

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Statement by Senator Lehman Before Senate Subcommittee on Labor in Connection With Proposed Amendment of Fair Labor Standards Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on April 26 I appeared before the Senate subcommittee on labor in support of S. 662, amending the Fair Labor Standards Act. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of my statement printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN BEFORE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR IN SUPPORT OF S. 662 AMENDING THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am pleased to be here today to testify on behalf of S. 662, which I introduced on January 21, for myself, Senator GREEN, Senator KILGORE, Senator McNAMARA, Senator NEELY, and Senator PASTORE.

While not a member of this subcommittee, I have, as you know, been present during most of the testimony thus far on these various bills before you dealing with amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act. I do not intend to speak at length at this time.

During these hearings, I have many times stated the basic sentiments which have guided me in sponsoring this bill providing a \$1.25 an hour minimum wage and increased coverage. I would like, on this occasion, to highlight the major political, economic, and moral issues which I believe are at the heart of these proposals, affecting the well-being of millions of Americans, their families, and their children.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not go into the details of my bill, including the substantial increase in coverage which would result from its enactment. Other witnesses have testified on these technical aspects of coverage, and I know that the subcommittee has an excellent staff analysis of S. 662, as well as of the other bills on the subject. I feel strongly that the increased coverage and the elimination of unjustified exemptions are completely consistent with the basic purpose of the act and with the need to provide a fair amount of economic justice for all Americans.

Mr. President, I remember the arguments that were made against the first minimum wage bill back in the thirties. These same arguments were heard again every time proposals were under consideration by the Congress to raise the minimum wage, or to expand its coverage.

The cry was heard, in the first place, that the establishment of the minimum wage constituted regimentation, and worse: That it would drive many, if not most, of the businesses of America into bankruptcy, that it would result in economic ruin and devastation.

Those arguments were without foundation in fact when they were made 20 years ago, and again 6 years ago. They are without real basis today.

It is generally conceded today—at least no public official of any party would, I think, dare deny it—that a Fair Labor Standards Act is a sound and essential part of our economic structure. It is a necessary safeguard for the bottom ranks of the Nation's labor force.

There is, of course, the question of what a fair minimum wage ought to be. In my judgment, the figures that have been written into law have always been too low. The figure of 75 cents an hour was too low when it was approved in 1949. It is, of course, far too low today.

Since the time the first minimum wage bill was passed, our economy, far from faltering, zoomed ahead with giant strides. Never was progress greater than in the years immediately following 1949. The increase in the minimum wage level in 1949 gave a new impetus to the national economy.

Since 1945 we have had an inflation. It has been a severe inflation. It has been especially marked in the years since 1949, as a result of price increases brought on by the war in Korea.

The minimum wage has not risen since 1949 and the minimum wage in 1949 was already set too low.

It is now more than 5 years since the time the 1949 amendments to the Wages and Hours Act went into effect. During these 5 years, national income has increased from \$218.9 billion to more than \$303 billion—an increase of over 38 percent. In these 5 years, the gross national product expanded from \$265 billion to more than \$362 billion—or almost 37 percent. Finally, corporation profits after taxes increased from \$16.1 billion to \$18.8 billion at the end of 1954—or 16.8 percent.

Most of this expansion took place between 1949 and 1953. The expansion of our economy has proceeded at a slower pace during the last 2 years. If we are to have a dynamic and expanding economy to keep pace with our expanding population, the rate of expansion must be greater than it has been in the last 2½ years.

The passage of the Minimum Wage Bill I have introduced—increasing the minimum wage to \$1.25 per hour and expanding the coverage to include about five million workers not now covered—would be a step in the right direction. It would help restore a dynamic quality to our economy. It would be a shot in the arm—a much-needed shot in the arm.

Testimony has been heard from some who complain that this increase in minimum wage would ruin this or that industry. While I am not in a position to comment on any particular allegation to this effect, I know that in general the result would be increased prosperity as a result of increased purchasing power.

Of course, it is generally conceded, even by President Eisenhower, that some increase in the minimum wage is desirable, but the increase recommended by the President is a paltry and insufficient amount. It reflects a backward-looking view of our economy. Ninety cents an hour might have been a fair figure in 1949. It is not a fair figure in 1955. Productivity has increased. There is unemployment as a result of automation and as a result of industries moving to low-wage areas. The increase of the minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour would help meet the consequences of these developments.

I do not think it is necessary for me to prove that \$1.25 an hour is a reasonable figure. I think it is up to the opponents of this measure to prove their case. Certainly the inflation has been no less than the amount of increase proposed in the minimum wage. And when we take into consideration that the minimum wage set in

1949 was already too low, we can easily see that a minimum wage of \$1.25 would not be excessive.

In speaking of the desirability of increasing the minimum wage, I do not want to neglect those provisions of the pending bill providing for increased coverage. They are equally as important as the increase to \$1.25 an hour. Too many of our workers are outside the protection of the Minimum Wage Law. I see no reason for many of the exemptions now in the law.

Of course, it should be borne in mind that in the last 3 years much damage has been done to the Fair Labor Standards Act by faulty administration. The law has not been policed as well as it should have been. Enforcement has been weak and tragically inadequate. I hope that these aspects of the situation will be remedied.

One of the most desirable effects of the bill I am proposing would be to establish a more uniform floor under the wage structure of the entire country. It is regrettable that there should be a lower standard in some parts of our country than is the case in others.

In this connection, it is paradoxical that so many Americans who have recently learned that what occurs 5,000 miles distant can affect the lives of every American, have not yet seen that what depresses the economy of one section of this country injures the economy of the entire country.

We all take pride today in stating and restating the lesson we have learned after two great wars—that we live in an interdependent world. When will it be said that all of us realize that we live in an interdependent Nation, and accept fully all the ramifications of that axiom?

One of the most potent arguments for a \$1.25 minimum wage is in the finding and declaration of policy of the present law. This states that substandard labor conditions constitute "an unfair method of competition in commerce," and cause "commerce and the channels and instrumentalities of commerce to be used to spread and perpetuate such labor conditions among the workers of the several States."

I need not reiterate to members of this subcommittee the problems of the runaway plants and industries which have been a cause of so much economic and human distress in many areas of the country, including my own, during the past few years. I do wish to emphasize, however, that these plants and industries have not only injured the economic well-being of workers and communities in the areas they have left. They are also an economic drag on the peoples and communities in the areas into which they have fled in their search for cheaper labor and substandard working conditions.

I have heard it said, even in these subcommittee hearings, that the administration's 90-cents-an-hour recommendation and its timid excursion into the field of expanded coverage does not really represent its desires, but is dictated by political considerations and the need for passage of some legislation, however meaningless, in this area. If such is the case, this represents one of the greatest abdications of leadership on an issue affecting the health and welfare of the American people that has ever come to my attention.

Congress, I am convinced, if given the proper leadership, would approve a bill raising the minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour and increasing coverage.

I hope, therefore, that this subcommittee, realizing the seriousness of the legislation before it and the overriding need for prompt action in this field, will report to the full committee a bill to raise the minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour and to increase coverage, substantially as outlined in S. 662.

Extension of Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding a statement by Mr. George W. Ball, in which he answered some of the allegations and charges made against him before the Committee on Finance in the hearings on H. R. 1, extending the Trade Agreements Act.

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

I was much disturbed to learn that in the hearings of the Senate Finance Committee, a statement was placed in the record near the conclusion of the hearings that severely attacks the character and motives of certain members of the committee for a national trade policy.

It has been reported that this material, on the basis that it is a part of the Senate hearings, is being circulated. Since it contains many misstatements of facts, innuendoes, personal attacks as "Foreign Agents" on many fine Americans, I feel that the Senate should be advised as to the truth in this matter.

Further, I feel that in sponsoring or opposing legislation, Americans, of whatever political faith they may be, should be allowed to urge the legislation without having their patriotism questioned or being accused of representing foreign governments.

Certainly the Senate, in the consideration of H. R. 1, which extends this basic trade policy of this country under both Democratic and Republican administrations, should not have its attention distracted by such personal attacks in the form of statements placed in committee hearings. Because of the lateness of this insertion in the record, I feel that a clarifying statement is not only fair but necessary.

We should debate and even perhaps disagree on issues such as H. R. 1 as Americans and any attempt to allege or insinuate that foreign influence motivates legislation is not in the interest of sound consideration of important legislation. I shall perhaps differ radically from some of those on the committee for a national trade policy on some of the provisions of the act, but I certainly respect their rights to speak as Americans, in this case. Too often in recent years major debates have been thrown off the track by alleging that certain proponents or opponents of legislation were Communists or scoundrels or both. Such interjection of bitterness—or foreign intrigue and smears damages our standing in the eyes of our friendly allies and of the world.

The material to which I object was levied against the committee for a national trade policy and are of this order. They were largely designed to attack the character of the supporters of H. R. 1 and are malicious, irrelevant and unfounded. The material was placed in the record by a man named Robert M. Burr, who purports to be president of an organization calling itself the National Bureau for Economic Realism, Inc., 270 Park Avenue, New York.

Mr. Burr's attack was filed with the Senate Finance Committee just before the hearings closed, too late for reply or investigation and was included in the published hearings of the committee at pages 2306 to 2331.

I do not know Mr. Burr nor the interests he represents. Who his clients or customers are or who pays its expenses is not disclosed.

Conversely, the Committee for a National Trade Policy is a well-known organization and has made no secret of its sponsorship or activities because it has nothing to hide.

The Committee for a National Trade Policy is a nonprofit corporation incorporated under the laws of the State of New York. It has about 1,000 members, of which approximately 450 of them are corporations, many being the largest and most important in the United States. There are 550 individuals associated with it as members, among them many leaders in the business world. On its advisory board are to be found representatives of major labor and farm groups.

It is important to note that this committee for the first time in history has joined important elements of American business and industry together, not to work for import quotas or subsidies or higher tariffs, but in an effort to assist in the development of a national trade policy.

The forces in the United States advocating higher tariff protection have long been well organized, for which every right exists. These include the American Tariff League, the National Labor-Management Council, and other bodies which support protective tariffs. The same is true of the many national trade associations which for most part have taken positions either against H. R. 1 or are in favor of its substantial amendment.

The recommendations of President Eisenhower and the report of the Randall Commission have been actively supported by the Committee for a National Trade Policy. Now it is supporting strongly H. R. 1.

Many of the most distinguished leaders of business in this country sit upon the board of directors of the committee and take an active part in its proceedings. The positions they advocate are in accord with the positions long held and publicly expressed by these men.

One of the principal points of attack in Mr. Burr's statement, graced only by the dignity of being included in the printed transcript of the hearings of the Senate Finance Committee, is largely devoted to attempting to demonstrate that a lawyer named George W. Ball was responsible for the creation of the Committee for a National Trade Policy—that Mr. Ball has dominated the committee—and that Mr. Ball has been motivated by the fact that the law firm of which he is a member has included among its many clients several foreign business interests and has acted as counsel for various agencies for the French Government. Because Mr. Ball and his firm have had foreign clients in the past, Mr. Burr implies that the Senate should vote down H. R. 1.

If America is to have foreign trade and intercourse with other nations, our distinguished attorneys will in the course of their regular practice have clients from foreign lands. But it is a fantastic argument indeed that because an American lawyer has represented foreign clients the Senate should not pass legislation in the national interest of the United States.

Neither should the tag "foreign agent" be applied—else this necessary legal service and practice by members of the bar will take on a connotation of questionable patriotism.

It is far even more fantastic for Mr. Burr to make such an attack when neither Mr. Ball nor his firm have represented any clients in support of H. R. 1—nor have they been associated with the Committee for a National Trade Policy since long before H. R. 1 was introduced. Neither has this attorney nor his firm taken any part in trying to secure the passage of this bill—whether on behalf of the Committee for a National Trade Policy or for any other organization, company, or individual.

I have known Mr. Ball for many years. I know him to be an able and competent

attorney, active in many phases of service to America, as an official and as a private citizen. In fairness to him and to the Committee for a National Trade Policy, he should have the right to keep the record straight. I would like to read into the record a statement prepared by Mr. Ball, commenting on the charges that have been made against him.

He is the holder of the Medal for Freedom, given him in recognition of his services during the war. His patriotism, his standing, and his dedication to public service should be unquestioned.

Mr. Ball's statement is as follows:

"Since July 1946, I have been a member of the law firm of Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly, and Hamilton, which has its principal office in New York City, and also maintains offices under the name of Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly, and Ball in Washington, D. C., and Paris, France. The firm comprises more than 45 lawyers. It is engaged in the general practice of law.

"While the great bulk of the firm's clients are United States corporations and individuals, it has in the course of its practice also represented certain foreign clients. Whenever such representation has come within the provisions of the Foreign Agents Registration Act, the firm has fully complied with that act.

"In the course of the statement submitted by Mr. Robert Burr to the Senate Committee on Finance, I am described as a founder of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc. Mr. Burr seeks to imply that I was the leading spirit in the creation of that organization and that I was motivated by the fact that my firm represented some foreign clients.

"The facts are quite the contrary.

"On July 14, 1953, I received a telegram from Mr. Harry A. Bullis, chairman of the board of directors of General Mills, Inc., asking me to a dinner in New York to meet with a group of prominent American businessmen to discuss the formation of a proposed Citizens Committee for the Development of International Economic Relations.

"Present at the meeting besides Mr. Bullis were Mr. John J. McCloy, chairman, the Chase National Bank; Mr. Joseph P. Spang, Jr., president of the Gillette Co.; Mr. Ralph I. Straus, a director of R. H. Macy & Co., Inc.; and Mr. Stewart F. Louchheim, president, Stewart F. Louchheim Co. of Philadelphia. I had not previously met any of these gentlemen except Mr. McCloy and Mr. Straus. I had been invited to the meeting because of my known interest in trade policy. I was asked to express my views with regard to the form of organization of a committee and the kind of program it should undertake.

"After this meeting I was advised that Mr. John S. Coleman had accepted the invitation of Mr. Bullis to undertake to organize such a committee. Mr. Coleman is president of the Burroughs Corp. and Chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago. He was at that time also president of the board of commerce of Detroit.

"In August 1953 my law firm was asked by Mr. Coleman to act as counsel of the organizing group in supervising the legal steps necessary to create the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., as a nonprofit membership corporation under the laws of the State of New York. When the committee was organized, my firm was retained as general counsel and I was elected secretary, with the task of keeping the minutes, and also a director. The articles of incorporation were filed with the secretary of state of the State of New York on September 16, 1953, and the organization meeting of the incorporators was held on September 17, 1953. The first meeting of the board of directors was also held on September 17, 1953. Under the certificate of incorporation, Messrs. Bullis, Coleman, Spang, Taft, and I,

along with Mr. Charles H. Percy, president, Bell & Howell Co., and Mr. Morris S. Rosenthal, then president, Stein, Hall & Co., Inc., were to hold office as directors of the committee until its first annual meeting. At the first meeting of the board of directors on September 17, 1953, Messrs. William L. Batt, Edward Littlejohn, Thomas B. McCabe, John J. McCloy, Ralph I. Straus, and Clarence Francis were also elected as directors.

"I mention these facts only because Mr. Burr has sought to draw some malign inference from the appearance of my name on the formal organization papers of the committee and refers to me more than once as being the 'founding secretary' or as having 'founded' the organization.

"The second part of Mr. Burr's attack on me consists of an attempt to show that in my relations with the committee I was really acting on behalf of certain foreign clients. Again, the facts are wholly contrary.

Let me make it emphatically clear that neither my firm nor I, nor, to my knowledge, any member or associate of my firm, has ever contributed one cent to the Committee for a National Trade Policy. Nor has any contribution ever been made by any foreign client which my firm represented; in fact, during the period that I served as a director it was an inflexible policy of the committee never to accept a contribution of any kind from any foreign company or interest. I recall, for example, that shortly after the committee was formed it refused a contribution offered by a Canadian company. Since I am no longer a director or officer of the committee I cannot speak for it today, but I should be amazed if there has been any change in this established committee policy.

"The relations of my law firm with the committee were on a professional basis. Not only did my firm make no financial contribution to the committee, it received from the committee fees amounting to \$20,000 for the work it performed as general counsel. The implication in Mr. Burr's pamphlet that the services which my firm or I performed for the Committee for a National Trade Policy were compensated for by the fees which my firm may have received for work performed on behalf of foreign clients—work entirely unrelated to United States trade policy—is both absurd and insulting.

"Mr. Burr attempts to make a great deal out of the fact that in the early months of 1953, my firm had represented the Venezuelan chambers of commerce (composed of private firms doing business in Venezuela). Our representation was in connection with proposed legislation that would restrict the import of oil into the United States. My firm, in turn, retained a number of prominent law firms in various parts of the country to explain the issues involved to American companies in their communities. Included among these firms was that of Headley, Sibbald & Taft, of Cincinnati. Mr. Charles P. Taft, of that firm, had the previous year been the Republican candidate for Governor of Ohio. I knew him to be an expert in the field of commercial policy.

"My firm ceased active work on behalf of the Venezuelan chambers of commerce on August 1, 1953, and withdrew its registration for that client under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. That was 6 weeks prior to the incorporation of the Committee for a National Trade Policy.

"When the Committee for a National Trade Policy was established, I informed the directors of these facts. I informed them also that my firm was then acting, and had acted for several years, as legal adviser to certain agencies of the French Government.

"Let me make it entirely clear, however, that my firm has at no time undertaken or attempted, directly or indirectly, on behalf of the French Government or any other foreign government, to influence the United States Congress with respect to legislation in connection with international trade, com-

mercial policy, or any other matter. To the extent that our services for the French Government may have involved attention to international trade or commercial policy, those services have been confined to the traditional lawyer's function of interpreting laws or regulations.

"Knowing my interest in the subject of trade policy which had long preceded any professional representation in this field, the directors of the committee were of the opinion that, in view of all the circumstances, no fairminded person would misinterpret my professional activities in such a way as to cause any embarrassment to the committee or its work.

"In October 1954, I submitted my resignation as a director and officer of the committee for a National Trade Policy, as well as the resignation of my firm as the committee's general counsel. I did this entirely on my own initiative, without any suggestion from any officer, director, or member of the committee. I explained to the directors of the committee that my firm was considering a proposal to represent certain clients in connection with a matter bordering on trade policy (not covered by the provisions of H. R. 1 or any proposed amendments thereto), and that I wished to avoid any possibility of embarrassment to the committee because of innocent or deliberate misinterpretation in connection with this representation. My resignation was accepted by the directors of the committee at their annual meeting on November 2, 1954. This was more than 2 months prior to the introduction of H. R. 1, and neither my firm nor I has represented any clients in support of H. R. 1."

In view of Mr. Ball's statement—and I have confidence in what he says—I think we should return the argument on this important piece of legislation to the merits. I feel we have a serious task confronting us to chart the course of this country in its commercial dealings with the rest of the world. To perform that task properly will take all the sober and informed attention which we can muster. We shall not succeed if we are deflected by unfounded attacks or mean insinuations on character and motives.

Elizabeth Jane Hench

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 2, Mrs. Elizabeth Jane Hench, of New Cumberland, Pa., will observe her 100th birthday anniversary.

This event will be marked by a celebration on Sunday May 1 when the Medical Society of Pennsylvania will present this splendid lady with a plaque, which reads:

The Medical Society of the State of Pennsylvania extends greetings and felicitations to Mrs. Elizabeth Jane Hench, born May 2, 1855, in recognition of one whose life span exemplifies healthful living.

The presentation will be made at the home of Mrs. J. Cover Sterline, daughter of Mrs. Hench, in New Cumberland, by Dr. Edward S. Kronenberg, Jr., president of the Cumberland County Medical Society. Later there will be a birthday party, at which there will be five generations of Mrs. Hench's family.

Doctors advise me that Mrs. Hench is in excellent physical condition and retains full use of all her faculties.

I am sure I express the sentiments of my colleagues in wishing this great lady a most happy birthday.

Ulysses Simpson Grant: The Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. SCHWENGL. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday it was my pleasure to attend the exercises on the Capitol grounds honoring the 133d anniversary of the birth of Ulysses S. Grant. This significant celebration is an annual event, and I was pleased to see that it was attended by a large number of people. The Marine Band played appropriate music; veteran and patriotic organizations laid wreaths at the monument; introductory remarks were made by Col. Randle Bond Truett, Chief of the National Memorials and Historic Sites Section, and Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant III, grandson of the former President, expressed his appreciation for the observance.

The principal speaker was our amiable, capable, and devoted public servant, the Honorable GEORGE A. DONDERO, of Michigan, who spoke eloquently on the subject: Ulysses Simpson Grant: The Man. I earnestly solicit the attention of my colleagues to Representative DONDERO's address.

ULYSSES SIMPSON GRANT: THE MAN

(Address of GEORGE A. DONDERO, Member of Congress at the Grant Memorial in Washington, D. C., April 27, 1955)

One hundred and thirty-three years ago today, Ulysses S. Grant, one of our greatest Americans, was born.

It is not my purpose to dwell on his brilliant military career nor his political career as President of the United States. The great man in whose memory we have met to do him honor had certain striking elements of character which made him what he was and which enabled him to accomplish what he did. I propose to confine my remarks to his characteristics as a man.

I know of no place more appropriate to discuss his life and character than here in the shadow of the Nation's Capitol Building, and at this imposing memorial erected by a united people to commemorate his name and fame. May we rekindle within us respect and admiration for the knightly character and leader that he was.

General Grant presents one of the strangest anomalies in history: that a man so distinguished in war should be so unwarlike in personal characteristics and free from the ambitions supposed to dominate the soldier.

Among the qualities which enabled him to accomplish what he did were his self-confidence, perseverance, and firm discipline. These qualities were not manifested in an extreme manner, for they were balanced by his temperate character. His self-confidence was combined with humility; his perseverance was attended with adaptability; and his discipline was softened by his innate kindness.

His self-confidence is clearly illustrated in a unique way by a letter which General

Grant wrote to his sister Mary from his headquarters at Oxford, Miss., December 15, 1862. The Vicksburg campaign was in progress. The General was expecting his wife and his father to visit him in a few days. Notice what the General said to his sister: "We are now having wet weather. I have a big army in front of me as well as bad roads. I shall probably give a good account of myself however notwithstanding all obstacles." We all know that 5 days after the General wrote the letter to his sister, expressing supreme confidence in his plans, a Confederate force captured Holly Springs where Grant's supplies for his army were stored and where his sister and father were at the time he wrote the letter.

A man of less courage and resourcefulness would have been frustrated and discouraged, but not so with General Grant. He immediately sent all the wagons he had "to collect and bring in all supplies of forage and food from an area 15 miles east and west of the road," to sustain his troops on the people in the region. This lesson, that an army could live off the country, was used in order that he could persevere in his long-range plan to capture Vicksburg.

He was so averse to inflicting pain that as a boy he never enjoyed the sport of killing small animals. He sickened at the sight of blood, yet was forced to witness the greatest outpouring of human blood for freedom in all our history.

He was a lover of horses. During the Wilderness campaign, he came in sight of a teamster brutally beating his horse in the face with the butt of his whip. He directed that the scoundrel be taken in charge and tied to a tree for 6 hours as punishment for his brutality.

During the Vicksburg campaign, or siege of Vicksburg as it is sometimes called, General Grant and staff took possession of a house as headquarters. He informed the family they might retain the upper rooms of the house and the kitchen below. One day the General met a young girl in the hallway carrying a tray of food. He inquired whom it was for. Frightened and trembling with fear, she admitted it was for her brother, a young Confederate officer who was wounded and concealed in the basement of the house. She had visions of a Northern prison for her brother and punishment for herself. "Tell your brother I will have my personal physician attend him and he shall have what food he needs," was the General's directive.

During the late twenties or about 30 years ago, an old lady, on whose head the snows of many years had fallen, entered the office of Ulysses S. Grant III, grandson of President Grant and one of the most respected and highly esteemed citizens of Washington, and told him the story. She said "I am the little girl who carried the tray of food, and I wanted some member of the Grant family to know of the incident before I passed away." Such are the facts as I heard them from the lips of the distinguished grandson of the man we honor today.

General Grant always abstained from profanity and would not tolerate it in others. He hated liars and cowards. The familiar saying that "an honest man is the noblest work of God" could literally be applied to Grant. Characteristic of the man and his meticulous adherence to the truth in an incident which happened in camp. After returning from an inspection, he was heard to say: "I was told so and so about the wounded by Dr. Smith while we were talking this morning inside his tent." A half hour later, he took the trouble to come back and say, as if it were a matter of the greatest importance, "I was mistaken when I told you that my conversation with Dr. Smith occurred inside his tent, that was not correct, it took place while we were standing in front of his tent."

One of Grant's generals, Ingalls, who knew him at West Point while a cadet said, "He

was always frank, generous, and manly." He would not tolerate obscenity or even off-color stories. They were objectionable to him. One evening a citizen who had come to camp said he would tell a story, and began by looking around and saying, "I see there are no ladies present." General Grant interrupted him with the remark, "No, but there are gentlemen present."

He entered the Military Academy because his father desired him to do so and not because he wanted to go. While there, he secretly rejoiced when it was rumored that Congress proposed to abolish the academy. While at West Point, he deliberately planned to be fired from the academy by putting on his full-dress uniform and leaving the grounds without permission. He walked a considerable distance to a favorite meeting place for the cadets. On the way, he passed several officers, who, believing he had authority to leave the grounds, made no report of his escapade, and his whole plan to be fired from the academy failed.

Years after graduating from West Point, he related that on his way to the academy from home he hoped the train would be wrecked and he would be injured just enough to disqualify him from entering. However, his training at West Point left its impress upon the young soldier. He was always refined in his manners at table and never violated the requirements of true politeness.

There was little if anything in Grant's early life to mark him as a man of destiny. Adversity, hardship, and poverty were not unknown to this famous soldier. Shortly before the breaking out of the Civil War, he pawned his watch for \$22 in order to provide a few Christmas presents for his children. His weaknesses, if they can be called such, were his devotion to his family and his singular love for children.

When his family visited him at City Point, his headquarters during the last months of the war, his meeting with them afforded him the happiest day he had seen since they parted. The morning after their arrival an officer entered the general's tent and found him in shirt sleeves engaged in a rough-and-tumble wrestling match with his two older boys—age 14 and 12 years respectively. He had become red in the face and seemed nearly out of breath from the exertion. The boys had tripped him up and he was on his knees on the floor grappling with his playful youngsters, and joining in their merry laughter as if he were a boy again himself. Noticing the officer, Horace Porter, with dispatches in his hand, the general rose to his feet, brushed the dust from his clothes and said, "Ah, you know my weaknesses—my children and my horses." The older son, Frederick Dent Grant, was the father of Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant III, my warm personal friend whom we all admire and respect.

This was the man who commanded the Armies of the Union. One army under his immediate command numbered over 100,000 men. He held in his hand the destiny of our Republic. He was intensely human and most considerate of others.

There is an erroneous impression abroad that General Grant was a poor student and left a somewhat indifferent record at West Point and graduated low in his class. His grandson, in an address delivered quite recently, called attention to the fact that this popular fallacy was incorrect. He quoted an officer who made a study of this subject and found that General Grant stood in the middle of his class and relatively higher than Jefferson Davis, General Hooker, Longstreet, Hancock, Custer, Pickett, Hood, and Sheridan.

His innate modesty is well expressed by Alexander H. Stephens, Vice President of the Confederacy, who said, "He is one of the most remarkable men I ever met. He does not seem to be aware of his powers."

Although his education was limited to country schools and the Military Academy, he acquired a general knowledge of literature sufficient to develop a most unusual facility for straightforward and clear expression, which assisted him greatly in later life. No one can read his memoirs without noticing his simple and direct method of expression. During the Civil War, his orders, written by himself, and many of them in the heat and confusion of the battlefield, distinctly conveyed his views, and none of them were ever misunderstood.

It is claimed that General Grant was careless about his personal appearance. It is true that many photographs of him as an officer during the Civil War show him with his vest unbuttoned or otherwise unconscious of his appearance. However, we have the authority of his grandson that his mother, in her effort to train him in the way he should go, tried to impress on him the scrupulous cleanliness of his grandfather and his meticulous insistence on clean linen. It will be remembered that when Lee surrendered to him at Appomattox, he apologized for his appearance because of his muddy boots and wearing no sword. These were his remarks when asked what his thoughts were at that supreme moment of his military career.

Those who knew him best loved him most; to dislike him was to misunderstand, like the little southern girl who didn't like the new minister. After the church service, she asked, "Mama, is the new minister a Yankee?" "Why, no, dear, why do you ask?" "Well, I don't like him, anyway; when he prayed he kept saying, 'Grant, O Lord; Grant, O Lord; Grant, O Lord,' and he never once mentioned General Lee."

Perhaps no better example of his extreme modesty exists than the occasion in 1884 when he wrote an article for the Century magazine on the Vicksburg campaign without mentioning himself. We all know he was the commander at Vicksburg and brought about its fall and the surrender of its garrison of 31,000 men.

Hamilton Fish, who was Secretary of State in the Cabinet of President Grant, when asked what he thought was Grant's dominant quality, said "absolute truthfulness, complete inflexible veracity. I do not think it would have been possible for Grant to have told a lie even if he had composed it and written it down."

It is a common expression among men in uttering the highest faith and confidence in a person to say: "His word is as good as his bond." During the administration of President Johnson, General Lee and other Confederate leaders were threatened with indictment and arrest for treason. Under the terms of surrender given by Grant they were paroled and were not to be molested as long as they obeyed their paroles. That his word be kept as good as his bond, General Grant told the President, "I will resign the command of the Army rather than execute any order directing me to arrest General Lee or any other of his commanders." That put an end to all attempts for vengeance against southern leaders.

Bearing on the character of the great Union commander is the statement of William H. Cook, chief usher at the White House during Grant's administration, who declared, "I have never seen a more devoted family or a happier one," and this during the tempestuous period of speculation and reconstruction of our country. Be it ever said to the everlasting fame and credit of President Grant he entered upon the duties of that high office without political experience or training in the art of diplomacy and statesmanship and made good. The only criticism leveled against him, and the one mistake he made, being as honest a man as God ever made, was that he believed other people in whom he placed trust and confidence were as honest as he.

A fair measure of the esteem and respect in which he was held is included in a tribute paid by a political opponent, a Democrat, assistant attorney general of New York, William A. Poste, who declared, "The century has produced and honored no more rugged and manly man than Ulysses S. Grant—he has gone down to his grave faithfully unto death."

The estimate of the Confederate General Longstreet, foe and adversary in battle who fought on the other side and who knew Grant at West Point, speaks in loud praise of the man in whose memory we have gathered here today. He said, "Grant will hold a place with Washington in the hearts of his countrymen. Personally, Grant was a warm-hearted, lovable friend, a magnanimous opponent. His greatness was marked by a modesty so noticeable as to win him the appellation of the 'silent man of destiny.'"

We honor ourselves by honoring Ulysses Simpson Grant on the 133d anniversary of his birth. We bestow upon him today the affectionate appreciation of his countrymen and the loving memory of a grateful people. "A man he was without vices, with an absolute hatred of lies and an unreserved love of truth, of a perfect loyalty to friendship, neither envious of others nor selfish for himself. With a zeal for the public good, unfeigned, he has left to memory only such weaknesses as connects him with humanity, and such virtues as will rank him among heroes."

Chemicals in Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill dealing with the use of chemicals in foods.

This bill represents an effort to modernize our Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act on a practical basis. The principal accomplishment of the bill is to close the loophole in the present law. This is done in two ways: First, by requiring the pretesting of food additives and food-packaging materials before they can reach the public; and second, by requiring the industry to submit a report of its pretesting to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare before marketing the new food additive or new packaging material. Although responsible companies follow the practice of pretesting, the present law is deficient in that it is legally possible for untested materials to reach the consumer.

The primary purpose of the bill is to protect the public health. I believe this has been done, and reasonable safeguards have been established. Other factors which vitally affect the national welfare have been given careful consideration. For example, although the bill provides for a reasonable degree of practical control over new products of the food packaging, and chemical industries, it also sets up balances which will prevent the stifling of research and competition in these important industries.

This bill provides a different approach than the Insecticide Act which I introduced in the 83d Congress. The reason for this is quite obvious. Many insecticides must be highly toxic in order to be effective. Food additives, however, do not present the same toxicity danger, and the possibility of a seriously hazardous food additive reaching the consumer is somewhat remote. Industry, as a whole, has performed an excellent and conscientious service by observing high standards of scientific testing before placing new additives in commercial channels.

The procedures established in this bill adequately serve to protect the public health, without requiring the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to write and issue licensing regulations covering the use of new food additives or new packaging materials. The bill provides practical control mechanisms for the Secretary, without permitting strangulation of industrial research by capriciousness in the Department.

Outstanding representatives of science, industry, and Government have devoted many hours of thought and study to the legislative problems posed by the tremendous progress being made in this field. The bill attempts to incorporate the commendable features of legislation that has been proposed during this session of the Congress. It also attempts to meet many of the more serious objections to these bills.

The bill applies to all new food additives. By definition, however, substances generally recognized among experts as being without hazard to the public health in their present uses are excluded from its operation. Pesticide chemicals are specifically excluded, and new packaging materials are treated separately.

Under procedures established in the bill, before marketing a new food additive, the industry or person must file a report of investigations to show safety with the Secretary. The report contains, generally, all pretesting data and all pertinent information bearing upon the new food additive. The Secretary must render an opinion on the basis of the data before him within 120 days after the report is filed. If the Secretary renders a favorable opinion or fails to act within the allotted time, the applicant may proceed to market the additive.

If the opinion of the Secretary is unfavorable there are several courses which may be followed:

(A) The applicant may request a public hearing in the Department. After the hearing the Secretary shall enter a final order based upon the evidence adduced. Appeal from this order lies with the circuit court of appeals.

(B) Either the Secretary or the applicant may request an advisory committee, to be selected from representatives of science, industry, and Government under procedures outlined in the bill. This committee is so composed as to combine scientific knowledge with the approach of commerce and Government.

(C) The applicant may elect to market the additive at the risk of having an injunction proceeding brought against him by the Secretary.

Several courses remain open in the event an advisory committee is requested by the Secretary or by the applicant. If the report of the committee is favorable to the applicant and is affirmed in an order by the Secretary, the applicant may proceed to market the product. If the report of the committee is favorable but the Secretary does not acquiesce, the applicant may either request a public hearing, appeal the order to the circuit court of appeals, or place the product on the market at the risk of an injunction by the Secretary.

If the report of the committee is adverse, the applicant may use the public hearing and appeal remedy; or the applicant may, in the alternative, proceed to market at the risk of injunction, but here the bill gives to the Secretary the benefit of a presumption that the new food additive would present a reasonable likelihood of hazard to the public health, and the burden falls upon the applicant to prove otherwise.

It should be pointed out at this stage that the applicant may withdraw the report at any time, and the Secretary may likewise modify or withdraw any opinion for cause.

New packaging materials have been treated separately in the bill because the potential hazard from packaging materials is very much less in degree, in that only trace contaminations generally may be involved. The bill does provide, however, that a report of investigations to show safety must be filed and, if the Secretary is of the opinion that the material presents a reasonable likelihood of hazard to the public health, the main sanctions of the bill shall be applied.

This bill attempts to reconcile the many divergent and conflicting points of view relative to regulation of the use of chemicals in foods. It is my belief that this legislation will meet the needs of dynamic, growing industries, and will provide a system of adequate controls, with the public health paramount. It is in this interest that the bill is submitted.

Voting and Attendance Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting and attendance record during the 2d session of the 81st Congress.

The record includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record.

Voting and attendance record, Representative **GERALD R. FORD, JR.**, 5th District, Michigan; 81st Cong., 2d sess.

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote	Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1950				1950		
1	Jan. 3	Quorum call	Present.	64	Feb. 23	Quorum call	Present.
2	Jan. 9	do	Present.			H. R. 4453, to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin: On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 177 to 239.)	Nay.
3	Jan. 18	do	Present.	65	do	On passage. (Passed, 240 to 177.)	Yea.
4	Jan. 19	do	Present.	66	do	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5330, authorizing economic aid for the Republic of Korea:		67	Feb. 27	do	Present.
5	do	On recommendation to Committee on Foreign Affairs for further study and hearings. (Defeated, 190 to 194.)	Yea.	68	do	do	Present.
		On passage. (Defeated, 191 to 193.)		69	Feb. 28	do	Present.
6	do	Quorum call	Nay.	70	do	Conference report on S. 1008, defining the application of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to certain pricing practices (basing point bill):	
7	Jan. 20	Motion to adjourn. (Defeated, 161 to 255.)	Present.			Motion to send to further conference. (Adopted, 240 to 144.)	Yea.
8	do	H. Res. 133, amending rules of House by repealing 21-day discharge rule which permits chairmen of legislative committees to bypass the Committee on Rules. (Defeated, 183 to 236.)	Yea.	71	do	Motion to table a motion instructing House conferees to insist on amendment of the House. (Adopted, 210 to 161.)	Yea.
9	do	Quorum call	Present.	72	do	H. R. 5953, authorizing contributions of \$1,229,240 to Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc. (CARE), to supply educational and scientific equipment and material to European libraries: Motion to strike out the enacting clause, thus killing the bill. (Adopted, 265 to 163.)	Yea.
10	Jan. 23	Quorum call	Present.			H. R. 4846, creating a National Science Foundation to support and initiate scientific research: On motion to recommit to the committee for further study. (Defeated, 134 to 240.)	Yea.
11	do	do	Present.	73	Mar. 1	On passage. (Passed, 247 to 125.)	Nay.
12	do	do	Present.	74	do	Quorum call	Absent.
13	do	do	Present.	75	do	H. R. 331, providing for the admission of Alaska into the Union. On passage. (Passed, 186 to 146.)	Yea.
14	do	do	Present.	76	Mar. 2	Quorum call	Present.
15	do	Motion ordering the previous question, thus ending debate on H. Res. 217, providing for the consideration of H. R. 331, a bill to provide statehood for Alaska. (Passed, 373 to 25.)	Yea.	77	Mar. 3	do	Present.
16	Jan. 25	Quorum call	Present.	78	do	H. R. 331, providing for the admission of Alaska into the Union. On passage. (Passed, 186 to 146.)	Yea.
17	do	do	Present.	79	Mar. 6	Quorum call	Present.
18	do	do	Present.	80	Mar. 7	H. R. 49, providing statehood for Hawaii. On passage. (Passed, 262 to 110.)	Yea.
19	do	do	Present.	81	do	Quorum call	Present.
20	Jan. 27	do	Present.			Conference report on H. R. 4466, establishing an International Claims Commission for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States and American nationals against foreign governments: On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 209 to 165.)	Nay.
21	do	do	Present.	82	do	Quorum call	Present.
22	do	do	Present.	83	do	Conference report on H. R. 2023, regulating oleomargarine and to repeal certain taxes relating to oleo: On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 262 to 106.)	Nay.
23	do	do	Present.	84	do	Quorum call	Present.
24	do	do	Present.	85	Mar. 8	H. R. 87, providing promotions for veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department. On passage (Passed, voice vote.)	Present.
25	Jan. 30	do	Present.	86	Mar. 9	Quorum call	Present.
		H. J. Res. 398, increasing the cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended: On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 136 to 239.)	Not voting.	87	do	do	Present.
26	Jan. 31	Quorum call	Present.	88	do	H. Res. 481, making in order the consideration of H. R. 874, providing a grant of \$36,400,000 to the States for Public Library Service Demonstration. (Adopted, 209 to 140.)	Nay.
27	Feb. 1	Motion that Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with. (Defeated, 104 to 271.)	Nay.	89	do	Quorum call	Present.
28	do	Quorum call	Present.	90	do	H. R. 874, providing a grant of \$36,400,000 to the States, for Public Library Service Demonstration: On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 162 to 176.)	Yea.
29	do	do	Present.	91	do	On passage. (Defeated, 161 to 164.)	Nay.
30	do	do	Present.	92	Mar. 13	Quorum call	Present.
31	do	do	Present.	93	do	do	Present.
32	Feb. 2	do	Present.	94	do	H. R. 3247, amending the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act of 1934 of the District of Columbia: On motion to consider bill. (Rejected, 69 to 241.)	Nay.
33	do	do	Present.	95	do	Quorum call	Present.
34	do	do	Present.	96	Mar. 14	do	Present.
35	Feb. 6	do	Present.	97	do	Conference report on S. 1008, defining the application of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to certain pricing practices (basing-point bill): On motion to recommit to committee of conference. (Defeated, 175 to 204.)	Nay.
36	Feb. 7	do	Present.	98	do	Quorum call	Present.
37	do	do	Present.	99	Mar. 15	H. R. 4703, relating to the internal security of the United States by tightening safeguards against espionage and sedition, on passage. (Passed, 368 to 2.)	Yea.
38	do	do	Present.	100	do	Quorum call	Present.
39	Feb. 8	do	Present.	101	Mar. 16	Conference report on H. J. Res. 398, increasing the cotton and peanut-acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938: On motion to recommit to committee of conference. (Defeated, 116 to 225.)	Yea.
40	Feb. 9	H. R. 2945, increasing certain postal rates: On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 150 to 218.)	Yea.	102	do	S. 2105, to provide subsidies to certain mines for the exploration for and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals: On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 155 to 161.)	Yea.
41	do	S. 2319, authorizing economic assistance to Korea and certain parts of China for a period ending June 30, 1950: On motion to recommit to Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to reduce amount of authorization from \$60,000,000 to \$20,000,000 and limiting amount advanced by RFC from \$30,000,000 to \$10,000,000. (Defeated, 137 to 239.)	Yea.	103	do	On passage. (Defeated, 144 to 166.)	Nay.
42	do	On passage. (Passed, 240 to 134.)	Yea.	104	do	Quorum call	Present.
43	Feb. 14	Quorum call	Absent.	105	Mar. 20	H. R. 7057, relative to deductions by land-grant colleges of certain estimates of cost presented to the Veterans' Administration: On suspension of rules and passage. (Passed, 245 to 101.)	Yea.
44	Feb. 15	do	Present.	106	do	Quorum call	Present.
45	do	Motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House. (Approved, 257 to 82.)	Yea.	107	Mar. 22	H. R. 7462, to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for moderate income families, and for other purposes.	Present.
46	do	Motion to adjourn. (Defeated, 97 to 236.)	Nay.				
47	do	Motion to dispense with Calendar Wednesday. (Defeated 94 to 238.)	Nay. ²				
48	do	Motion to adjourn. (Defeated, 109 to 218.)	Nay. ¹				
49	do	Quorum call	Nay.				
50	do	Motion to adjourn. (Defeated, 126 to 198.)	Nay.				
51	do	Motion to dispense with further proceedings under call of the House. (Approved, 243 to 102.)	Yea. ¹				
		S. 2734, promoting the rehabilitation of the Navaho and Hopi Indian Tribes and provide for a better utilization of the resources of their reservation:					
52	Feb. 21	On amendment extending State laws to cover certain offenses to the Navaho and Hopi Reservations. (Defeated, 142 to 196.)	Yea.				
53	Feb. 22	Quorum call	Present.				
54	do	do	Present.				
55	do	Motion to adjourn and thus prevent consideration of H. R. 4453 (FEPC). (Defeated, 127 to 278.)	Nay.				
56	do	Motion to dispense with the call of committees on Calendar Wednesday and prevent consideration of H. R. 4453 (FEPC). (Defeated, 121 to 285.)	Nay.				
57	do	Quorum call	Present.				
58	do	Motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House. (Approved, 290 to 115.)	Yea.				
59	do	Motion to adjourn and thus prevent consideration of H. R. 4453 (FEPC). (Defeated, 127 to 284.)	Nay.				
60	do	Motion to consider H. R. 4453, the Federal Fair Employment Practice Act. (Approved, 287 to 121.)	Yea.				
61	do	Motion to adjourn. (Defeated, 165 to 239.)	Nay.				
62	do	Motion to consider H. R. 4453. (Approved, 270 to 134.)	Yea.				
63	do	H. R. 4453, to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin (FEPC): On amendment inserting the text of H. R. 6841 providing for voluntary compliance and removing the compulsory provisions of H. R. 4453. (Adopted, 221 to 178.)	Yea.				

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan; 81st Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote	Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
108	1950 Mar. 22	H. R. 7402—Continued On amendment deleting middle-income housing section. (Adopted, 218 to 155.)	Yea.	163	1950 May 11	Quorum call.	Present.
109	do	On passage. (Passed, 261 to 10.)	Yea.	164	May 15	do	Present.
110	Mar. 23	H. Res. 482, authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities. (Adopted, 248 to 12.) Conference report on H. J. Res. 398, increasing cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. On adoption o. conference report. (Adopted, 197 to 156.)	Yea.	165	do	do	Present.
111	do	On adoption o. conference report. (Adopted, 197 to 156.)	Nay	166	do	H. Res. 567, providing for the consideration of H. R. 5990. (Adopted, 194 to 32.)	Yea.
112	do	Quorum call.	Present.	167	do	H. R. 5990, providing for construction, development, administration, and maintenance of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway as a part of the District of Columbia park system: On motion for consideration of bill. (Adopted, 192 to 29.)	Yea.
113	Mar. 24	do	Present.	168	do	do	Present.
114	do	do	Present.	169	May 18	Quorum call.	Present.
115	do	H. Res. 518, the rule providing for consideration of H. R. 7797, providing foreign economic assistance. (Adopted, 262 to 22.)	Yea.	170	May 19	H. R. 7941, amending and supplementing the Federal-Aid Road Act to authorize appropriations for the construction of highways: On passage. (Passed, 246 to 34.)	Yea.
116	do	Quorum call.	Present.	171	May 23	Quorum call.	Present.
117	do	do	Present.	172	do	Conference report on H. R. 7797, extending the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 and authorizing program of technical assistance to underdeveloped areas. (Adopted, 247 to 88.)	Yea.
118	Mar. 27	do	Present.	173	May 24	Quorum call.	Present.
119	do	do	Present.	174	June 6	do	Present.
120	Mar. 28	do	Present.	175	do	H. R. 7468, omnibus claims bill, for relief of sundry claimants: On adoption of amendment deleting title III, for relief of Harry Tansey. (Adopted, 184 to 119.)	Yea.
121	Mar. 29	do	Present.	176	June 13	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 143 to 227.)	Yea.
122	Mar. 30	do	Present.	177	do	On passage. (Passed, 202 to 163.)	Nay
123	Mar. 31	do	Present.	178	June 21	Conference report on H. R. 6567 increasing \$2,000,000,000 the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation. (Adopted, 235 to 81.)	Not vot- ing.
124	do	On motion to recommit with instructions to strike out title III. (Rejected, 150 to 220.)	Nay.	179	do	Conference report on S. 3181, extending the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 by providing 6-month extension and giving local governing bodies the option of continuing rent control for another 6 months. (Adopted, 176 to 145.)	Not vot- ing.
125	do	On passage. (Passed, 287 to 86.)	Yea.	180	June 22	H. J. Res. 334, amending certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in certain international organizations by increasing United States share of expenses in 5 international organizations. (Adopted, 209 to 91.)	Nay.
126	do	H. Res. 531, providing for House agreement to Senate amendment to H. R. 1758, amending the Natural Gas Act. (Adopted, 176 to 174.)	Nay.	181	do	H. Res. 649, making in order consideration of S. 2269, providing for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army. (Adopted, 232 to 61.)	Yea.
127	Apr. 3	Quorum call.	Present.	182	do	S. 2269, providing for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army. On passage. (Passed, 201 to 84.)	Yea.
128	do	do	Present.	183	June 26	Veto by the President on H. R. 87, relating to the promotion of veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department: On motion that bill and message be referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed. (Rejected, 115 to 165.)	Nay.
129	do	do	Present.	184	do	On overriding veto. (Overridden, 213 to 72 (3/4 majority necessary).)	Yea.
130	do	do	Present.	185	do	Quorum call.	Present.
131	Apr. 4	do	Present.	186	June 27	do	Present.
132	do	H. R. 7846, authorizing Army, Navy, and Air Force to contract for plans and specifications and to take options on sites, to expedite construction of rental housing on defense posts. On passage (passed, voice vote).	Present.	187	do	H. R. 6826, extending the Selective Service Act of 1948 to July 9, 1951. On passage. (Passed, 315 to 4.)	Yea.
133	Apr. 19	Quorum call.	Present.	188	June 29	H. R. 8920, reducing excise taxes: On recommitment to Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report it back as 2 separate bills, the 1st bill containing those provisions relating to excise taxes and the 2d bill containing the remaining provisions of H. R. 8920. (Rejected, 147 to 238.)	Yea.
134	do	do	Present.	189	do	On passage. (Passed, 375 to 14.)	Yea.
135	do	do	Present.	190	do	S. 3550, extending import-control authority over fats and oils and rice and rice products for a 1-year period from June 30, 1950, but discontinuing authority to control import of coconut oil: On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to report bill with an amendment to include import control authority over coconut oil and cheese. (Rejected, 72 to 264.)	Yea.
136	Apr. 20	do	Present.	191	do	Quorum call.	Present.
137	Apr. 21	S. J. Res. 166, providing for posthumous award of appropriate medals to crew of plane who lost their lives over the Baltic Sea in performance of their duty. (Adopted, 333 to 0.)	Yea.	192	June 30	do	Present.
138	do	Quorum call.	Absent.	193	do	S. 3336, providing for the organization of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico: On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to report bill with amendment providing that an islandwide referendum shall be held in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. (Defeated, 1 to 290.)	Nay.
139	Apr. 24	do	Present.	194	do	Quorum call.	Present.
140	Apr. 25	do	Present.	195	July 10	do	Present.
141	Apr. 26	do	Present.	196	do	do	Present.
142	Apr. 27	do	Present.	197	do	H. Res. 647, disapproving Reorganization Plan 27, creating a Department of Health, Education, and Security. (Passed, 249 to 71.)	Yea.
143	do	do	Present.	198	July 11	Quorum call.	Present.
144	May 1	do	Present.	199	July 12	H. R. 8083, authorizing the Export-Import Bank of Washington to guarantee United States private capital invested abroad: On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 156 to 184.)	Yea.
145	do	do	Present.	200	do	On passage. (Passed, 195 to 151.)	Nay.
146	do	H. R. 7185, providing open competitive examinations for veterans for position of apprentice in the Federal service: On suspension of rules and passage. (Passed, 209 to 93.)	Yea.			H. R. 7439, to protect the national security of the United States by giving power to summarily dismiss employees for security reasons to Attorney General, Secretaries of State, Commerce, Defense, Army, Navy, Air Force and Treasury, and Chairman of Atomic Energy Commission and National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics:	
147	do	H. R. 6354, authorizing District of Columbia Board of Commissioners to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia: On suspension of rules and passage. (Passed, 194 to 87.)	Yea.				
148	May 3	Conference report on H. R. 5472, authorizing construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation and flood control. (Adopted, 210 to 137.)	Nay.				
149	May 4	Quorum call.	Present.				
150	do	Conference report on H. R. 1243, amending the Hatch Act relative to penalties for violations of this act by Federal civil-service employees. (Adopted, 203 to 140.)	Nay.				
151	May 5	Quorum call.	Present.				
152	do	do	Present.				
153	May 6	Motion to adjourn. (Defeated, 98 to 170.)	Not vot- ing.				
154	do	Quorum call.	Absent.				
155	May 8	do	Present.				
156	May 9	do	Present.				
157	May 10	do	Present.				
158	do	H. R. 7786, making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951: On Gore amendment increasing the funds for grants for hospital construction under the Public Health Service from \$75,000,000 to \$150,000,000. (Adopted, 258 to 131.)	Nay.				
159	do	On Case amendment reducing funds for administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration by \$2,950,000. (Adopted, 222 to 163.)	Yea.				
160	do	On Thomas amendment as amended by the Taber amendment specifying certain percentage reductions of nonmilitary operation expenditures effecting a reduction of \$600,000,000. (Adopted, 274 to 112.)	Yea.				
161	do	On Jensen amendment reducing number of Federal employees by not filling vacancies that occur in certain civilian agencies. (Adopted, 201 to 185.)	Yea.				
162	do	On passage of bill. (Passed, 362 to 21.)	Yea.				

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan; 81st Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote	Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
201	1950 July 12	H. R. 7439—Continued On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to report bill with an amendment providing an additional right of appeal to the Civil Service Commission from any action by the heads of such agencies or departments. (Defeated, 144 to 193.)	Nay.	236	1950 Aug. 14	S. 192, conferring jurisdiction on the courts of the State of New York with respect to civil actions between Indians or to which Indians are parties. On passage. (Passed, 295 to 4.)	Yea.
202do.....	On passage. (Passed, 327 to 14.)	Yea.	237	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Present.
203	July 17	Quorum call	Present.	238	Aug. 16	H. R. 8195, rescinding the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services: On amendment directing that other essential postal services shall not be curtailed or terminated by reason of the bill and authorizing appropriation of sufficient funds to restore former postal deliveries. (Rejected, 159 to 213.)	Yea.
204do.....	On motion to suspend rules and pass the bill. (Defeated, 134 to 210 (two-thirds vote necessary).)	Yea.	239do.....	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 111 to 261.)	Yea.
205do.....	H. J. Res. 502, continuing until June 30, 1951 the exemption of certain import taxes on copper: On motion to suspend rules and pass resolution. (Passed, 283 to 58 (two-thirds vote necessary).)	Yea.	240do.....	On passage. (Passed, 264 to 108.)	Nay.
206do.....	Quorum call	Present.	241do.....	Conference report on H. R. 6000, extending and revising the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system and amending the public assistance and child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act: On motion to order previous question on motion to recommit. (188 to 186.)	Yea.
207do.....	Quorum call	Present.	242do.....	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 374 to 1.)	Yea.
208do.....	H. R. 10, facilitating the deportation of undesirable aliens from the United States and providing for the supervision and detention pending eventual deportation of aliens whose deportation cannot be readily effectuated because of reasons beyond the control of United States. On passage. (Passed, 326 to 15.)	Yea.	243do.....	H. Res. 716, providing for the consideration of H. R. 6277, giving military discharges to the members of the Russian Railway Service Corps. (Defeated, 91 to 242.)	Nay.
209	July 18	Quorum call	Present.	244	Aug. 17	H. R. 7570, providing for the appointment of 1 additional district judge for the northern district of Ohio: On motion to recommit to committee until such time as any vacancies existing in the northern district of Ohio have been filled. (Defeated, 142 to 146.)	Yea.
210	July 19	S. 3809, extending the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 and authorizing appropriations therefor through the fiscal year 1951. On passage. (Passed, 362 to 1.)	Yea.	245do.....	On passage. (Defeated, 133 to 148.)	Nay.
211	July 20	S. 2822, amending the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and increasing the insurance coverage of individual deposits by the Corporation from \$5,000 to \$10,000 and simplifying the computation of the assessments charged insured banks: On amendment authorizing \$15,000,000 for a site and a new building for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. (Defeated, 90 to 227.)	Nay.	246	Aug. 22	Quorum call	Present.
212do.....	Quorum call	Present.	247do.....do.....	Present.
213	July 24	H. R. 6454, authorizing the appointment of 2 additional district judges for the northern district of Illinois: On motion to recommit to the committee with instructions to reduce from 2 to 1 the number of judges to be provided by the bill. (Defeated, 116 to 163.)	Yea.	248	Aug. 23do.....	Present.
214do.....	On passage. (Passed, 163 to 110.)	Nay.	249do.....	H. R. 8850, creating 2 additional Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture and an Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture: On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 123 to 222.)	Yea.
215do.....	H. R. 6240, authorizing the appointment of a district judge for the northern and southern districts of Indiana: On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to provide that the judgeship created by the bill be temporary. (Defeated, 102 to 171.)	Yea.	250	Aug. 24	H. R. 3775, providing for an additional district judge for the 3d division of the District Court for the District of Alaska. On passage. (Passed, 196 to 147.)	Nay.
216do.....	Quorum call	Present.	251do.....	H. R. 9477, providing allowances for dependents of enlisted members of the uniformed services and suspending certain provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949. On passage. (Passed, 361 to 0.)	Yea.
217	July 25	Quorum call	Present.	252do.....	H. R. 8677, providing for the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal and to reconstitute the agency charged with the civil government of the Canal Zone: On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to amend bill to provide that no tolls shall be levied upon vessels engaged in coastwise trade of the United States. (Defeated, 20 to 330.)	Nay.
218	July 27do.....	Present.	253	Aug. 25	S. 456, authorizing the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of an additional public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia: On motion to recommit to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for further study and investigation. (Defeated, 124 to 226.)	Nay.
219	July 31	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 120 to 179.)	Yea.	254do.....	Quorum call	Present.
220	Aug. 2	Quorum call	Present.	255	Aug. 26	Conference report on H. R. 7786, making appropriation for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951. On passage. (Passed, 311 to 1.)	Yea.
221	Aug. 3do.....	Present.	256	Aug. 28	S. 868, providing for dissemination of technological, scientific, and engineering information to American business and industry. Quorum call	Present.
222	Aug. 4do.....	Present.	257	Aug. 29	S. 3357 to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce. Quorum call	Present.
223	Aug. 7	H. R. 8396, authorizing President to grant financial assistance to States and local governments in major disasters: On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to report bill with an amendment providing for congressional approval of such grants. (Defeated, 25 to 232.)	Nay.	258do.....do.....	Yea.
224do.....	On motion to recommit. (Defeated 145 to 233.)	Yea.	259do.....	H. Res. 826, making in order consideration of H. R. 9490, protecting the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Communist organizations. (Adopted, 357 to 1.)	Yea.
225	Aug. 9	H. R. 7009, making permanent the temporary district judgeship in the eastern and western districts of Missouri. On passage. (Passed, 240 to 133.)	Nay.	260	Aug. 30	H. R. 9490, protecting the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Communist organizations, barring Communists from Government jobs, requiring labeling and identification of Communist propaganda, denying passports to members of the Communist Party and prohibiting contributions by Government officials to Communist-front organizations. On passage. (Passed, 354 to 20.)	Yea.
226do.....	Quorum call	Present.	261do.....	Quorum call	Present.
227	Aug. 10	H. R. 9176, to provide for defense production and economic controls: On Spence amendment providing authority to stabilize prices and wages by either voluntary controls or by establishment of ceilings. (Adopted, 393 to 3.)	Yea.	262do.....	S. 4029, providing for authorizations, through which the Armed Forces can meet the demands for additional personnel in the medical, dental, and allied categories to support the expanding forces without requiring the large scale call to active duty without their consent of Reserve officers who have had substantial periods of service in World War II. On passage. (Passed, 363 to 1.)	Yea.
228do.....	On Wolcott amendment exempting new construction from credit controls. (Adopted, 202 to 188.)	Yea.	263do.....	H. Res. 834, citing Edward A. Rumely for contempt of Congress for failure to furnish certain information to the Committee To Investigate Lobbying Activities. (Adopted, 183 to 175.)	Nay.
229do.....	On Wolcott amendment limiting control of credit to consumer credit and real-estate credit. (Defeated, 173 to 224.)	Yea.	264do.....	H. Res. 835, citing William L. Patterson for contempt of Congress for failure to furnish certain information to the Committee To Investigate Lobbying Activities. (Adopted, 238 to 106.)	Yea.
230do.....	On Cooley amendment deleting from the bill provisions relating to control of commodity speculation. (Adopted 198 to 194.)	Nay.				
231do.....	On passage. (Passed, 383 to 12.)	Yea.				
232do.....	H. Res. 749, citing Julius Emspak for contempt of Congress by reason of failure to answer questions before Committee on Un-American Activities. (Adopted, 372 to 1.)	Yea.				
233do.....	Motion to adjourn. (48 to 274)	Nay.				
234	Aug. 14	H. R. 8195, rescinding the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services: On motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of H. Res. 667, providing for the consideration of H. R. 8195. (Adopted, 248 to 81.)	Nay.				
235do.....						

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan; 81st Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote	Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
264	1950 Aug. 31	Quorum call	Present.		1950	Conference report on H. R. 9526—Continued	
265	do	do	Present.			in an amendment of the Senate cutting off all aid to countries that ship commodities that may be used in manufacture of arms to Russia or its satellites with a House amendment providing that such aid should be cut off upon determination by the National Security Council that such trade is against the best interests of the United States:	
266	do	H. Res. 836, citing Joseph P. Kamp for contempt of Congress for failure to furnish certain information to Committee To Investigate Lobbying Activities. (Adopted, 215 to 115.)	Yea.			On ordering the previous question. (Ordered, 167 to 149.)	Nay.
267	do	Quorum call	Present.	284	Sept. 21	On concurring and adoption of amendment. (Adopted, 286 to 30.)	Yea.
268	do	H. Res. 818, providing for consideration of S. 784, for the relief of the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Co. (Defeated, 139 to 159.)	Nay.	285	do	Quorum call	Present.
269	Sept. 1	Quorum call	Absent.	286	Sept. 22	Conference report on H. R. 8920, increasing individual and corporate income taxes and closing certain loopholes. On adoption of report. (Adopted, 328 to 7.)	Yea.
270	Sept. 13	do	Absent.	287	do	Veto by President of H. R. 9490, protecting the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Communist organizations. On overriding veto. (Overridden, 286 to 48.)	Yea.
271	do	H. Res. 842, providing for sending H. R. 8920, tax-revision bill, to conference:		288	do	Quorum call	Present.
272	Sept. 14	On motion ordering the previous question. (Rejected, 106 to 226.)	Nay.	289	Dec. 5	H. R. 9827, Excess-Profits Tax Act of 1950. On motion to recommit with instructions to increase the average earning credit and to increase the corporate surtax rate by 5 percentage points. On adoption. (Defeated, 145 to 252.)	Yea.
273	do	On Eberharter amendment requiring the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee to report a bill to levy an excess profits tax before the adjournment of the 81st Cong. (Adopted, 331 to 2.)	Yea.	290	do	On passage. (Passed, 378 to 20.)	Yea.
274	do	H. Res. 847, providing for sending H. R. 9490, Communist-registration bill, to conference. (Adopted, 324 to 9.)	Yea.	291	do	H. R. 9763, to extend and amend the Housing and Rent Act:	Yea.
275	do	Veto by President of H. R. 6217, providing out-patient treatment for veterans of the Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, and Philippine Insurrection: On overriding veto. (Overridden, 321 to 12.)	Yea.	292	Dec. 7	On motion to recommit to committee. On adoption. (Defeated, 153 to 223.)	Yea.
276	do	Veto by President of H. J. Res. 238, providing the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence:		293	do	On passage. (Passed, 221 to 152.)	Nay.
277	Sept. 15	On overriding veto. (Overridden, 307 to 14.)	Yea.	294	Dec. 13	Quorum call	Present.
278	do	Quorum call	Present.	295	do	H. R. 9853, to furnish relief policy assistance to Yugoslavia. On motion to recommit with instructions to furnish aid on a loan basis similar to that provided Spain. On adoption. (Defeated, 76 to 173.)	Yea.
279	Sept. 18	H. R. 9646, amending the National Security Act to authorize the President to appoint General of the Army George C. Marshall to the office of Secretary of Defense.	Nay.	296	Dec. 15	On passage. (Passed, 225 to 142.)	Present.
280	do	On passage. (Passed, 220 to 105.)		297	Dec. 20	Quorum call	Present.
281	do	S. 2609, providing a correctional system for youth offenders convicted in the courts of the United States:		298	do	H. R. 9798, to authorize a Federal civil-defense program. On motion to consider:	Yea.
282	Sept. 20	Quorum call	Present.	299	Dec. 21	On adoption. (Adopted 297 to 0.)	Yea.
283	do	Conference report on H. R. 9490, protecting the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Communist organizations. (Adopted, 303 to 20.)	Yea.	300	1951 Jan. 1	On passage. (Passed 247 to 1.)	Present.
284	do	Conference report on H. R. 9526, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1951:		301	do	Quorum call	Present.
285	do	On motion to concur in Senate amendment dispensing with bonds for imported seasonal agriculture labor. (Defeated, 160 to 172.)	Nay.	302	do	S. 3295, to amend the Railway Labor Act relating to union contracts and agreements for deductions from wages of railway employees. On question of consideration. (Agreed, 286 to 48.)	Yea.
286	do	S. 3437, to strengthen the Atomic Energy Act by increasing the salary of the Commissioners and by establishing 3-year term of office for General Manager and amending patent provisions.		303	do	Quorum call	Present.
287	Sept. 21	Quorum call	Present.	304	do	S. 3295 to amend Railway Labor Act. On motion to recommit with instructions.	Nay.
288	do	do	Present.	305	do	On adoption. (Defeated, 61 to 284.)	Yea.
289	do	do		306	Jan. 2	On passage. (Passed, 292 to 52.)	Present.
290	do	do		307	do	Quorum call	Present.
291	do	do				H. R. 5244, for the relief of Charles J. T. Ves. (Conference report.)	
292	do	do				On adoption. (Adopted, 219 to 127.)	Nay.
293	do	do					
294	do	do					
295	do	do					
296	do	do					
297	do	do					
298	do	do					
299	do	do					
300	do	do					
301	do	do					
302	do	do					
303	do	do					
304	do	do					
305	do	do					
306	do	do					
307	do	do					

A Resolution To Designate April 30 of Each Year as Presidents' Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a House joint resolution today which I commend to the attention and consideration of all our colleagues.

My resolution would designate April 30 of each year, the anniversary of the inauguration day of George Washington as first President of the United States, to be known as Presidents' Day. This resolution stems from a suggestion made to me by Mr. David McDonough, of Miami, Fla. He has long been active in community affairs and has a great sense of civic responsibility. This idea of his for the commemoration of our

past Presidents is but one of the many fine civic endeavors on which he has worked.

I am hopeful that this Congress, during this session, will adopt this resolution in order that proper plans may be made throughout our country to officially honor our past President by April 30 of next year.

Understanding Airpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by David S. Smith, Assist-

ant Secretary of the Air Force, before the junior chamber of commerce, Lowell, Mass., on April 27, 1955:

UNDERSTANDING AIRPOWER

I consider it a great privilege to appear before the junior chamber of commerce of such an important city as Lowell, Mass. I am grateful to Mrs. ROGERS, your distinguished Representative in Congress, through whom the invitation was extended. I am grateful to the members of the junior chamber of commerce, who indicated their interest in hearing an Air Force speaker.

I accepted the invitation so cordially extended because of the opportunity it gave me to thank you, and through you Jaycees everywhere, for what they are doing for the Air Force. I accepted it also because it is a personal pleasure for me to get away from the Pentagon, and have a good heart-to-heart talk with people like you. You are the present and future leaders of your community. Many of you, probably most of you, are veterans of military service. All of you are citizens deeply concerned with national security. My job at the Pentagon lies in helping to make sure that our plans are right, and that our security will be maintained. I am happy to have the opportunity

to make a report to you on some of the things we are doing.

First, however, a further word about the junior chamber of commerce and the Air Force. Last January, as you well know, the national organization of the junior chamber of commerce launched its Air Force recruiting assistance campaign. It is a little early to identify the current success of recruiting efforts with any one type of assistance. In fact, it is not even desirable to identify different contributions to the recruiting effort, because we are all working as a team—a national team—and our pride must be in the success of the team, not the performance of individual players. I am sure, however, from the news that reaches my office, that your efforts are combining with various other steps being taken, and are bringing results. More and more young men are signing up for the Air Force, and reenlisting in order to make a career of service in the Air Force, and we are very pleased with the results.

Three months ago, only a little more than 20 percent of the airmen scheduled for separation in February 1955 indicated an intent to reenlist. The Air Force now estimates that this figure has increased to 30 percent for airmen who did reenlist in February or who plan to do so within 90 days from their separation. From 20 to 30 percent is a 50 percent increase. Things are really looking up.

We also believe that as a result of this increased interest in the Air Force, the bonds between the man in uniform and his civilian supporters are being greatly strengthened. The stronger those bonds, the stronger our national security. A few weeks ago the Gallup poll reported that 71 percent of the American people are convinced that if another world war comes, the Air Force would play a much more important part in it than either the Army or the Navy. Analyzed by age groups or by education levels, the percentage is the same. The great popular appeal of the Air Force affects all walks of life. The American sense of reliance on air power is strong.

I am not sure, however, that American understanding of airpower is commensurate with American appreciation of the traditions and the performance of the Air Force.

We are, we say, an airminded Nation. So rapid have been the developments in this half-century which we call the air age, and so conclusive are the lessons of history, that airpower is now generally accepted as the predominant military force. But we are tired of war. Recurrently through the last 15 years homes throughout the Nation have been saddened by the loss of loved ones. We are reluctant to face the fact that preparedness must be for a lifetime, and not merely for a foreseeable, limited period. We have not, as a nation, given evidence that we accept the security of our Nation as everybody's business, and not the exclusive responsibility of the man in uniform. We gripe—to use the GI term—because, 10 years after V-E and V-J Days, we still face the sacrifices necessary to maintain a huge Military Establishment.

This griping may well be a habit of democracy, but not all habits are good habits. The thought that preparedness can be seasonal is certainly a mistaken idea. William Jennings Bryan expressed a national attitude when he said that in times of national peril, a million men would spring to arms. And millions of men did spring to arms to defend the Nation in two world wars. However, millions of men have been reluctant to remain in arms, when the victory was won, to make sure that the peace was well guarded.

I am sure that all of you can recall the frantic effort to demobilize, after World War II. The sad truth is, that when the peace was won, no nation's people were ever

quicker to lose interest in their armed forces than the people of the United States.

For this reason, the history of our armed services in America has been one of high peaks of military strength, followed by almost bottomless valleys of weakness. And the wonder is that we were able to rise from the valleys to reach the peaks.

We might ask what course history would have taken, if we had never permitted ourselves to descend into the valleys. If we had been strong in 1916, would Germany have sunk the *Lusitania*? If we had been strong in 1941, would the Japanese have dared to attack Pearl Harbor? If we had been strong in 1950, would the Communists have struck in Korea?

It may be academic to ask the questions, because there can be no definite answers. But it is necessary for us to realize that while our Nation has sprung to arms in the interest of national defense many, many times in the past, it is no longer possible to wait for war to begin, in order to start building national defense. Modern warfare begins too suddenly and strikes with too much devastation—witness Pearl Harbor—to permit delayed mobilization. We must be ready when war starts—if it should start again.

Quite aside from the fact that this is so because our survival as a nation depends upon it, we should be willing to admit that it is so because it is enormously expensive and wasteful—wasteful of human lives, money, material resources, and opportunities for the development of mankind—not to maintain preparedness. It is amazing that in the past we have seemed willing to pay so high a price for the privilege of ignoring danger until it was upon us.

What we now need to understand above everything else is that the price is higher, beyond estimate. Nuclear weapons, combined with the capabilities of long-range air in a period of lessened guard and depleted power, have revolutionized warfare. And we hold no monopoly on such weapons.

We hold no monopoly—neither the practical monopoly in long-range bombers nor the absolute monopoly we once possessed in nuclear weapons—because there can be no monopoly in science. Our pilots who first encountered the Soviet-built MIG-15, in November 1950, were surprised to discover what a formidable weapon the Communists had. Before the war was over we learned a great deal about the general excellence of Soviet technology. We have developed a healthy respect for Soviet industrial capacity.

We know now that the Soviet Union has made remarkable progress in the building of nuclear weapons and modern long-range bombers. It is this progress that has put us in what President Eisenhower has forthrightly called an age of peril. Communist exploitation of the potentiality of their weapons makes it an age of tension as well.

In addition to the world's largest air force, containing some 20,000 aircraft in combat units, the Soviet Union has a huge ground force, a powerful submarine force, guided missiles, and a large industrial capacity, most of which is devoted to the production of war goods. As early as 1949 her industry was able to produce an atomic explosion, and in 1953 she announced to the world that she possessed the hydrogen bomb. Thus on the one hand, our national security program must be designed to meet the most serious of all threats to the survival of western civilization—the combination of Soviet long-range airpower and atomic weapons. On the other hand, it must also be designed to cope with the constant possibility of local warfare such engagements as the free world has experienced in Korea, in Indochina, and is now experiencing in the Formosa Strait.

The leaders of communism have repeatedly made it clear that their goal is communism worldwide. The United States is a principal obstacle which confronts them in their path to this goal, and the support you give your Air Force enables it to remain that obstacle. I said remain, not maintain. I do not mean maintain for a limited period, but maintain indefinitely. The United States is and must remain a roadblock to international communism. The understanding our air-minded Nation has not yet fully acquired is that if there is a new kind of war, there is also a new kind of peace. This is a peace that can be kept only through strength.

It is not enough for our Nation to be air-minded. It must possess air superiority. It must control the airways, and be prepared to defend them against all who would use them to violate our freedom and our democracy.

To give the Nation the strength necessary to maintain peace as the most precious gift of our times, and to resist and conquer aggression if it comes, the United States has established its Air Force, and assigned it certain definite missions. The development of nuclear weapons and of guided missiles carrying atomic warheads, which has come in the 8 years since the Air Force was established, has not altered these missions. What such development has done is to place greater responsibility on the Air Force for the successful carrying out of its missions. These missions are the conduct of strategic air warfare, the defeat of enemy air forces, combat support of the Army, support of the Navy in keeping the sea lanes open and the air defense of the United States directly related to Air Force offensive capabilities.

To perform its missions in this age of crisis, the Air Force is continuing today, and will continue for the next several years, the build up of air strength which was programmed in 1950, after the Korean war caught military resources. When the Korean war began the Air Force consisted of about 42 effective wings and about 400,000 men in uniform. Today we have 121 wings, ready and effective, and about 960,000 men in uniform. By the end of June 1957, we expect to have reached our 137-wing goal, and 975,000 men in uniform. All Air Force wings are now equipped with modern aircraft, and all fighters are jet propelled.

Constant progress is being made in modernization of aircraft. New types are replacing outmoded types.

Technological advances in propulsion and electronics are making substantial contributions to the development of guided missiles. The Air Force has made significant progress in the development of strategic, tactical, and air defense missiles, all of which are being pushed vigorously.

Construction of the base facilities needed to support the 137-wing program is a most serious problem. Our offensive forces must be able to hit any potential enemy on short notice under all conditions. Our long range aircraft can operate from the United States in the event of war, and advanced refueling techniques have greatly lengthened ranges of smaller combat aircraft. However, the existence of bases overseas, equipped to handle all types of aircraft, greatly increases the flexibility, economy of operation, and hence the effectiveness of our offensive air forces. Overseas bases also increase the capability of tactical air forces to operate in overseas theaters.

Our air defense forces require bases located so that our interceptors can reach attacking enemy aircraft before they reach the line where they would drop their bombs on American cities. Radar facilities are needed to detect the approach of enemy aircraft, and communications and navigation

facilities are needed to direct the defenders to intercept them. It is not sufficient to have such facilities within the United States. We must have them in Canada, Alaska, and the Arctic.

Bases within the United States are needed for training our tactical forces, for providing logistic services, and to maintain a strategic reserve which can be sent to any theater of operation in need. I have just returned from an inspection of several bases. I can tell you that I was proud of what I saw.

Maintenance facilities must be increased to keep up with the increased complexity of modern aircraft and equipment. With the greater consumption of fuel by jet aircraft, increased fuel storage facilities are required.

In the past 4 years the Air Force has gone a long way toward building the base structure needed to support its modernized and expanded forces. Continued modernization of base facilities is required to provide base support for the programed increase to 137 wings.

All this costs money, lots of money. Whether or not we understand fully the continuing need for maintaining strength in order to guarantee peace, the American people have certainly been generous in supporting the build-up of the Air Force under the present program. In 1954 and 1955, the Air Force budget, requested by the President and approved by Congress, was for about \$11.5 billion. For fiscal year 1956, beginning next June, the President has requested \$14.53 billion, excluding appropriations for base construction. Our President, and his administration, have recognized the real nature of the continuing threat to national security, and the most effective way of countering it.

A great deal of the money appropriated for the Air Force will go in pay to personnel—and toward increasing the attractiveness of a service career in order to attract and retain qualified personnel. I said at the beginning of my remarks that we have been concerned about our reenlistment rate, and that it is improving. Now I want to backtrack on one score. Whereas the reenlistment rate in general has been about 20 percent, among the men we need the most—the trained, skilled, and experienced technicians—the rate has been even lower, below 15 percent. We are also losing veteran pilots and experienced staff officers. We are losing trained mechanics, radar men and technicians. So the shortage of trained, experienced personnel is the No. 1 problem within the Air Force.

The Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Harold Talbott, has taken the keenest personal interest in accomplishing those things which will increase the attractiveness of a service career, and encourage men to reenlist, and remain in service. We are all grateful for the fact that Congress recently approved a substantial pay raise, earnestly advocated by Mr. Talbott, and is now considering other legislation designed to improve service attractiveness. One such measure is adequate family housing of proper standards and within the proper rental brackets for men in the Air Force. Considering what it costs to train a man, approximately \$14,000 for an airman, and more than \$200,000 for a triple-rated pilot of an atom bomber, his pay could be increased by many, many dollars before it would equal the cost of losing him. We could increase service attractiveness in many ways, and still not make the rewards of a military career comparable financially with those offered by civilian industry to these trained men.

Earlier, I also spoke of the bonds between the men in uniform and the citizens at home, that are being strengthened. These bonds are numerous and of many kinds, and I shall

not attempt to identify them all or to define them. They are bonds of interest, affection, and sympathy, of gratitude and honor. But the most important bond of all is that which I have stressed, the bond of understanding. If the people of Lowell and of each community in this Nation develop a real understanding of our Air Force, of its responsibilities and its needs, your community will send more men into the ranks of the Air Force. It will also stand ready to support the Air Force in every necessary way in its supreme mission of preventing war, and securing peace under acceptable conditions.

When this understanding of airpower and of the role of our Air Force in maintaining it is widely and thoroughly understood, the youth of our land will turn naturally to the air, as the youth of England in the days of her greatest glory turned naturally to the sea, as the proper sphere for their noblest careers. When that happens, we will indeed have become an air-minded Nation.

I think that understanding is coming, and coming very rapidly. People like you, throughout the land, are helping to bring it about, and the evidences are unmistakable. I feel confident, therefore, that our Air Force will be able to carry out the missions for which it was created. I feel confident that our national security will not be violated, and that we will be able to enjoy those rights we consider inalienable—those rights which were won for us, and must constantly be rewon by sacrifice.

H. R. 5210 and H. R. 5211

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following statements on H. R. 5210 and H. R. 5211:

H. R. 5210 is a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to promote diversified ownership of domestic corporations by encouraging small investors to buy stock and reinvest their dividends.

It is hoped that the passage of this bill will result in direct ownership of American industry by Americans. When the people of the Nation own the corporations, it will be impossible to socialize the country.

Through this bill millions of capitalists will be created. For example, the employees of American Telephone & Telegraph Co. or other corporations would not only buy shares of their companies out of current income but would increase their ownership through the reinvestment of their dividends and yet would have the privilege of deferring taxes on those dividends for at least 10 years or until the shares disposed of, such as the provision which now prevails in the series E savings bonds.

The masses are customers of many of the American corporations. They should also be the owners. They can do this by purchasing shares directly or through an investment company. The investment companies and the New York Stock Exchange have automatic purchase plans whereby individuals can, out of current income, buy into American industry, and many corporations have the same provision for the purchase of their own shares by employees.

In connection with the use of common stocks in a long-term investment program, a research firm prepared a computation which will easily convince the most confirmed skeptic. These figures cover a 30-year period and assume that the investor will start with a salary of \$3,500 and gradually increase until at the end of the 30-year period he was receiving \$7,500, with the indicated changes over the period:

Years:	Salary
1-5	\$3,500
6-10	4,500
11-15	5,500
16-20	6,500
21-30	7,500

The figures assume that the investor put 10 percent of his yearly salary aside and these amounts were invested quarterly in common stocks in over seven different 30-year periods and the dividends were reinvested. The averages of industrial common stocks were used in making these computations so that no assumption of better than average is involved.

Period:	Value at end of period
1858-88	\$97,545
1868-98	61,070
1878-1908	65,515
1888-1918	70,400
1898-1928	107,585
1908-38	50,010
1918-48	52,860

Average..... 72,140

These remarkable results were achieved with a total investment of only \$17,500. In the worst period, 1908-38, the fund at the end was worth a little less than \$3 for every dollar put in and on the average it was worth about \$4 for every dollar put in.

These results would certainly indicate that passage of the bill H. R. 5210 is a step in the direction of individual security for the individual to supplement his social security and pension plan. It is hoped that through this bill the 63 million working people of the Nation will own the business corporations and reverse the present trend—with 6 million to 10 million who now own these corporations.

H. R. 5211 is a bill to exempt from Federal income-tax dividends paid by regulated investment companies whose income is derived entirely from tax-exempt Government obligations.

Because of the Federal tax program of the last decade the number of wealthy individuals who normally would absorb a large amount of tax-exempt obligations has been greatly reduced. Therefore, to finance the \$7 billion school program it will be necessary to get the masses to purchase such bonds. The investment companies have proved that their method of operation is the best yet discovered for reaching the masses—hence the provisions of this bill.

To sell \$7 billion in school bonds, in addition to the normal amount of Government obligations, plus the expanded financing of toll roads will not be easy unless we reach the masses.

It is hoped that the various State regulatory authorities will declare as legal investments the shares of investment companies whose assets are invested in tax-exempt Government obligations and that the Congress will amend the proper bills to permit national banks to deal in the shares of the tax-exempt investment companies to the same extent that they deal in tax-free Government obligations.

From the standpoint of the small investor this is an ideal way to build an estate. For

example, an individual could systematically invest a specified amount—say, for example, \$100 a month—in the shares of one of these investment companies and compound his earnings. When millions of Americans, through ownership of shares in a tax-exempt investment company own the obligations of the school districts and other Government agencies it is only natural to expect that they will take a greater interest in the operations of these agencies and will be more concerned as to the efficiency of those operations.

This bill (H. R. 5211) might very well go a long way toward revolutionizing the financing of municipalities because instead of having a few hundred dealers specializing in municipal bonds there would be more than 10,000 salesmen discussing these obligations with investors.

Senator George: Quarterback for the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, Senator WALTER GEORGE has been doing a remarkable job in recent weeks as a quarterback on foreign affairs. From crisis to crisis he has been out ahead of the Secretary of State, and the President, and the country is the better for it. Last Saturday night he delivered an address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, and again he seems to have influenced a change of policy by the administration. Those who heard this speech called it an "extraordinary address," and it deserves a wide audience. I present herewith a partial text of these impromptu remarks:

Jimmie Pope and ladies and gentlemen of this distinguished audience, now, I suppose you want me to talk to you a little bit about foreign affairs.

From the beginning, of course, we have had relations with other peoples, but prior to World War I, to the great masses of the American people, our foreign relations were hardly known.

These relations and the relations growing out of them occupied the attention of the President, the Secretary of State, and a small group of men in the United States Senate, and intellectuals—men and women throughout the Union.

Even after the outbreak of World War II we said: "Aren't we separated from all that clash and all that confusion by 3,000 miles of ocean and do we not live under other political institutions, and are we not dominated by other social and economical ideas?"

MARKETS DECLINED

Well, we very soon found the answer. The ranchers and cotton growers and manufacturers soon found their markets declining and all but disappearing. And in every accounting and banking house in this Nation, business, temporarily at least, came almost to a standstill. For the first time, Americans in all walks of life began to realize that every important public act committed on the other side of the globe directly affected

the welfare and well being of the American people.

At that time and prior to that time and from the beginning, we had the policy of what you and I know as strictly isolationism. We were protected by two great oceans. The British Navy was the unquestioned mistress of the seas, and behind that navy and those two oceans, we enjoyed an immunity seldom found to a young and struggling people, for a long, long time.

World War I came and ended, but we did not reserve the power unity which enabled us to win that war. It fell apart. We were conscious, of course, of how slightly our interests were affected by international affairs, but the unity which enabled us to win that war fell apart.

At the end of the Second World War, the power unity was again dissolved and almost completely dissolved because the American people, true to their traditions, true to their innermost longings, wanted to get back home and wanted to get the boys back home and wanted to settle back into a normal life.

That war, of course, was marked by certain mistakes. All wars are, in point of policy or strategy, and we made some mistakes.

CREATED VACUUMS

I think it may now be said, since the Yalta papers have been published, that we made a great mistake in insisting upon the complete destruction of the great producing nation in Europe—Germany.

Then, after Japan came in and before the end of the war, we again insisted upon the complete, utter destruction of that great producing nation, upon the destruction of the two greatest producers in the world, outside of ourselves, unmindful of the fact that at the moment we were creating economic and political vacuums.

We were right, I think, in insisting upon the utter destruction of Hitler militarism as it had been developed in Germany and as it had lived in Japan.

At any rate we did, and at any rate, these two great powers were destroyed. We made a peace treaty with Japan and Japan is now slowly coming back. We made but recently a treaty with West Germany under which sovereignty is restored to West Germany. But more than that, she is entitled to come into NATO and under which she will come into NATO on May 5, according to present schedules.

Both Germany and Japan are moving back industrially, and commercially, especially West Germany, and you can't understand, I do not believe any of us can understand, what is going on in Europe and what has gone on there for several months, without a realization of what Germany's return to the sisterhood of states in that area of the world means.

SEES SOVIET RETREAT

Many of the actions taken by our Soviet friends undoubtedly are predicated upon the return of Germany, of the entry of Germany into NATO, upon the rearming under restrictions, of West Germany.

The coming back of West Germany, not immediately, but ultimately, will mean the organization of all Western Europe and the retreat of the Soviets back to their ancient boundaries with possibly the exception of one satellite which cannot be defended by Western Europe. Ultimately and at no great distant date, with the return of Japan, there will commence again the age-old struggle for Northern Korea and the rich area of Manchuria, and that struggle will be between what we now call the Chinese People's Republic and Japan.

Moscow is 6,000 miles away from that battlefield, and that battleground, and so

two great significant facts have come to pass. They are: The peace treaty with Japan and her entry into world affairs; the peace treaty with Western Germany and her entry again into world affairs.

These are two important facts. I believe Justice Holmes once said that a single page of human history is better than a whole volume of logic. Here are your pages.

Many men and women in this audience tonight will see the day when our Russian friends will go back to their ancient borders and boundaries and when again there will be reestablished a power group in the Far East that will give some stability to that area.

STABILITY IN FAR EAST

Although you may disagree with me, I would be less than frank if I did not say to you that in my considered judgment, whatever it is worth, the great hope for stability in the Far East is somehow, sometime the revival, and I will not say consolidation, but I will say the solidification of the efforts of Japan and India, the most populous countries outside of the Chinese People's Republic, in all of Asia.

I know that you would say that oil and water can't mix, and sometimes we are all a bit worried with Mr. Nehru. Sometimes he is a bit trying and he takes some funny courses and yet he stands very definitely for something in the Far East. And when there is a great commercial power, which again can live and thrive in Japan, reaching out for markets, both for her fabricated goods, and particularly for her new raw materials, there will begin to be order in the Far East.

I am not speaking to you about tomorrow or the day after tomorrow. I am simply saying to you what, in the course of human events must be the pattern which we will see for the development again, both in Western Europe and in the Far East.

We made the supreme mistake, perhaps, at the end of World War II, in assuming that because we had fought side by side with our Russian friends to win that war and because we had come to know them, that they must be, on the whole, people with aims and purposes and aspirations much or very similar to our very own.

AUSTRIAN TREATY RUSHED

Perhaps we were not justified in reaching that easy conclusion, but we did reach it. We acted upon it, and that is past history. There is no need to discuss it here.

We, of course, know that Russia is still actuated with the old Russian imperialism, plus the communistic ideologies of the 1917 revolution. Capitalism or the capitalistic system could, of course, not be tolerated inside the Russian state or empire, and capitalism and the capitalistic system, could not be tolerated outside because it is the way of Communist expansion.

Now, what is the state of the world tonight? Some most interesting things have been going on.

In Austria, a treaty has now been hurried to a conclusion and the four powers are invited to witness this ratification, and its signing.

A study of Russian tactics ought to show us that it can mean but one thing and that is that Russia is tremendously concerned with the rearming of West Germany and with Germany taking her place in the NATO group.

A little while ago we were very much disturbed because the Colombo group had called a conference down in Indonesia. Now the nervousness in Washington and in some high places in Washington stemmed from the belief that we would have no friends in that conference and that resolutions would come out of that conference solid-

ying the yellow and black races against the white man everywhere. So there was nervousness here.

STATEMENT BY CHOU

Then we began to speak in more optimistic language about that conference and only last Saturday, I was rash enough, perhaps unwisely, to say that I thought the heads of state should have something to say about that conference, that at least we should have an understanding of what that conference meant and what its real objective was and that I believed there would be some friends of the Western Powers there.

You have heard the speeches that were made within the past week. You have noted the utterances they have made, and while perhaps those speeches do not represent the rank and file of the Asiatic states represented there, they nevertheless do represent the thinking of some of the leaders of those Asiatic states. And then, just last night and this morning you read that Chou En-lai had said he had no purpose to go to war with the people of the United States; that he was not planning such a war, and indicated that he was willing to sit down and talk with us.

Now I have been thinking, for many weeks and even many months, that after a period of great wars, and particularly of great revolutions, fairly shaking the foundations of the old civilizations, a people into whose hands leadership has been thrust, or to which leadership had come, must be able to make some adjustments to meet the changing conditions of the world.

WOULD CONFER WITH FRIENDS

You may recall that not too long ago I said that I believed the time was rapidly approaching when the heads of government of the four great powers could sit down and talk about the problems of Europe and the tensions in Europe; the tensions, indeed, which shadow all civilization.

Day-by-day the conviction that grows—at least to my way of thinking—is that we should have a conference first with our friends, with those nations who have been uniformly friendly to us, and with those nations in the southeast of Asia who are our friends.

Why? Because I think it important that we know precisely their thinking on the important problems that have arisen in the Far East and precisely what readjustments, if any, we should be willing to make to meet changing times and changing conditions.

That is not appeasement. It never has been and never will be appeasement for any strong power to say to another power that it is willing to sit down and talk about the problems that concern you and concern the world.

I do not know and I doubt if anyone can know what degree of sincerity is in the mind and heart of Chou En-lai, but I do think the things that he saw and witnessed down in Indonesia since the last Sabbath have opened his mind and when he says that he is willing to talk, then I will unhesitatingly say that this Nation should be big enough and great enough, through its highest officials, to talk to him.

It is time that we were relieving the tensions of this world, if we can. We should know what our friends think and say, what position they have, in what conclusions they concur in about the trouble spot in the Far East. We should not be unmindful of the concurring judgment and opinion of our friends. Indeed, I do not think that any nation can be unmindful of the opinion and judgment of its friends.

I am not talking about what the President should do or should not do with reference to

his position now or hereafter, in the Formosa area.

From the beginning I have said and taken one position, and I believe it is right. I still believe it is right, and that position is that this decision is with the President himself.

In that conviction I have not wavered and will not waver; but I have also expressed the belief, and I believe it profoundly, that when and if a fateful decision must be made by the President as to whether or not he will defend any island or islands in the area of Formosa, that he will get all the information that he can from his joint chiefs, from his military leaders, from every agency of information that is available to him, and if I do not mistake the man, he will then go into his closet and face-to-face with his Maker, he will make his own decision.

I say now that out of a world conference, there can come good, that a conference with our friends will be helpful to us, and that we ought to be willing to talk with the Chinese Peoples' Republic or their leaders. We owe this to our own country, to our friends, and to all mankind everywhere. Out of that conference might come, not a final solution, but a first step which could lead to a second and third step toward the solution of some of the problems of our present time.

WOULDN'T DENY AID

I know very well that there are many good friends of the United States who believe that the time has come when we should give more attention to our home affairs and when such aid and assistance as we might give to other countries should be very definitely marked in behalf of the essential American interests which we are seeking to serve.

With that general thought, no American can quarrel, but I say to you tonight, and I hope that you editors and managing editors will bear it in mind, that this is no time to do either of two things, or both. This is no time to say that there will be no further aid or assistance given to those people of the world that are struggling to make themselves strong.

I change my mind as I go along, frequently. I am glad I do because it is probably the only proof that I have that I am in existence. I have changed my mind about economic aid because undoubtedly tonight in many wide areas of this earth, especially in the Asiatic and African countries, economic aid, point 4 if you please, technical assistance if you wish to be more technical in describing it, is a far greater military aid to people who love peace and who don't want a war. This is no time to turn away from our international obligations; whatever those obligations are. It is no time for us, in the present state of the world, to grow soft in our own ability to carry out and execute those programs that we regard as vital.

STRENGTH IN BEING

No foreign policy will receive any respect unless the people who put it forth have the strength and the will to carry it to execution. In an atomic age, that means strength in being, because the nuclear weapons of this modern age threaten to destroy the productive capacity of the people on which great reliance could have been placed. You must have something ready and presently at hand.

So this is not the time for us to turn back in our efforts to continue militarily strong, nor is it the time for us to lose interest in the economic soundness and strength of the whole free world.

How can the free world be strong, militarily and economically unless through the

cooperative efforts of all free peoples, ourselves included?

How can we turn the clock to another day and say that the trade and commerce of the world, especially the free world, again should be circumvented and departmentalized to the point almost of the stagnation of that commerce? How can we do this and yet hope all free nations will become economically strong and prosperous?

DIDN'T SEEK LEADERSHIP

Upon their prosperity and strength will depend their ability to maintain their own military equipment, their own military strength.

We didn't seek world leadership. You don't get it by seeking it. World leadership comes to a nation if it comes at all, because of the superb and supreme heroism of its people; because of their devotion to duty, private, and public, because of their tireless exertions to bring it about.

Above everything else, it comes to a nation when it is great enough and big enough and strong enough, when mighty impulses are running through the world, to rise to the challenge of stirring times.

So it came to us. Would we pass it up? Can we pass it up? Future generations would hold us responsible and rightly responsible for failure to grasp the high responsibilities resting upon us.

The road which we are traveling may be long and hard and thorny. Indeed, it is hard and long and thorny, but it is worthwhile, my friends, to travel along that highway that can lead us, and will lead us, if we keep our courage and our faith, to a world in which the normal things of mankind and of human life again may be enjoyed and appreciated.

Loyalty Day, May 1, 1955, Has Been Officially Designated by Congress and Proclaimed by President Eisenhower as an Occasion for Rededicating Our Love and Devotion to the American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to note that the President on April 27 approved House Joint Resolution 184 to designate May 1, 1955, as Loyalty Day and has issued a proclamation accordingly.

I had the privilege of introducing House Joint Resolution 184 in the House of Representatives and my good friend, Senator PRICE DANIEL of Texas, sponsored the measure in the Senate. This is the successful culmination of several years of effort to designate a special day when the American people will be given special opportunities to reaffirm and rededicate their loyalties to the ideals and institutions of our American way of life. We know and recognize that every day is and should be Loyalty Day, but in designating May 1, 1955, as the Loyalty Day,

we are attempting to publicize and highlight at least one day on which the American people may give special emphasis and loyalty to our Government and its institutions.

The idea of designating May 1 as Loyalty Day originated among veterans on the Atlantic seaboard, who were disturbed by the traditional May Day rallies and parades of the Communists. These veterans decided that the best way to discourage and draw attention away from the Communist rallies and parades, was to organize a demonstration and parade emphasizing loyalty and support of the United States and the American way of life. The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, an organization of which I am proud to be a member and past commander in chief, has acted as sparkplug in organizing Loyalty Day rallies and parades over the years, until Loyalty Day observances around the first of each May have become the outstanding events in many cities in the United States. It was at the request of the VFW that Senator PRICE DANIEL and I sponsored legislation to designate May 1 as Loyalty Day.

I want to express appreciation to the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and the House; to the Senate and House leadership and to the membership of both bodies for their splendid cooperation in making it possible for the Loyalty Day bill to become law. I am grateful to all those who have assisted in the course of this legislation through the Congress.

On April 25, 1955, following approval of the Loyalty Day bill by the Senate and prior to the Presidential approval, the Hearst press, in an editorial printed in all of their papers, commented on Loyalty Day in the following manner:

The designation of Loyalty Day as a special observance, to be held annually on the 1st day of May, reflects the awareness of Congress of the great value of commemorative occasions expressing the patriotic enthusiasm of the American people.

There was a time between the two great wars when many of the American people were inclined to be somewhat timid about showing enthusiasm for their country.

When the enemies of America scoffed at all display of patriotism as flag-waving, the timid people let themselves be persuaded to look the other way when the beautiful flag of the United States went by, and to be silent when the stirring national anthem was sung, and to make a great show of tolerance when American traditions and history were disparaged and besmirched.

Loyalty and love for America were derided by our enemies as forms of narrow nationalism, and while very few Americans believed this, too many of them let themselves be intimidated and looked around to see if anybody was looking before they displayed their emotions about the country, its flag, or the inspiration of its institutions.

But then the second of the two great wars came along, and millions of young Americans offered their lives in the fullest expression of loyalty and love, and thousands of them made the supreme sacrifice of life itself.

Since then there has been no timidity about patriotic enthusiasm in America, and

our people are proud to express the sentiments that fill their hearts.

Loyalty Day is in keeping with the glad hearts of our people that sing and shout loyalty and love and pride, and it is good to have a special day dedicated to the patriotic ideals which dignify every day of our lives.

In addition to the Hearst editorial praising Loyalty Day, some of the great radio and TV networks are also extending an accolade to the purpose and intention of Loyalty Day. For example, on Monday evening, May 2, from 8 to 9:30 o'clock, the NBC-TV network will have a showing of the spectacular *Darkness at Noon* in color as well as in black and white. This special program, which deals with the issue of loyalty versus subversion, is an NBC contribution to the Loyalty Day theme. Commenting on the NBC-TV show *Darkness at Noon*, VFW Commander in Chief Merton B. Tice had this to say:

As commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, it is tremendously gratifying to me to learn that the National Broadcasting Co. is planning to stage the great dramatic Broadway hit, *Darkness at Noon*, before the television cameras. This is one of the great plays to be done on the subject of anti-communism. When it was premiered on Broadway in 1951, the critics labeled it a "dramatic thunderbolt," and today we of the Veterans of Foreign Wars sincerely believe that the presentation of *Darkness at Noon* on television will be a potent force in the field of Americanism. We also feel that it will be a dramatic climax to the hundreds of VFW Loyalty Day celebrations that will take place April 30 and May 1.

National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present to you a brilliant report made by the Honorable JOHN L. McCLELLAN, United States Senator from Arkansas, national director and outgoing president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. I commend this report to the reading of all of the Members of Congress and to the people generally who receive copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD throughout the United States:

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT, SENATOR JOHN L. McCLELLAN, OF ARKANSAS, NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, MAY 26, 1954

Officers and directors of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, delegates to its 41st national convention, and honored guests, I am happy that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress can now resume its annual convention sessions which were halted 4 years ago by a defense emergency, and I am especially pleased that so many delegates from all sections of the country are in attendance here today as I give to you this report of activities of the congress since last we met.

You will recall that the fighting started in Korea 3 months to the day after our 40th session in May 1950 and thereafter all public-works construction except that of a defense nature was banned. In the light of this situation, our directors suspended the annual conventions until the emergency should be past.

In the spring of 1951, however, our officers and directors met together here in Washington, and invited a few leaders in our field to join us in discussions of policy and formulation of a plan of action to take while the Korean fighting went on. It was decided to continue the suspension of congress meetings, and the project hearings, until such time as they might be expected to have more direct and profitable result.

Meanwhile, the national officers, not desiring to lose, during a sustained period of inactivity, the impetus gained from 40 years of progress, conceived the idea of holding regional meetings where rivers and harbors, flood control, and other water-resource projects pertaining to the particular area might be reexamined and, if so decided, kept in an active status.

Three such meetings were convened, and each was well attended and achieved some beneficial results. The New England States held an area meeting at Taunton, Mass., in May 1952; the Florida Waterways Congress was host to a regional meeting at Orlando in December 1952; and a statewide conference for the State of Illinois was held at Springfield in September 1953.

Out of these meetings came sound advice at the State and local level as to which projects might be laid aside, and which others might be retained and advocated at a later time.

Now we are met here in the 41st national convention of this body to consider many important matters concerned with the general subject of water resources, and to formulate our policies thereon. Much of the agenda was outlined in the call for this meeting sent out in March of this year. The subject set forth included: The urgent need for enactment of an omnibus flood-control and rivers-harbors authorization bill; the long-neglected maintenance of important rivers and harbors channels; the rapidly deteriorating merchant marine; the advisability of a sound program of public works to help absorb any slack in employment by reason of economic readjustments; and, despite the truce in Korea, recognition of the continued need for major expenditures in expanding and maintaining a strong national defense.

You have heard brilliant expositions of these topics yesterday by an impressive panel of speakers. Others are to follow, after which our projects committee will report its findings and recommendations as to the vast number of specific projects which were submitted and argued before it. Matters of general policy decisions will be laid before you in the resolutions committee's report.

Leading the list of officials who appeared before this congress was the President of the United States. It is difficult to find exact words to express our appreciation for the interest that Mr. Eisenhower has shown in this program of conservation and development of the Nation's water resources.

This interest was first made manifest officially in the message to Congress on the state of the Union February 2, 1953, shortly after Eisenhower's inauguration, in which he called for a strong Federal program in the field of resource development. "Its major projects should be timed," he declared, "wherever possible to assist in leveling off peaks and valleys in our economic life. Soundly planned projects already ini-

tiated should be carried out. New ones will be planned for the future."

He urged that this program should not rest entirely on the shoulders of Federal bureaucracy, but rather should bring into partnership the States and local communities and private citizens, all working together. "This combined effort," he said, "will advance the development of the great river valleys of our Nation and the power that they can generate."

Reiterating the theme of partnership and joint responsibility in his state of the Union message in January this year, Mr. Eisenhower declared that the next fiscal year will see work started on 23 new projects which have met the Federal Government's requirements of economic soundness. Stating these would be built "with local sharing of cost wherever appropriate and feasible," he added: "The Federal Government will continue to construct and operate economically sound flood-control, power, irrigation, and water-supply projects wherever these projects are beyond the capacity of local initiative, public or private, and consistent with the needs of the whole Nation."

This message also recommended enactment of legislation to strengthen agricultural conservation and upstream flood-prevention work, and to achieve a better balance with major flood-control structures in the downstream areas. It promised recommendations for the adoption of "a uniform and consistent water-resources policy."

In transmitting his economic report to Congress in January, President Eisenhower wrote that "our approach to a position of military preparedness now makes it possible for the United States to turn more of its attention to a sustained improvement of national living standards."

Pointing out that the backlog of desirable Federal, State, and local public works is counted in tens of billions of dollars, he emphasized that such programs should be so designed and executed as to contribute to economic stability, by being accelerated in slack times and restrained in boom times.

The report promised that effort will be devoted during the present year to "the large task of evolving truly integrated long-term programs of major Federal works in the fields of water and soil conservation."

With regard to the advance planning of public works, our own national vice president, Congressman OVERTON BROOKS, of Louisiana, has introduced a bill in Congress which would require the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Public Roads to report to Congress comparative figures on public works money for the year 1935 to 1941, and from 1945 to 1953.

The bill states that a massive public works program conceived to make war on a future depression would require years of planning to prevent loss of millions of dollars through the necessity for urgency and emergency action, in many cases authorizing public works which cannot be economically justified.

Great further encouragement in our aims is provided by the President's message submitted to Congress with the budget for fiscal year 1955. Here he speaks of budget provisions for helping to prevent the ravages of floods and soil erosion as one of the "constructive domestic purposes designed to strengthen the foundations of a stable and prosperous economy." Further, under the subject of tax proposals, it is recommended that deductions up to 25 percent of the farmer's gross income be allowed for soil conservation expenses on farms.

Under new legislative proposals, it is recommended that the sum of \$3 million be

authorized for cooperation with State and local agencies on watershed protection; and \$10 million for aid for non-Federal development of water resources, with an added \$400,000 for Federal projects.

The sum of \$580 million is recommended to be obligated for civil functions of the Defense Department; in other words, for construction work of the Corps of Engineers. Net budget expenditures of slightly over \$1 billion are estimated for 1955 in the category of "natural resources."

Here again it is pointed out that "a strong program of resource conservation and development is necessary to support the progressively expanding demands of our increasing population and to contribute to the economic growth and security of the Nation."

Budget recommendations provide for the continuation of river basin work now underway. Less urgent features of the projects, not required for operation of going or completed units, will be deferred. Budget expenditures of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers include an estimated \$443 million in fiscal 1955 to carry on construction of about 160 river basin development projects. A substantial amount of these expenditures is for multipurpose development for irrigation, flood control, navigation, and hydroelectric power. During the year, 20 projects will be completed or substantially completed, including 9 flood control projects, 5 irrigation projects, and 6 multipurpose projects with power facilities.

The budget further recommends starting work on 6 irrigation and water supply projects, 8 local flood prevention projects, and 8 navigation projects. In addition, it provides for resumption of work on 2 flood control reservoirs and 2 river and harbor improvements. This work is estimated to cost a total of \$184 million, with expenditures of \$20 million scheduled for the fiscal year 1955. Together with the St. Lawrence Seaway, this totals 23 new projects and 4 resummptions in the budget.

I think you will agree with me this by no means is all that is to be desired. We need to make faster progress—but as long as our Projects Committee continues to hear as many applications as they had before them on Monday, however, there is no danger of a shortage of proposals to be considered by the Federal Government in the way of land and water resources development.

Additional work should be undertaken, the President's message said, with a view to strengthening our vital upstream conservation activities. Farmers increasingly realize that it is in their own interest to do more of this work. Because the Nation, as well as farmers and local communities receive benefits, this work should be a joint responsibility. Existing law, however, does not provide an adequate basis for cooperative upstream development.

The 1955 budget, therefore, includes \$3 million under proposed legislation to permit the Department of Agriculture to cooperate with local and State agencies in the planning and installation on small watersheds of the necessary protective facilities, and to provide for better conservation, development, utilization and disposal of water. This will supplement the \$11 million to be spent under existing law for watershed protection and flood-prevention projects, but still this amount should be larger.

We approve and applaud the administration's policy toward public works construction, their permanent value to the national economy, their present value as defense spending tapers off to act as a deterrent to unemployment and recession, and the view that, wherever feasible, they should develop

as a partnership of all responsible interests or those which may enjoy the benefits.

Improvements of internal waterways for navigation and for flood control not only have a beneficial economic effect to make our Nation stronger, but they also effect beneficially the strengthening of our defenses. Particularly wise, we believe, is the resumption of flood-control works that are not completed, in order to avoid both the tragic waste from floods, and the loss of money already invested. Maintenance of navigation projects we consider foresighted action to provide water transportation to relieve congested railroads and highways, thus to prevent any future transportation delays which might adversely affect national defense efforts.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress is pleased to find the administration in accord with its long-established policy favoring additional production of hydro-electric power, but opposing unnecessary Government competition with the private power industry in constructing such facilities. The budget report recognizes the "willingness of State and local groups to participate" in providing the power facilities, but states that where the necessary transmission facilities are not also being provided on reasonable terms, the Department of Interior will construct and operate them.

It is a source of great satisfaction to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress to find itself continuing to work in the company of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. There seemed serious danger a while ago that civil functions might be removed from their roster of duties, and we would lose them as leaders, staunch allies and co-workers in this field. Fortunately, reason prevailed, and the Engineer Corps continues its supervision of navigation and flood-control projects, a job which it has done superbly for more than a century, a peacetime job much less spectacular but in the large sense as vital, as the great achievements of the corps in the works of national defense or helping to win a war.

We are greatly indebted to the distinguished Chief of Engineers, Maj. Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis, Jr., for the interesting and valuable contribution he made to yesterday's program when he discussed the rivers-harbors and flood-control program.

Another Government agency with which we have learned to work together over many years is the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior, whose Secretary, Hon. Douglas McKay, honored us by attendance at this convention, and by his helpful presentation of his department's program of reclamation.

The great experience, expert techniques, alertness to improve their standards and methods in developing and utilizing our natural resources, of the Bureau of Reclamation, have certainly gained for them a reputation for competence which will reassure the United States Congress to believe that any moneys supplied to that Bureau will be completely justified and well expended. The same assurance should apply to any appropriations asked for the Corps of Engineers.

Another Cabinet officer who generously gave his time to appear before our congress was the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, who discussed intelligently the soil-conservation program of his Department. This congress has consistently supported the Agriculture Department's authoritative work on soil conservation, reforestation, and upstream watershed control. We support the future program in this field and oppose any change in it, unless perhaps it should come by way of expansion.

Foreign trade is much in the minds of nations throughout the world today, perhaps only secondary to the questions of war and peace. A vital factor in all considerations of expanding the trade of any nation is its merchant marine. A strong, efficient, modern American merchant marine is indispensable to development of our trade with world countries, to the preservation of our domestic economy at high peak in peacetime, but also it has been, and shall continue to be, an invaluable aid to national security in a national emergency, a vital factor to success in time of war.

We should like to urge upon the United States Congress that there appears united sentiment throughout the country to support the development and maintenance of our water-transportation facilities, as essential to our prosperity, with particular reference to the water carriers in the foreign trade, the domestic coastwise and inland waterways, the shipbuilding and repair facilities, and the maintenance of adequate harbors on our expansive coastline to service fully the commerce of our Nation.

The brilliant pages of history written by the American merchant marine during World Wars I and II were substantially augmented by further performance during the Korean emergency when American-flag vessels were available to serve the United Nations interests.

The United States, with its present world leadership in industry, finance, agriculture, and other fields, must continue to be a leading maritime nation. It must never have to depend upon foreign-flag shipping for bottoms to carry its exports, nor to aid its national defense.

Now, for a few moments before closing, I should like to talk about our organization and its future. After having served for 10 years as your president, I have not stood for reelection this time. This afternoon you will hear the names of your new directors. All 21 offices were vacant because we have not been able to hold elections for some time. With a wholly new board of directors in office, you shall be off to a flying start toward a richer and broader future. These directors shall meet and select a new president, and to him I wish to extend in advance my greatest good wishes, and a cordial pledge of cooperation, and the hope to be of further service to him and to the congress whenever either shall call upon me.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress is a body which moves quietly, avoids criticism, and performs wonders. It should have the unqualified and continuous financial support of all interests and individuals who realize the long-range vitality of America is measured by our evaluation of the land and water resources so generously given us by Providence.

Transportation depends in part upon our inland waterways, our barge lines; the harm of devastating floods can be halted by measures of control; soil erosion and the dust bowls can ruin agriculture or, by proper measures, can be brought under control; foreign trade depends upon navigable harbors and inland waters, as well as the open seas; irrigation can bring desert lands into production of food; impounding of flowing waters and building of dams and hydroelectric plants brings light and power for manifold uses to the city, and the farm dwellers.

All these, and many more, conservation activities are the zealous concern of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Their work is fortunately at present in general accord with expressed policy of the Federal Government. This is a time for forward progress on all fronts. I wish you all every possible success in your part of this tremendous program, for America's sake.

False Witness Against Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it appears unmistakable that one of America's most widely circulated magazines, the Reader's Digest, has opened its pages to special pleading, or, perhaps more properly, has become public-relations agent for the new Hoover Commission.

In recent weeks it has been necessary for two of my colleagues—Senator GORE and Representative ROGERS of Colorado—to challenge the accuracy of material published in this magazine, and it has now become my duty to follow in their path and to make known certain falsehoods and half-truths that appeared in the May issue of Reader's Digest. I refer to the article Dollars Into Dust, a slashing, reckless attack on reclamation in general and the Upper Colorado and Central Arizona projects in particular.

The prejudice behind this article and its distortion about the "almost unbelievable Government extravagance" in Bureau of Reclamation projects should shame the editor of any honest, impartial magazine. One is tolerant of those who mislead through want of information. But, on the other hand, it is hard not to be indignant when reporters go into the field and glean the truth only to ignore it when it hurts their purposes.

The damage done by the misinformation in this article can never be completely undone, but I submit for those who read our RECORD the following statement and editorial which shed the light of truth on the Digest's latest example of shabby journalism. The statement was made late last month in Phoenix, Ariz., by Mr. David Brinegar, executive secretary of the Central Arizona Project Association. The editorial, printed soon after Mr. Brinegar's statement, was written by the respected editor and publisher of the Arizona Daily Star, Mr. William R. Mathews. The statement and editorial follow:

STATEMENT OF MR. DAVID BRINEGAR, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT ASSOCIATION

Mr. Harvey had answers to every one of those false statements, but chose not to use them.

When he was here I gave him the facts about the Central Arizona project. Late in September 1954 he asked not only for facts on the Central Arizona project, but assistance in obtaining information about the upper basin project. Through John Geoffrey Will, of Denver, then executive secretary of the Upper Basin Commission, I obtained the upper basin material Mr. Harvey wanted.

The article published in Reader's Digest under the names of Mr. Miller and Mr. Harvey presented none of this material. It repeated a large assortment of propaganda

statements almost verbatim out of California-published literature, with the implication that these statements were factual and could not be effectively answered.

For instance, the Digest article says that populous States would have to pay most of the bill for the Central Arizona project. That is false. The Central Arizona project would fully repay all its costs to the Federal Treasury and return an additional three to seven billion dollars of direct tax revenues to the Federal Government besides. This is not our estimate—this is the estimate of one of the most conservative agricultural economists in the United States, True D. Morse, formerly head of Doane's Agricultural Service at St. Louis and now Under Secretary of Agriculture.

The Digest article says that the Central Arizona project would irrigate only 226,000 acres. That is false. It would provide water for three-quarters of a million acres of the most valuable farming productionwise in America.

The Digest article says that the Central Arizona project construction cost would be \$1,991 per acre. That is false. The cost of agricultural works never went beyond \$400 per acre and several times was estimated lower. I suggest that in this instance the Digest was rather moderate. However, some Californians have used a figure as high as \$5,000 an acre.

The Digest charges that there is a "concealed subsidy" to Arizona farmers of \$9,200 an acre in the Central Arizona project. The Digest then lists, out of a California propaganda leaflet, figures indicating that New York State would pay \$256 million of the project cost, and that other States would pay other large sums. These statements are false; all Arizona at any time asked was an opportunity to borrow the money from the Federal Treasury on a 70-year loan, cut to the same sound pattern as other large, multi-purpose reclamation projects which have paid out, or are paying out, dollar for dollar.

The Digest uses other figures with an intentional shocking effect, whereas an analysis of the figures reveals there is no reason for shock. The pump lift out of the Colorado River is stated at 1,000 feet and the length of the major canals as 300 miles. Does the Digest know that within southern California there is a pump lift of 1,615 feet out of the Colorado River, feeding a major aqueduct system totaling more than the mileage involved in the Central Arizona project aqueducts, and involving transportation of very nearly the same amount of Colorado River water? The Arizona pump lift would be 985 feet.

It astounds me to have people seriously ask, "Is the Central Arizona project feasible?" when all they have to do is look around on any trip to southern California and see completely demonstrated the feasibility of transporting a million acre-feet of water annually through 300 or more miles of aqueducts, with a 985-foot or higher pump lift.

The Digest repeats the old canard that the Central Arizona project would unduly enrich 420 large landowners. The Digest says that this is one surprising aspect of the Central Arizona project which has escaped notice. Either the Digest writers and editors are ignorant or deliberately deceptive. This is a propaganda statement made for 8 years by the Colorado River Association of California in virtually every piece of that California group's literature, and totally refuted by Arizona and the Bureau of Reclamation in testimony before Congress. More than 30,000 farms of all sizes would benefit, not one of them in any disproportionate amount.

The Digest, in the Leslie Miller-Holman Harvey article, has picked up a long list of old, widely disseminated, but quite answerable statements made by California propagandists in an effort to frustrate use of Colorado river water by Arizona. The facts concerning these things were available to Mr. Harvey and presumably also to Mr. Miller. Certainly, in any publication office as large and as important as the Digest's some research checking should be performed to avoid carelessly reproducing outright misstatements of fact.

I have written Dewitt Wallace, editor of the Digest, suggesting to him that if the Digest has an honest intention of thoroughly discussing reclamation, there are several outstanding writers capable of handling the stories factually. I wish every person who knows reclamation's true story of benefits would also write him.

The Digest has done a disservice to the entire nation, and particularly to the business of reputable gathering, checking, and publishing of factual information.

[From the Arizona Daily Star of April 11, 1955]

A DISTORTED STORY

The Reader's Digest, with its multimillion circulation, wields powerful editorial influ-

ence in the United States. When this power is used to promote a special-interest group it can become a telling weapon.

In the May issue, we see the unfortunate spectacle of the Digest not only promoting a special-interest group, but doing so with a disregard for facts which is surprising in a publication with the reputation the Digest enjoys.

In an article entitled "Dollars Into Dust" the Digest launches an attack on reclamation in the United States, and therein devotes several paragraphs to the Central Arizona project.

The article is carried under the bylines of Leslie A. Miller and Holman Harvey. Mr. Miller is a former Governor of Wyoming, and Chairman of the Hoover Commission Task Group on Reclamation and Water Supply, and as such his name will carry great weight with those who read the article.

Unfortunately, it was Mr. Harvey, and not Mr. Miller, who visited Arizona gathering data for this report.

At the time he was here, Mr. Harvey was supplied with the facts about the Central Arizona project. None of these appeared in the article.

To the contrary, the paragraphs devoted to the Central Arizona project are based almost completely on distortions created by California interests who are battling the Ari-

zona project with every means at their disposal.

And it is to the credit of these California interests, as propagandists, that they have been able to sell their distortions to a magazine with the circulation, influence, and reputation of the Digest. The article will mean much to the campaign they are waging.

The Central Arizona Project Association realizes how much this article can hurt Arizona, and answered the allegations in an article carried in yesterday's Star quoting David Brinegar, its executive secretary.

Unfortunately, such an article published in Arizona can do almost nothing to remedy the damage done by the Digest article, and with that realization, the association has written the Digest asking whether it is interested in publishing a fair appraisal of reclamation, and the Central Arizona project, or whether this biased and inaccurate report is to go unanswered in its pages.

Whether through careless reporting and editing, or through intentional distortion, the Digest stands now in the position of pulling southern California's chestnuts out of the fire, and using the half-truths and untruths from California's own battle guide.

Whether the Digest is going to remedy the damage it has unfairly done to Arizona, and at the same time to its own reputation for accuracy and fairness, remains to be seen.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 2, 1955

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

O God! our Father, Thou searcher of men's hearts, from whom no secrets are hid: Help us in this opening moment of a new week's council to draw near to Thee in tranquillity, in humility, and sincerity. With Thy benediction may we face the toil of this day with honest dealing and clear thinking, with hatred of all hypocrisy, deceit, and sham, and in the knowledge that all great and noble service in this world is based on gentleness and patience and truth.

In this dear land of our love and prayer, may we close our national ranks in a new unity, as sinister powers without pity or conscience plot to destroy the birthright of our liberty of worship and speech and the sanctity of the individual. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1955.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOHN STENNIS, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

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

CI—331

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 28, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4904) to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 2 years, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4904) to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 2 years was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Minimum Wages of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today. I have cleared the matter with the minority leader.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of William G. East, of Oregon, to be United States district judge for the district of Oregon, vice James Alger Fee, elevated; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William R. Connole, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John A. Remon, of the District of Columbia, to be a member, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

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