents, I am offering some further information about this resolution.

FOUR-TO-ONE SUPPORT

The mail I have been receiving on this legislation is about 4 to 1 in favor—with many of those in support representing large organizations and societies. I have been very free in permitting news correspondents to examine this mail, which has made the rose the subject of many fine news stories. These, in turn, have stimulated newspaper editorials in all parts of the United States.

However, some of these stories have emphasized the small proportion of mail which is opposed to the rose and thus gave the impression that this legislation is controversial. One article warned jokingly that a new war of the roses was about to break out in the Congress. Then, one of the most reputable newspapers in the country published an item that the House hopper began to receive bills proposing the national designation for everything from the Easter Lily to the stinkweed. This is completely false, since there have been no other bills on the subject.

OBJECTIONS TO ROSE

What are the objections to the rose as our national flower? The one most frequently raised is that it is not truly native to our soil.

It is difficult to find anything more native to America when you realize that fossils have been found in Oregon indicating that the rose was here as early as 6 million years ago.

Roses have contributed their special beauty to all of American history. An early visitor noted their presence in New Amsterdam and we have evidence that they were also grown in the gardens of old Virginia, New England, and South Carolina.

William Penn was a rose enthusiast and I am told that to this day his heirs annually accept a single red rose in payment for rent on certain Pennsylvania properties.

GEORGE WASHINGTON

George Washington may have been one of the earliest rose hybridizers in this country. His agricultural experiments are well known, and in Mount Vernon's gardens there are plants named Martha Washington and Mary Washington. While their origin is not definitely established, there is reason to believe that the General himself created them.

Rose hybridizing got an early start in America. A South Carolinian named John Champney created Champney's Pink Cluster around 1810, and the Reverend William Harrison, of New York's Trinity Church, originated Harrison's Yellow about 20 years later.

By the time of the Civil War, hybridizing techniques had improved and Robert Buist published a Manual of Roses listing more than 900 varieties. Another author who contributed to the literature on the rose was the famous Francis Parkman who wrote the Book of Roses about his hobby.

Today the people who grow roses in the United States are legion. It is estimated that there are more than 30 million rose gardeners in this country and the number is growing each year.

OTHER NATIONS' INSIGNIA

Another objection is that the rose is the national flower of England. However, some type of rose is also the national flower of Honduras, Iran, and Luxembourg. But all of these have been adopted so long ago that we would not recognize them as the cultivated rose we know today.

Nor do we have the exclusive rights on several other national insignia. The red, white, and blue colors are used in the flags of 17 countries: Burma, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Paraguay, Panama, France, Liberia, Iceland, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Thailand, and United Kingdom.

And the eagle is used in the coats of arms of at least six countries, Mexico, Panama, Ecuador, Poland, Syria, and Spain.

You might be interested to know that other national insignia of the United States, which we take almost for granted today, were the centers of considerable controversy before they were adopted.

FRANKLIN WANTED A TURKEY

On July 4, 1776, Congress set out to acquire a great seal for the new Government. Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, and Thomas Jefferson were appointed as a committee to bring in a design for a seal. Each submitted a different design and one using the eagle, was finally adopted on June 20, 1782. But the venerable Franklin was very much opposed to the eagle. His choice was a turkey. Franklin wrote in 1784:

I wish that the bald eagle had not been chosen as the representative of our country; he is a bird of bad moral character; he does not get his living honestly; you may have seen him perched on some dead tree, where, too lazy to fish for himself, he watches the labor of the fishing-hawk, and when that diligent bird has at length taken a fish, and is bearing it to his nest for the support of his mate and young ones, the bald eagle pursues him and takes it from him. With all this injustice he is never in good case; but, like those among men who live by sharping and robbing, he is generally poor, and often very lousy. Besides he is a rank coward; the little kingbird, not bigger than a sparrow attacks him boldly and drives him out of the district. He is therefore by no means a proper emblem for the brave and honest Cincinnati of America, who have driven all the kingbirds from our country; though exactly fit for that order of knights which the French call Chevaliers d'Industrie. I am, on this account, not displeased that the figure (as represented on the medals or badges of the Order of Cincinnatus) is not known as a bald eagle, but looks more like a turkey. For a truth, the turkey is in comparison a much more respectable bird, and withal a true original native of America. * * * He is, besides, (though a little vain and silly, it is true, but not the worse emblem for that), a bird of courage, and would not hesitate to attack a grenadier of the British guards, who should presume to invade his farmyard with a red coat on.

The Star-Spangled Banner was not accepted as our national anthem for more than 100 years after it was first proposed in Congress in 1830.

The song was the object of furious attacks. Its words were termed too belligerent and too bumptious. The music was branded as inappropriate and above all "utterly unsuitable" since some of it was said to lie beyond the range of the average voice.

ANACREON IN HEAVEN

Many people were distressed over the fact that Francis Scott Key's words had been put to the music of Anacreon in Heaven, the club song of an 18th century English convivial society.

Some Members of Congress said the song should never take precedence over My Country 'Tis of Thee, Yankee Doodle, and the Battle Hymn of the Republic. Others claimed the words were too uncomplimentary to our English brethren and thought Hail Columbia would be more appropriate.

As late as July 2, 1926, the singing of the Star-Spangled Banner caused a near

riot in New York City and police reserves had to be called out to quell the disturbance.

The Congress adopted it as our national anthem on March 3, 1931.

Finally, one of the objections is that we in the National Government should have more important things to do than to consider the subject of a national flower.

NEED FOR DIVERSION

None of us in this greatest legislative body on earth need apologize for the proportion of vital legislation we consider day in and day out. In these times of international turmoil we are so preoccupied with troubles and failures, crises and frustrations, that we should welcome an occasional diversion of this sort. The rose is a beautiful product of nature. We think of it in a bouquet that a boy lovingly presents to a girl, or on a table piece at some bright celebration. Or perhaps we associate the rose with contemplative hours in a garden where the worries of the day fade before the glow of its soft colors.

Yes, it has thorns. Yes, some varieties can be terribly difficult to keep alive. But that, too, is beauty—something to be cultivated and cherished.

I would like to see the rose—which symbolizes peace, loyalty, love, devotion, and courage—associated with the United States of America in the minds of people in all corners of the world.

This legislation is now before the Committee on House Administration. It would be helpful if Members of Congress and the public generally would let the committee know of their support.

## A War Party?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 31, 1955*

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, other than a few wicked, would-be profiteers, whose god is the dollar, and, in number, a comparatively small group of sincere individuals who mistakenly think war is necessary to establish and maintain world peace, no one wants war.

There is no war party. Nevertheless, yesterday, in the Senate, a former candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination, referring to the President, said:

> There are forces in his (Eisenhower's) administration so powerful and apparently so eager for a war with China that they are becoming almost impossible to resist. That the United States should be plunged into a war over Matsu and Quemoy ought to be unthinkable. Yet there are those in high places in the present administration itself who are plotting and planning to bring such a war about, whatever the risks involved.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The conclusion is inescapable that the present war party is attempting to create a situation and an atmosphere in which the President would have no choice but to follow them.

Perhaps the gentleman is laying the groundwork for another campaign for the presidential nomination and, knowing that no one in his right mind wants war, wishes to create the impression that he is the one who can and will, if elected President, keep us out of war—hence, charges the Republican administration with being a war party.

His statement cannot be excused on the ground of ignorance. He is a former Member of the House. He has served in the Senate 6 years. He knows that it was Wilson, a Democrat, who won election in 1916 with the slogan "He kept us out of war," but that in April of 1917 we became involved in World War I.

He knows that the policies of Democratic President Franklin Delano Roosevelt plunged us into World War II.

He knows that Truman, another Democratic President, at the request of United Nations, sent our men into the Korean war.

The gentleman knows, or at least he should know, from his experience and his knowledge of what has happened in Washington, that it was the unsound foreign policies of Acheson, Roosevelt, and Truman which involved us in World War II and in the war in Korea.

He also knows that it is the adherence of Secretary of State Dulles and the State Department to some of the policies of Acheson and the previous Democratic administrations which has us in a situation where we must now—to use a common expression, the meaning of which is clear to most—"either fish or cut bait"; back out or fight.

On several occasions, those speaking for this Nation have asserted that neither Quemoy nor Matsu, nor Formosa itself, is vital to the defense of the United States of America. Then, on other occasions, we have been led to believe by those high in authority that, if Red China attempted to take any one of the three, we would go to war to defend them.

Let me repeat—the present dangerous situation was inherited by the present Republican administration. If we go half way around the world to fight another war, in my opinion, it will not be because that war is necessary for our national defense, but because policies conceived and carried out by previous Democratic administrations have forced us into a situation where we must either acknowledge our mistakes, or establish a new line of defense which is necessary to our national security, and which we can successfully hold.

That we should send our conscripted men more than half way around the world to fight in a war, to hold islands the possession of which is not vital to the defense of America, and in which our allies have said they will not join us, is something which I cannot understand, and to which I will not subscribe.

Inasmuch as the present situation is but the harvest of the thinking and the action into which the gentleman's party has involved us, it ill becomes him to throw mud at the present administration. It may be that his purpose is to distract attention from the follies of his own party, and to promote his own campaign for a presidential nomination and election.

## Five Things That Should Be Known About the Yalta Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 31, 1955*

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, some individuals would like to divert the attention of our people from the Yalta papers by attacking the way they were made public rather than discussing what happened at Yalta, why it happened, and who was responsible.

A careful analysis of the situation at Yalta has been made, and it appears that there are at least five salient points which are entitled to be emphasized, particularly at this time when a further conference is under consideration.

These salient points are as follows:

1. The decision to make the Yalta papers public was right.

The American people are entitled to know the facts concerning the conduct of the Nation's foreign affairs. This is particularly so in this case where the papers reveal the details of a conference as a result of which thousands of American boys died on the battlefield.

It is the policy of this administration to inform the people concerning the conduct of the people's business. We do not believe in making secret deals which sell out our allies and which are deliberately kept from the American people.

The position of those who oppose making the papers public is consistent. In one breath they say there is nothing new in these papers. In another breath they say they contained information so sensitive and secret that their release has been harmful to the national security and to the relations with our allies.

From the standpoint of the Nation and the free world, it was particularly wise to make the papers public at this time. Suggestions are being made to hold another conference with the Communist leaders. As we consider whether such a conference should be held, the records of previous conferences should be made public so that they can be studied not only by the diplomats but by the people of the free nations.

Only in this way can we be adequately prepared to meet the ruthless tactics of the Communists at the conference table. We will also be reminded again that in the past a Communist's word has meant nothing once the papers were executed. Only by studying the record of previous conferences can we avoid making the same mistakes in the future.

The sensitivities of diplomats, either ours or those of our allies, cannot be the decisive factor in determining whether to make public the record of a conference held 10 years ago. No diplomat's face is worth the life of one American boy.

2. What happened at Yalta and the price we have paid and are paying for the mistakes which were made?

Up to this time the most well-publicized result of the Yalta Conference has been the sellout of Poland and the Eastern European nations. Poland, the Balkan nations, and all

the rest have Communist governments today because of the deals made at Yalta.

What happened in Europe as a result of Yalta was bad enough but what happened in Asia was even worse as far as the interests of the United States are concerned. As a result of a secret deal made at Yalta, concessions were given to the Russians which paved the way for the Communists to take over China. The Korean war, the war in Indochina, and the crisis in Formosa resulted directly from the fact that China went Communist.

The Yalta deal contributed in two ways to the Communist victory in China. Turning over to the Russians rights to the jugular-vein Manchurian Railway and the warm-water ports, together with the recognition of Outer Mongolia as a satellite state, were concessions which materially assisted the Communists in their stuggle with the Nationalists. In addition, the fact that this agreement was made without the Nationalist Chinese being consulted had a disastrous effect in destroying the face of Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalists once the deal was made public.

3. Who was responsible?

Generally speaking, as the President has pointed out, we should look to the future rather than to the past except where studying the past may help us to avoid mistakes in the future.

However, Senator JOHNSON, Senator LEHMAN, and others have declared that the decisions made at Yalta were military rather than political, and they have even charged that General Eisenhower and General MacArthur were responsible for those decisions.

Alger Hiss took this same line when he testified before the Committee on Un-American Activities on August 3, 1948. He said that the decisions at Yalta with regard to the Far East were military rather than political decisions.

General Marshall, however, testifying in 1948 before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, said the Far East decisions at Yalta were political rather than military, and that he, as Chief of Staff, was unaware of them, although present at Yalta.

Both General MacArthur and President Eisenhower have denied that they were consulted with regard to the Yalta Conference. If any further proof is needed to establish that the Marshall, rather than the Hiss, view is the correct one we find it in Secretary Stettinius' book, Yalta and the Russians. He states categorically, on page 95, that Averell Harriman, then Ambassador to Russia, was the man who was solely responsible for conducting the negotiations with the Russians with regard to concessions which should be made in Asia. And in Winston Churchill's Memoirs, volume VI, Triumph and Tragedy, page 389, we find the Stettinius conclusion confirmed again.

This may be why Senator LEHMAN is protesting so strongly that the decisions on China were military rather than political. Governor Harriman was the man primarily responsible, and since they have raised the issue, it is important to put the responsibility where it belongs.

Finally, it is to be recalled that the Far East decisions were so secret that even our State Department didn't know about them until after President Roosevelt's death 3 months later (see Stettinius' book).

4. The role of Alger Hiss at Yalta.

It has been claimed that there is nothing in the Yalta papers to indicate that Alger Hiss advocated pro-Communist positions. It is interesting to note that at no time in his career did Hiss publicly take decidedly pro-Communist positions, despite the fact that we all know he was convicted of lying when he said he did not turn Government documents over to an espionage agent. It is also to be recalled that Whittaker Chambers testified that men like Hiss in the Soviet apparatus were strictly prohibited from publicly taking a pro-Communist line.

The important question concerning Hiss is not whether he took a pro-Communist position but what documents he had access to. On galley page 91 of the Yalta papers, it states: "All memoranda for the President on topics to be discussed at the meeting of the Big Three should be in the hands of Mr. Alger Hiss not later than Monday, January 15."

In other words, Hiss had access to the secret-briefing papers which were used by our side during the Conference. If he was an espionage agent at that time, this information was made available to the Communists. At a conference table a negotiator can have no greater advantage than to know what moves his opponents are going to make.

5. The lessons of Yalta.

The decisions at Yalta paved the way for the communizing of Poland, for the Communist conquest of China, and for all of the tragic results which have flown from those events. Those who represented the United States at the top level—Roosevelt, Stettinius, Harriman, Hopkins—were not deliberately pro-Communist but they exhibited a fatal lack of understanding of Communist tactics and strategy and, consequently, they were completely taken in by Stalin.

This Conference was typical of the kind conducted with the Russians during the Roosevelt-Acheson-Truman regime. In every conference we got a piece of paper—the Communists got a piece of territory.

Their mistakes were of the head rather than the heart. But regardless of why the mistakes were made, the Yalta Conference was catastrophic as far the United States and the free world were concerned.

That is why the records of our previous conferences with the Communists must be thoroughly examined and publicized so that we do not make the same mistakes in the future that we made in the past.

## A Proposal to Repeal Federal Taxes on Gasoline, Lubricating Oils, and Diesel Fuel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 31, 1955*

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill in Congress to repeal Federal taxes on gasoline, lubricating oils, and diesel fuel.

If my proposed legislation is enacted it will save Connecticut's taxpayers over $10 million a year and return to the voters the right to determine when, where, and what amount of their tax dollars are to be spent for highway improvements. This is the American way.

Nor are these the only objectives I have in mind in submitting my proposal to Congress. I offer the following additional reasons:

First. During the past several years the Federal motor fuel taxes collected in Connecticut were more than double the Federal allotments for highway construction in Connecticut.

Second. Only a few days ago President Eisenhower's own United States Comptroller General, Joseph Campbell, told the Congress that the administration-sponsored $101 billion, 10-year interstate superhighway program raised "questions of legality," and indicated he might officially rule against the very heart of the program—the earmarking of Federal gasoline taxes to pay for highway construction.

Third. In the broad constitutional concept of States' rights, the construction, improvement, and maintenance of State highways is the primary responsibility of State governments.

Fourth. The construction of proposed defense highways is the responsibility of the Federal Government, and should be financed by special appropriations of Congress. The American Constitution provides that the common defense of the country is vested in the Federal Government.

I wish to point out that the 1953 allocation of Federal funds to build highways in Connecticut was only $4,897,000, compared to the $11,512,000 paid into the Federal Treasury from Connecticut under the 2-cents-per-gallon Federal levy on gasoline and the 6-cents-per-gallon Federal tax on lubricating oils. During the same year the 4-cents-per-gallon Connecticut State tax amounted to $23,759,000.

The United States Bureau of Public Roads estimates that approximately $12 million will be collected this year in Connecticut. New allocations—fiscal year 1956—of Federal funds for Connecticut highways will be $8,086,262—primary highways, $2,057,610; secondary highways, $1,031,625; urban roads, $3,350,400; interstate highways, $1,656,627.

While it is true that the Federal motor fuel taxes are not allocated directly to States for highway construction, but are revenues going into the general Treasury funds, the whole theory that Federal grants-in-aid for State highway construction is built on the premise that the Federal Government is making a comparable return for tax dollars collected. This is a distorted concept. Furthermore, the Federal Government has never adequately supported badly needed farm to market roads, but concentrated on expanding the bulk of Federal aid on building superhighways in sparsely settled areas of the West or poor sections of the South. This is another reason why the Federal levy ought to be abolished. But I am not in favor of abolishing the Bureau of Public Roads needed to plan and supervise defense highways and act in a research and advisory capacity to State highway departments.

If the 2 cent a gallon Federal gas tax is relinquished, the States can reimpose it to meet the specific needs of their own highway program. An intensified State and local highway program is badly needed in Connecticut.

In the event of air-atomic attack, the roads of Naugatuck Valley are appallingly inadequate to meet the needs of evacuating the entire population as now projected by the civil-defense planners.

In view of the fact that Naugatuck Valley has been designated a probable critical target area, civil-defense officials are planning a simulated attack exercise

beginning June 15 to test civil defense operational procedures.

If a rapid mass evacuation of only 50,000 people in the Naugatuck Valley was undertaken, a terrible traffic jam would result. But a "dry run" of this nature would certainly highlight the essential need of defense highways in the valley.

I will support the proposed Federal superhighway program if all Federal automotive and motor-fuel taxes collected in Connecticut are earmarked for highway use in the State. Comptroller General Campbell's questioning the legality of earmarking these funds to retire the highway bonds calls for a reevaluation of the whole program.

Joe Campbell has the statutory authority to spike the very heart of the program, therefore my bill will release the Federal Government from the burden of collecting a gas tax it probably cannot use for highway building and allow the States to reimpose the tax where it can be legally earmarked to build drastically needed public highways.

# SENATE

## FRIDAY, APRIL 1, 1955

*(Legislative day of Thursday, March 10, 1955)*

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

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

Our Father God, at this ancient altar of the unseen and eternal, we bow with thanksgiving that the faith of the Pilgrims who came to these shores is living still in this dear land for which they dared and died. In this agony of the world's black night make our spirits as candles of the Lord and make our America the beacon of freedom for the whole world.

In this age on ages telling, we hear Thy call to be partners with Thee in making a new heaven and a new earth. Forgetting the old, unhappy things that are behind, with all their cruelties and contentions, help us in this new day to count as colleagues all who will now add their might to the gathering armies of the free who challenge the tyrants who enslave and degrade humanity, whenever and wherever their evil system has its way. With deep repentance for our own sins, bring us at last to a united victory which shall make all men free. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 30, 1955, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On March 28, 1955:

S. 913. An act to eliminate the need for renewal of oaths of office upon change of status of employees of the Senate or House of Representatives.

On March 31, 1955:

S. 632. An act for the relief of Jan R. Cwiklinski; and

S. 691. An act to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor No. 877 at Baytown, Tex., and certain tank cars.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING RECESS

Under the authority of the order of Wednesday, March 30, 1955,

The Secretary of the Senate received the following message from the House of Representatives:

The House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4720) to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances.

That the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 85) authorizing the printing as a House document the pamphlet Our American Government, What Is It? How Does It Function?

That the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4436. An act relating to the use of storage space in the Clark Hill Reservoir for the purpose of providing the city of McCormick, S. C., a regulated water supply; and

H. R. 5240. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

H. R. 4720. An act to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances;

H. R. 4941. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4951. An act directing a redetermination of the national marketing quota for burley tobacco for the 1955–56 marketing year, and for other purposes.

### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5240) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

### EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 30, 1955,

Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, on March 31, 1955, reported favorably, without amendment, Executive L, 83d Congress, 2d session, the protocol on the termination of the occupation regime in the Federal Republic of Germany, and Executive M, 83d Congress, 2d session, the protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the accession of the Federal Republic of Germany, both signed at Paris on October 23, 1954, and submitted a report (Executive Report No. 6) thereon.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

### ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS AND EXECUTIVE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches; and that at the conclusion of the morning hour the Senate go into executive session for the purpose of considering Executive Calendar Nos. 7 and 8, Executive L and Executive M, the protocols entered into during the 83d Congress, 2d session.

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

### COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At the request of the Vice President, the Chair announces his appointment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], as a member of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, under authority of Public Law 108, 83d Congress, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Hon. Homer Ferguson.

### COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At the request of the Vice President, the Chair announces the appointment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], as members of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, to fill existing vacancies thereon.