

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 10813. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the fisheries; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. J. Res. 610. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 10814. A bill for the relief of Willem Fransen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 10815. A bill for the relief of Maria Ragusa Chiapetta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 10816. A bill for the relief of Lillian Ida Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10817. A bill for the relief of Dr. Thomas B. Meade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 10818. A bill for the relief of George T. Moore and Carl D. Berry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 10819. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to the descendants of James H. Haney, Bledsoe, Tex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 10820. A bill for the relief of Alexandra Vasilievna Ghermanoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10821. A bill for the relief of Ezra Dweck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 10822. A bill for the relief of Maria G. Connolly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 10823. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive Zaudie Makuria, a citizen and subject of Ethiopia, for instruction at Annapolis; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 10824. A bill for the relief of Sonja Spieker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H. R. 10825. A bill for the relief of the estate of Robert Joseph Welch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 10826. A bill for the relief of the estate of Charles O. Fairbank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 10827. For the relief of Melvin Grant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10828. A bill for the relief of Maitland McKinley Joseph; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

955. By Mr. BOW: Petition of Mildred Carter and others, of Stark County, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I

veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

956. Also, petition of Fred L. Ickes and others of Stark County, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

957. By Mr. BRAY: Petition of 22 members of Post No. 172, the American Legion, Jasonville, Ind., in support of H. R. 7886, a bill to increase pensions to World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

958. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of the department of Pennsylvania executive committee, the American Legion, urging enactment of necessary legislation to declare November 11, now known as Veterans Day a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

959. By Mrs. CHURCH: Petition of the City Council of the City of Waukegan, Ill., urging that the Congress include in any Federal highway construction legislation the requirement that in every highway project where Federal funds are used, to make it possible for municipal governments to be reimbursed for all changes to its water and sewer facilities required by such projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

960. By Mrs. KEE: Petition of Mrs. Carolyn Barosky, president, Wood-Venable Auxiliary 8519, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Kimball, W. Va., and 9 other members of Wood-Venable Auxiliary 8519, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

961. Also, petition of John F. Boyd, of Alderson, W. Va., and 43 other residents of Monroe and Summers Counties, W. Va., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Criticism of TV and Radio Commercials Is Unjustified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received a letter from Mr. Ted Rand, general manager of radio station KDRS, Paragould, Ark., regarding recent attacks made against the radio and television industry in the House of Representatives. Mr. Rand is an outstanding business and civic leader. The principal complaint against these media was that both television and radio stations increased the sound volume when commercials were being presented. According to Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of California, "these excessively loud commercials" applied to networks as well as local programs. Mr. HOSMER asked the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission to look into the matter and advise him of the Commission's findings.

Mr. Rand's letter, giving views and observations of an owner and operator of a radio station, is good reading indeed. His letter portrays the value of

radio to a community. I highly recommend that you read it. The full text of Mr. Rand's letter is as follows:

KDRS,

Paragould, Ark., March 31, 1956.

The Honorable E. C. GATHINGS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GATHINGS: The assaults upon radio by Representative CRAIG HOSMER and others, in my opinion, accent the negative. It seems to me that radio needs something of a champion among Congressmen who will accent the positive.

I feel sure that you appreciate the services which the radio industry has rendered to the Nation. Moreover, I am confident that you have intimate knowledge of the manner in which many Arkansas radio stations relate themselves to their communities.

In our community, we do not merely give lip service to the goals, dreams, problems, and purposes of our people. We roll up our sleeves and pitch in. We devote time, talent, and energy to the building of our community. We try to do our best in support of those groups which are creating happiness within our community—from a home demonstration club's bake sale to a citywide campaign to raise \$100,000 for a new industry.

We have time for our churches, Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, Red Cross, cancer, nursing home, schools, civic clubs, service clubs, farm groups, and every other similar organization. We rarely receive any direct remuneration from our work on behalf of these groups, although we do feel that our community service policies are directly responsible for our overall successful business operation.

We are typically American in the business sense, and I firmly believe that our industry is suffering unnecessary abuse from some of its critics. While criticisms of specific abuses by a few stations may be completely valid, the tendency to smear them across the entire industry is unfair to many of us.

I sincerely hope that you will find an opportunity to speak up for the great majority of the Nation's radio stations and in defense of the typical small city Arkansas station which builds its entire service around its people and their needs.

If the emphasis remains upon the negative aspects, may I then recommend that someone be equally unfair in appraising other aspects of the American scene which might be loud, noisy, and obnoxious in their own way:

Used car dealers illuminate their lots in a manner which is bright, glaring, and disagreeable to me.

Service stations fly masses of distracting pennants and twirling silver devices. They display huge day-glo signs. They distort the natural beauty of my town.

Magazines cluttered with attention-getters continually force me to turn to page one-hundred-and-something for a continuation of the article I am reading.

Full pages of my newspaper contain nothing but advertising. I find this annoying.

Billboards put to shame the loudest radio commercial I have ever heard. These billboards obliterate the landscape, and they divert my attention from the somewhat important function of operating my automobile.

I pay to see commercials at my neighborhood theater.

Times Square is simply a disgrace.

Anyone who will acknowledge the futility of these observations may then wonder with me why radio and television are such prime targets.

After all, radio and television offer two great compensating factors: a dial for the selection of various stations and a switch for turning the entire receiver off.

May I urge you to caution critics of the broadcasting industry to temper their observations with an appraisal of the services performed for the Nation, and to properly relate radio and television to the age in which they live.

Frankly, I am proud to be part of an industry which is vitally important in the everyday lives of the Nation's people. Because we are, we should not be shielded from valid criticism. However, there surely must be room for the presentation of radio's positive side in the Congress of the United States.

Very truly yours,

TED RAND,
General Manager.

Many people accept fine programs of both radio and television as a matter of course and apparently do not appreciate fully that the station or network that is making such program available to them is performing a distinct and outstanding public service. Numerous viewers and listeners over their television and radio receiving sets do not stop to think that these programs are offered to them gratis; that if they do not like one particular station they have but to turn the knob. So many are prone to be unappreciative and ungrateful for the entertainment and educational value of the programs which come into our homes, and criticize the time consumed in advertising the product or firm or company that makes the program possible. Without advertising there would be no radio and TV industry; the public could not have and receive the entertaining, news, and educational programs that are a part of the daily lives of the American people.

I am of the opinion that those who criticize commercial advertising are in reality in the great minority, and that such is not the attitude of the majority of our populace.

The radio industry has consistently grown bigger and stronger from year to year. I set forth a table showing the growth of commercial radio stations:

Growth of commercial radio stations

Year:	Commercial stations
1922	30
1923	556
1924	530
1925	571
1926	528
1927	681
1928	677
1929	606
1930	618
1931	612
1932	604
1933	598
1934	593
1935	623
1936	616
1937	646
1938	689
1939	722
1940	765
1941	897
1942	925

Growth of commercial radio stations—Con.

Year:	Commercial stations
1943	948
1944	957
1945	977
1946	1,009
1947	1,346
1948	1,835
1949	2,340
1950	2,611
1951	2,782
1952	2,915
1953	2,990
1954	3,094
1955	3,244

Source: Years 1922-1926 from Federal records; 1927 onward from Federal Communications Commission.

The broadcasting industry has become and is one of our most significant fields of endeavor. The following economic analysis of the total radio and television industry, as published by Caldwell-Clements, Inc., in *Mart* magazine, reflects the general importance of this industry:

Year 1955

Sale of time by broadcasters.	\$1,000,000,000
Talent costs.	200,000,000
Electricity, batteries to operate 176,900,000 radio and TV receivers.	750,000,000
12,500,000 radio receivers, retail value.	485,000,000
7,500,000 television receivers, retail value.	1,215,000,000
250,000,000 phonograph records.	310,000,000
Radio repairs and supplies, 95,000,000 replacement tubes.	237,000,000
Parts, accessories.	425,000,000
Labor.	850,000,000
Total	5,472,000,000

This data covers both the radio and television industry.

The following table clearly illustrates the phenomenal growth of the radio manufacturing industry.

Radio receivers—Selected data, 1922-55

Year	Sets produced	Retail value	Homes with radio sets	Total sets in use
1922	100,000	\$5,000,000	280,000	400,000
1923	550,000	30,000,000	1,000,000	1,100,000
1924	1,500,000	100,000,000	2,500,000	3,000,000
1925	2,000,000	165,000,000	3,500,000	4,000,000
1926	1,750,000	200,000,000	5,000,000	5,700,000
1927	1,350,000	185,000,000	6,500,000	7,000,000
1928	3,281,000	400,000,000	7,500,000	8,500,000
1929	4,428,000	600,000,000	9,000,000	10,500,000
1930	3,827,800	300,000,000	12,048,762	13,000,000
1931	3,423,000	225,000,000	14,000,000	15,000,000
1932	3,000,000	140,000,000	16,809,562	18,000,000
1933	3,806,000	180,500,000	20,402,369	22,000,000
1934	4,084,000	214,500,000	21,456,000	26,000,000
1935	6,026,800	330,192,480	22,869,000	30,500,000
1936	8,248,000	450,000,000	24,600,000	33,000,000
1937	8,064,780	450,000,000	26,666,500	37,600,000
1938	6,000,000	210,000,000	28,000,000	40,800,000
1939	10,500,000	354,000,000	28,700,000	45,300,000
1940	11,800,000	450,000,000	29,200,000	51,000,000
1941	13,000,000	460,000,000	29,700,000	56,000,000
1942	4,400,000	154,000,000	30,800,000	59,340,000
1943			32,000,000	58,000,000
1944			33,000,000	57,000,000
1945	500,000	20,000,000	34,000,000	56,000,000
1946	14,000,000	700,000,000	35,000,000	60,000,000
1947	17,000,000	800,000,000	37,000,000	66,000,000
1948	16,000,000	700,000,000	40,000,000	74,000,000
1949	10,000,000	500,000,000	42,000,000	81,000,000
1950	14,000,000	721,000,000	45,000,000	90,000,000
1951	13,000,000	605,000,000	45,850,000	100,000,000
1952	10,000,000	500,000,000	46,000,000	114,500,000
1953	13,400,000	536,000,000	48,000,000	120,500,000
1954	11,200,000	470,000,000	50,000,000	127,000,000
1955	12,500,000	850,400,000	52,000,000	135,000,000

Source: *Broadcasting Telecasting—Broadcasting Yearbook, 1956.*

We Do Not Want Vigilantes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the throwing of sulfuric acid into the face and eyes of Victor Riesel, who has exposed many a labor racketeer, was not an isolated act. It was characteristic of the methods of the vicious gangsters who so frequently, by beatings, bombings, sometimes by murder, have sought to silence those who exposed their lawlessness, their stealing of welfare funds, the misuses of union dues.

Ever since the gangsters attained nationwide power in organizations like the Chicago Capone crime syndicate, they have frequently, without punishment, made good their boast that those who exposed them would be silenced.

Many a gangster, turned informant, has been executed by the gang. The recent attempt to silence Riesel obviously came from the same source.

Nor have police officers been exempt from the decrees of the gangsters. Well do I recall that, when a legislative committee held hearings in Chicago in an attempt to ascertain from whence came the pressure back of the paroling of the four Capone gangsters, two testifying police officers were threatened with physical violence. Not long thereafter, one, Captain Drury, when on his way to furnish another committee with information about the gang, was coolly and deliberately slain.

Others, sometimes officers charged with enforcement of the law, sometimes reporters or newspaper publishers or editors, have met a similar fate.

Time and time again have legislative committees, State investigatory bodies, called to the attention of the public this lawlessness which apparently has known no limits. If we continue to permit gangsters to ignore the law, to beat and to-kill not only their own associates who inform against them, but innocent individuals whose only fault is that they speak or publish the truth about crime—if men like Victor Riesel are to be murderously assaulted—how long will it be before men like Pegler, Clark Mollenhoff, and others who publish or speak the truth about these gangsters will be likewise permanently injured or removed from the scene?

If those charged with the enforcement of the law fail in their duty because of lack of public support—if that situation worsens, will not otherwise law-abiding citizens attempt to retaliate by lawless punitive acts? Will not a situation develop similar to that which existed in the West when outraged citizens acting in defense of their rights organized and without legal procedure hung or shot those who over-long willfully disregarded all law? Drifting into such a situation is unthinkable. The cowardly assault on Victor Riesel—a courageous fearless writer—should be another warning to

law enforcement officials to fully perform their sworn duty.

One remedy for the threat to our freedom is to elect to law-enforcing offices only those who, regardless of threats of physical violence or political execution, have the will, the ability, the courage, the determination to see that all laws are enforced without fear or favor.

That remedy has worked in Berrien County, in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, where two prosecutors, Joe Killian and Jack Spelman, with the assistance of Sheriff Kubath and fearless judges, have successfully demonstrated that the unlawful activities of gangsters will not be tolerated and that the civil rights of citizens will be protected.

What we need is not more civil rights legislation, but a better enforcement of what we have.

Tribute to the Memory of the Honorable Vera Buchanan, Late a Representative From Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I rise to add my small tribute to the memory of my friend and colleague, the Honorable Vera Buchanan, late a Representative from the 30th District of Pennsylvania. I know that this feeling is shared by all of us here, for her courageous spirit, her patience and understanding were an inspiration to all who knew her.

Mrs. Buchanan was elected to the 82d Congress on July 24, 1951, to succeed her husband, the late Frank Buchanan. Like her husband, she worked hard for the people of her district, and they returned her to the 83d and 84th Congress. After having previously served on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Committee on Public Works, she was elected to the Committee on Banking and Currency in the 84th Congress. As you know, the Banking and Currency Committee deals with housing matters. We are constantly concerned with the statistics of housing, and their effect on the Nation's economy. Being a successful homemaker herself, Mrs. Buchanan brought to the committee a special insight in housing matters, and a warm understanding of the problems and needs of homemakers and the importance of the home in American family life.

A severe case of pneumonia overtook Mrs. Buchanan last year when she had devoted her energies to the point of exhaustion in support of housing and flood-control legislation for her constituents. Her death on November 26 deprived the people of her district of a devoted and courageous representative. The House has lost a sincere and capable Member

who will be sadly missed by those of us who knew her and valued her friendship.

My deep feeling of sympathy goes out to her two daughters and other relatives in their great loss.

Anniversary of the Birth of John F. Stevens, Chief Engineer of the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the decision of the Congress and the President in 1906 to approve the lake-lock plan for building the Panama Canal. Today is the 103d anniversary of the birth at West Gardiner, Maine, of John F. Stevens, who was the chief engineer of the Panama Canal. I ask unanimous consent that a statement and a poem on Mr. Stevens may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

The State of Maine has produced many leaders on the national scene but few have attained the stature of John F. Stevens, who was born at West Gardiner, Maine, on April 25, 1853.

In a career packed with hard work and adventure he built a record of constructive achievement that stands as an inspiration to the youth of our land.

After graduating from the State Normal School at Farmington, Maine, and an attempt at teaching, Stevens decided upon an engineering career. In 1874, at the age of 21, and without technical engineering training, he went to Minneapolis where his uncle, Jesse Stevens, was an engineer. There he began as an assistant engineer—a roddman—for the city.

Attracted by greater opportunities that would be afforded on the railroads, then at peak construction, he went to Texas in 1876, and secured employment as a railway section hand. Rising step by step, he worked as roddman, instrument man, surveyor, and location and construction engineer—all of which served as a great school of experience.

Attracting the attention of the great railroad empire builder, James J. Hill, he was sent by the latter to locate a route for the Great Northern Railway over the Rocky Mountains. This led to his dramatic discovery on December 11, 1889, of Marias Pass in Montana, through which the railroad was constructed.

This notable achievement is commemorated by a bronze statue of the engineer-explorer near the track at Summit, Mont., showing Stevens as he appeared at the time of his discovery. Replicas of this statue are in the Maine State Library and in the national headquarters in New York of the American Society of Civil Engineering, of which society he later became national president.

In the course of his rise in the railroad work, Stevens was well prepared for a still greater assignment in taking over the build-

ing of the Panama Canal. For appointment as Chief Engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission, the combination of his ability and extraordinary background of experience made him a "natural."

Assuming charge in the Canal Zone on July 25, 1905, at a time when chaos and hysteria incident to yellow fever was coupled with the resignation of its previous Chief Engineer, by the adoption of wise policies, Stevens promptly brought matters under control. One of the outstanding instances of his broad outlook was his sympathetic and timely support of the health and sanitation plan that had been proposed by Colonel Gorgas—adequate health and sanitation being an absolute prerequisite for constructing the canal.

Considering the problem of constructing the Panama Canal from every significant viewpoint, functional as well as economic and engineering, Stevens strongly recommended to President Theodore Roosevelt what is known as the lake and lock type canal as offering the best solution, and vigorously opposed the so-called sea-level proposal.

When this celebrated issue as to the choice of type was before the Nation in 1906, he was the greatest single influence in bringing about the decision of the Congress and the President for the high-level lake and lock plan. This contribution, which has been justified by more than 40 years' successful operation, establishes him in history as the basic architect of the Panama Canal. He was rewarded by the President with the first appointment to the combined positions of Chairman and Chief Engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission (1907).

Having organized the forces for construction, acquired the necessary equipment, designed the key features of the waterway, launched the project and brought it to a point where its success was a certainty, Stevens resigned in April 1907 and returned to railroad work. The Panama Canal was completed by others under the Stevens plans.

Though separated from the project his interest never ceased. At times of crises during the remaining years of construction, he always gave his support in the best interest of the project. In later years, he wrote extensively of his Isthmian experiences. Special reference is made to his collaboration with Col. William L. Sibert, a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission in charge of Atlantic construction, in a book entitled "The Construction of the Panama Canal," published in New York by D. Appleton & Co. in 1915. This volume is probably the best engineering historical treatise produced by the construction era.

Just after the declaration of war by the United States in 1917, Mr. Stevens went to see President Wilson and requested an active assignment in the war. The President expressed his interest, as Russia was then an ally and badly in need of a competent railroad man, in connection with its war transportation problems. Appointed as Minister Plenipotentiary and head of the United States Railway Mission to Russia in 1917, he undertook the difficult tasks involved in operating its railroad system. Later, from 1919 to 1923, he was president of the Inter-Allied Technical Board supervising the Siberian railways.

In these positions he observed the start and early years of the Communist Revolution. Accurately foreseeing the vast scope of that work conspiracy, he was among the first to alert responsible leaders of the United States to its dangers.

It is thus historically fitting that in 1956, which marks the 50th anniversary of the decision in 1906 by the Congress and the President for the lake-lock plan for building the Panama Canal, that the Honorable Maurice H. Thatcher, of Kentucky, formerly Civil

Governor of the Canal Zone, and the only surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, serving during peak years of canal construction, and later a Member of Congress, should write for the occasion of Mr. Stevens' birthday an inspiring poem that epitomizes the vision and work of this eminent leader for the Panama Canal.

The poem follows:

"JOHN F. STEVENS: A TRIBUTE

"Amongst all those whose labors cleft the land
To blend, as one, the seas at Panama—
There was none greater than John Stevens;
and
The passing years bear witness. He fore-
saw—
More clearly than the others had foreseen—
The value of the plan for lock and lake,
And led Authority—in doubt between
Diverse designs—the wiser choice to make.
Possessed of genius rare, with skills supreme
And ripen'd knowledge gained from ven-
tures vast—
He shaped the moulds to vitalize the Dream
Which had so long persisted in the past.
His all he gave to serve the Isthmian Task:
What more could men demand, or duty
ask?"

—Maurice H. Thatcher.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 25, 1956.

Eleventh Anniversary of Meeting of American and Russian Soldiers on the Elbe River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by me about the 11th anniversary of the meeting of American and Russian soldiers on the Elbe River.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR POTTER

Today is a significant day for a great many American veterans. It is a day which is well worth remembrance and thoughtful consideration of the American people. Today marks the 11th anniversary reunion of the American Veterans of the Elbe River link-up. I would like to quote now from a letter by Joseph Polowsky, the secretary of the American Veterans of the Elbe River link-up, sent to the fellow veterans of that occasion:

"Eleven years ago, at noon on Elbe day 1945, a patrol of American riflemen thrust through the no-man's land between the forward American and Russian lines and linked up with a patrol of Russian soldiers on the east bank of the Elbe River. On that blood-soaked river bank, we met the Russian soldiers with high resolve and as friends. All of us on both sides swore never to forget the scene, the day or each other, swore to do what we could to make a freer and more peaceful world for our children, and to meet again in peace. Two days later, when the link-up was more fully secured and American and Russian military units were joyously greeting each other, our patrol mis-

sion was completed, and we returned to the American lines; General Eisenhower said the American people were proud of us for our initiative and devotion to duty. The confidence and optimism, the spirit of comradeship and hospitality all of us had 11 years ago, from General Eisenhower to the privates in the field, lives on in us as American veterans. We'll make the American people proud of us once again when we shake hands again with the Soviet Elbe veterans at our reunion this month in Washington."

I should like to quote also from a letter from Mr. Polowsky addressed to the Soviet Veterans of the Elbe River link-up:

"Last spring, the Governments of the United States and the Soviet Union cooperated in bringing together the American and Soviet Elbe veterans for an inspiring and successful 10th anniversary reunion in Moscow. On May 11, 1955, at a formal meeting at which military and civilian representatives of the United States Government and the Soviet Government were present, the Elbe veterans read the following unanimously approved joint declaration: 'We Soviet and American veterans of the Elbe River link-up of the Allied Armies in 1945, gathered together in Moscow on the 10th anniversary of that historic event, affirm that we have not forgotten the friendly alliance formed during the war years. The link-up of our soldiers at the Elbe will live on in history of mankind as an enduring symbol of friendship, good will and mutual respect between our peoples. Today, as 10 years ago, we declare our determination to work for friendship between the American and Soviet peoples and the establishment of a peaceful world. We hope this first reunion will establish a tradition. We hope that on future anniversaries of the Elbe River link-up, American and Soviet war veterans will exchange friendly greetings and hold reunions as friends.'

"We American Veterans of the Elbe River link-up will hold our 11th anniversary reunion in Washington, D. C., on Elbe Day—April 25, 1956. We extend to the Soviet Veterans of the Elbe River link-up a cordial invitation for a group of Soviet World War II veterans to visit us at our reunion. We are sure that the visit of the Soviet veterans to the United States this spring will contribute to the establishment of the free and friendly world we all fought for during the years of the Second World War."

And now, may I read the words of acceptance from the chairman of the Soviet committee of the participants of the meeting at the Elbe. He says:

"Permit me, on behalf of the Soviet veterans of the Elbe meeting, to sincerely thank you for the invitation extended to the Soviet participants in this unforgettable, historic meeting to visit the United States of America to participate in the meeting of the American Veterans of the Elbe River link-up, which is being held on April 25, 1956, in Washington, D. C.; and thank you also for your good wishes and your efforts toward supporting and strengthening the ties between the

American and Soviet veterans of the Second World War.

"The Soviet committee of the participants of the meeting at the Elbe, with a deep feeling of gratitude, accepts your kind invitation and is ready to send to the United States a group of Soviet participants of 5 to 7 people to take part in the meeting of April 25th of this year in Washington, D. C.

"We trust that the meeting of the Soviet and American veterans of the Second World War will further mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the Soviet Union, and other freedom loving peoples who carried on so great a battle against a common enemy in the years of the Second World War."

It is interesting to note that some 11 years ago the armies of the United States and of the Soviet Union were fighting a common cause. The meeting at the Elbe demonstrated that the peoples of these two countries deeply cherish the common goals of freedom and peace. This should serve as a reminder to all of those in positions of responsibility in all countries that these are the goals of the peoples. We all sincerely hope that these meetings on a man to man basis at the various levels of our society will continue to deepen the mutual understandings and to strengthen the bonds of common interest all over the world.

Results of Annual Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted I would like to include in the RECORD the result of my annual questionnaire. About 12,700 of these questionnaires went out to the persons who are on my mailing list to receive my semimonthly newsletter. In addition, I sent my questionnaire to every newspaper which is published in Maricopa County and asked that it be printed in such a manner that it could be cut and mailed to me. I received many questionnaires from this source. A total of 1,868 questionnaires were returned to my office; 95 percent of the answers came from persons residing in Maricopa County, Ariz. I do not claim that my poll is a scientific sampling of the opinion of voters in Maricopa County. It does reflect, however, as broad a cross section of the voters as it was possible for me to obtain.

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you approve of President Eisenhower's foreign policy?.....	75	15	10
2. Should we continue military aid to friendly foreign nations?.....	71	18	11
3. Do you favor amending the Walter-McCarran Act to allow a greater number of immi- grants to enter the United States?.....	24	64	12
4. Do you favor Secretary Benson's farm program?.....	68	15	17
5. Should defense spending continue at the present level?.....	68	17	15
6. Do you favor a tax reduction prior to the attainment of a balanced budget?.....	20	75	5
7. Do you believe that the Eisenhower administration has done a good job in governing the country in the past 3 years?.....	89	8	3
8. Do you favor Federal aid to school construction?.....	83	38	9
9. Should the United States postal service be self-supporting?.....	79	14	7
10. Do you favor a national right-to-work law, outlawing compulsory membership in any labor organization?.....	86	11	3

The Parris Island Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, recently I was shocked to read of the death of some fine young Americans at the Marine training base on Parris Island.

My first reaction was one of horror. It seemed completely inconceivable that this tragedy could have happened in this country. Even more amazing, the incident occurred in the United States Marines.

Everyone knows that the Marine Corps has a reputation for toughness. It is an important part of the great spirit of a great fighting organization. Each former marine I know takes particular pride in his service. Without exception, every young man I have met who served with the corps wears his former service with a certain air, a knowledge that he was one of the finest outfits in world military history.

On every battlefield the United States Marines have acquitted themselves well. Every volume that tells of the growth of this great Nation has an important place for the leathernecks. It is true now as it was 170 years ago, the marine has no superior as a fighting man. An important part of the secret of his success has always been the training he receives. In a word, it is rough; it's meant to be. Yet for all its roughness there is intelligence, planning and direction to it.

Still in the final analysis any system is only as good as the men who administer it. In the Marine Corps, as indeed everywhere else where man is involved there are instances of abuse and flagrant violation. A review of the record of any criminal court will show that man has a habit of violating his conscience and the best laid plans of God and his fellow creatures. So it is with the Marines.

In every instance the corps tries to find and correct any inequalities or injustices in the system. Their only interest is in maintaining the quality of their organization. Humiliation of the individual and stupidity are not a part of their plan. If those two undesirable qualities crop up occasionally they are committed by individuals and not by the system, nor the men who direct the Marine Corps.

This is a most difficult matter to consider rationally or objectively. The fact is that young Americans have died while taking training under the rules and regulations of a United States Armed Force.

Still, it seems to me that there has been some hysteria toward this tragedy. The papers have been filled with stories about other abuses or alleged abuses in boot camp. Everyone has an opinion and it is usually a very violent one.

However, I firmly believe that this is a matter which the Marines can handle. They have been dealing with the weakness and the strength in men for a great many years. Their discipline and train-

ing have always been tough. Their courts-martial records show that there have been abuses before. In every instance they have handled their problems with the same dispatch and efficiency which characterizes every combat action in which they have participated.

Commandant Pate's reaction to the news of the tragedy was instant and commendable. He flew down to the scene to take charge, to make sure that an investigation was launched with the maximum of authority to get the job done; he called for a board of inquiry. At no point can I find reason to criticize the action of the general or any of his officers since the entire incident came to light. They know the full story of what happened and will act accordingly.

Whatever the decision rendered by the board of inquiry, I have every reason to believe that it will be a fair one—fair to the American people, just to the parties involved, and in the finest tradition of the United States Marines.

As to the future of the training programs, I think they are in the best hands right now. If modifications are called for, they will be modified. If the system is right and some individuals are wrong, the individuals will be changed.

We have trusted the United States Marine Corps in war. Now let us have confidence in them in peace. And more, let us pray to God that they might always receive His help and guidance.

The Right To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an interesting and provocative book, *The Right To Know*, by an old friend, Kent Cooper, executive director and former general manager of the Associated Press. At any time and under any circumstances, anything from Mr. Cooper on the subject of news gathering and dissemination would be worth while. At this time, when the United States is struggling painfully with the difficult dilemma of reconciling the necessity of keeping news of strategic value from potential enemies with the guaranties of the Bill of Rights and the necessity of having an informed and intelligent electorate, this book is most timely.

It is of vital importance that all responsible Government officials should continue to actively concern themselves with the problem of releasing legitimate news of the Government business to the greatest extent possible to the people by press and radio. As Cooper so dramatically points out, the surest way to destroy free government is by suppression and tainting of news sources.

While I do not agree with all of the conclusions and comments contained in

this interesting and readable book, I do commend it wholeheartedly to readers interested in this vital subject.

Statement of Hon. Thomas J. Lane, of Massachusetts, in Support of H. R. 10344

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a splendid statement made by our colleague and my very good friend from Massachusetts, Mr. LANE, in support of H. R. 10344, introduced by Mr. LANE—

To establish the concurrent jurisdiction of the Federal Government and the States and Territories with respect to sedition against the Government of the United States, States, Territories, and their political subdivisions.

Which statement was made April 20, 1956, before Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Judiciary Committee.

There is no Member better versed on the subject matter of H. R. 10344 than our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. LANE. I might also say there is no Member of the House more devoted in the performance of his duties to his people than my distinguished friend, Mr. LANE, of Massachusetts.

The bill which he introduced, and the statement he made in support of it are evidence of the fine character of service which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] renders.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN THOMAS J. LANE, DEMOCRAT, MASSACHUSETTS, SUPPORTING H. R. 10344, "TO ESTABLISH THE CONCURRENT JURISDICTION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND THE STATES AND TERRITORIES WITH RESPECT TO SEDITION AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES, STATES, TERRITORIES, AND THEIR POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS," SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 OF THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, APRIL 20, 1956

Mr. Chairman, in recent years we have witnessed a gradual erosion of States rights.

It goes without saying, that only the Federal Government can carry out certain functions, but the growing tendency to take over more and more authority, denying to the States even the right of cooperation, will lead to a topheavy centralization of power.

Amendment 10 to the Constitution provides that "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Under the Smith Act, passed by the Congress, the Federal Government is empowered to try and punish those who are accused and are found guilty of sedition.

The law does not specifically prohibit the States from taking such action under their own laws.

The Supreme Court of the United States has recently decided, but with a strong dissenting opinion by the minority, that only the Federal courts have jurisdiction in cases involving sedition.

This has paralyzed the initiative of those States which, under their own laws, have been most active in prosecuting sedition within their own borders.

In turn, this has weakened our total efforts to protect ourselves from the Communist conspiracy, and has had the effect of giving aid and comfort to the enemy.

The Communists are expert in exploiting every legal loophole to their advantage, and will continue to do so as long as we permit them to claim a conflict between Federal and State laws of this issue. Any division plays into their hands.

Obviously, State officials are more familiar with certain aspects of the problem, as well as having the additional facilities to prosecute sedition.

Furthermore, there is a precedent for joint Federal-State action.

Under the Volstead Act, both authorities moved in on violators of the prohibition laws.

Unfortunately, the Smith Act was loosely written.

This fact is generally recognized as a result of the Supreme Court's interpretation.

To compensate for this omission, several bills are up for consideration by the subcommittee.

One of them is H. R. 3 "to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws."

I submit that is language altogether too general.

It states "that no act of Congress shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the field in which such act operates, to the exclusion of all State laws on the same subject matter, unless such act contains an express provision to that effect."

This covers all legislation.

It could have far-reaching applications, establishing the principle of precedence and priority on the part of the Federal Government "to occupy the field" if Congress so states, without delegation of that power to the Federal Government by the States through amendment of the Constitution.

Secondly, H. R. 3 provides that, in cases of irreconcilable conflict between acts of Congress and State laws, the Federal law shall invalidate those contradictory provisions of the State laws.

We are primarily concerned here with the problem of sedition alone, and not dealing with possible legislation in which there might be an honest difference of opinion among our people, or progressive legislation which the several States might enact without fear of being subordinated in all cases to the will of Congress.

Again there is no conflict on the issue of sedition.

We need and want the most effective employment of our courts to try and punish sedition.

Acting in concert, we shall make sure that no Communist conspirators will escape.

Speaking in support of my bill, H. R. 10344, I want to emphasize that it is specifically limited to sedition.

And that it will establish a concurrent jurisdiction as among the Federal Government, the States, the Territories, and their political subdivisions, to make certain that the laws and the courts give us full protection against those who conspire to overthrow the Government by force and violence.

To ferret out the Communist intriguers, there must be specific authority under both Federal and State laws for this purpose.

H. R. 10344, by establishing concurrent jurisdiction with respect to sedition keeps us well on the target.

It avoids the suggestion that Congress might expressly provide for the exclusion of all State laws on the same subject matter.

It clearly removes any possibility of judicial conflict of authority in dealing with the Communist danger and without establishing

rules of interpretation that might be used in similar circumstances, and regarding other issues as a subterfuge for weakening our cherished institutions.

I submit that H. R. 10344 is strictly to the point.

Southbridge DAV.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the text, in part, of an address I delivered on Sunday, April 22, 1956, at the annual banquet of the Southbridge, Mass., chapter, Disabled American Veterans.

The material follows:

REMARKS, IN PART, OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN BEFORE THE DAV, SOUTHBRIDGE, MASS., APRIL 22, 1956

Distinguished commander, distinguished State commander, Judge Williams, my able and distinguished friends of the general court, Senator Benoit and Representative Cournoyer, distinguished town officials, Gold Star Mothers, officers, members, and friends, it is always with a great sense of privilege that I attend the installations of this outstanding veterans' organization because I am conscious of the fact, as the American people are, that this Nation owes to you and to all our gallant veterans a deep debt of gratitude that can never be repaid.

Moreover, you have not been satisfied to serve in time of war alone and to offer your all on the altar of patriotic devotion. You have also made, and are making, tremendous contributions to the Nation in time of peace.

Your service to this beautiful community in various phases of its civic, economic, and political life, your unselfish service to the State and particularly your untiring efforts for the disabled veterans and their dependents are so well known, so memorable and distinguished, so praiseworthy, that they scarcely need comment from me or anyone else.

However, I gladly embrace this opportunity once again to tell you how deeply and sincerely your fine work is appreciated, and I am sure that it will be continued with the same zeal with which it has been conducted in the past.

I propose this afternoon to discuss with you very briefly some matters relating to veterans' affairs which are presently pending in the Congress and before the country, but before I do that I would like to make some reference to the progress we are making regarding flood-control and flood-rehabilitation work because I know how close to your hearts this subject is, and you know how close it is to mine.

When the great flood disaster struck us last summer and fall, it came like most disasters of this kind without particular warning. Not even our weather services, which usually endeavors to the best of its ability to give us timely reports, was able to present an accurate forecast of the approach and course of the terrible storm which caused such great loss of life and heavy damage in our area.

Most unfortunately and most unhappily this lovely community was afflicted with a sorrowful blow almost without precedent in the history of our State, in fact, I doubt that any similar disaster has ever beset any area in our State as the result of floods

and turbulent waters as that which was visited upon us last August and which was augmented during the fall season.

The damage was great and the losses and suffering that followed almost unbelievable but, as I stated in your town hall a few days after this frightful disaster, I am proud and filled with unbounded admiration for this stirring manner in which all the people of your community faced up to this great disaster and the way in which you set to work both in your public and private facilities, to bring order so speedily out of the chaos and confusion and restore vital public services and set into motion the machinery of rehabilitation. Let me emphasize that you are all entitled to great credit, all of your town officials, your able, diligent, effective representatives in the general court, your various civic and business organizations and, indeed, all the people of Southbridge, for the spirit of determination and fortitude which you exhibited in the midst of adversity.

As you know, Government at every level has been participating in the efforts to repair the damage that was wrought and to bring the community back to normal in every respect. In this work your town government has made tremendous contributions and all your town officials to a man, have given their cooperation and assistance.

The State government, which has primary responsibility for the rivers and waterways of the Commonwealth, due in large measure to the unceasing, vigorous, persistent labors of Senator Benoit and Representative Cournoyer, and State agencies, is endeavoring to play its part, and the Red Cross and Federal Government, pursuant to its mandate under the laws, to cope with emergency situations is working and cooperating to the fullest extent possible. For all these efforts we can be thankful, to the Army engineers, civilian defense, Small Business Administration, and all the rest, and we can be thankful most of all for the indomitable spirit and never-say-die attitude of the good people of Southbridge who have made sure that their community will rise up from this disaster stronger, more prosperous, and finer than ever.

I may say that in Washington we are making splendid progress to date with the efforts which I commenced right after the floods and have continued since that time as chairman of the Massachusetts Congressional Delegation Committee on Flood Prevention and Rehabilitation.

So urgently have we pressed the matter of flood protection in this area in our determination to see to it in every way we can that such a disaster will never be visited upon the people again, that almost within a month from the convening of Congress this year, we were able to secure legislation inaugurating several major flood projects in our area including the major dam at East Brimfield, which is considered by the Army engineers to be the key to adequate protection at Southbridge. That project has been authorized and planning money has been appropriated and we expect that before long construction will be underway. I am also pressing for planning money for the project at Westville which is another important part of the overall protective plan and, in time, I expect that that will also be accomplished although the engineers advise me that from an operational standpoint it would be necessary substantially to complete East Brimfield first.

The point I desire to make, my friends, is that we are moving as rapidly as humanly possible toward the desirable goal of full and adequate flood protection for this community and other areas in our State against the ravages and cruel afflictions of periodic floods. And we have been also moving with all possible dispatch with activities designed to effect stream clearance and stream im-

provement by the removal of rubbish, debris, and other obstructions and to provide for unimpeded flow of the river and the other streams involved.

In this work, among other features, we must understand two things, first, that it is a cooperative undertaking which involves the concurrence and participation of the local governments, and the State government as well as the Federal Government.

Secondly, we must realize that the major projects in mind are of considerable magnitude and require careful planning and construction activities over a period of time and that they cannot be completed over night.

The main thing to remember is that we are making progress, great progress. We are on the right road, moving in the right direction, and if we continue to cooperate with each other as we have been doing up to this point, I venture the prediction that it will not be very long before we will realize our objectives and the people of this community will be able to feel assured that, insofar as anything that can be done to insure them protection against terrible floods, it will have been done and accomplished by the patience, persistency, ability, and zeal of all those to whom responsibility for this work may be committed.

Then there is the question also of disaster insurance which will enable people and businessmen generally to be insured against floods and other disasters. To those of us in this area the arguments for this proposal are unanswerable. Admittedly there are practical difficulties to be worked out concerning the program, and the committees of the Congress are now considering them with vigor and careful attention, and I am hopeful that we will be able in due course to provide a system of insurance that will go a long way toward indemnifying our people against losses from these great disturbances of nature.

This great organization may feel well pleased and well satisfied with the response its membership has made in time of stress and danger. Dedicated as you are to the welfare, interest and defense of the Nation, determined as you are by reason of your own past service to protect it, I know that it is not necessary for me to urge upon you the continuance of your splendid work.

By all means, let us continue to build adequate protection against floods so vitally needed.

And by all means, let us continue to build adequate protection against the dreadful world conspiracy of communism which threatens our liberties at this hour. That is a particular job for patriotic Americans to see to it that the insidious influences of subversive elements is checked.

And let us see to it also that the cause of the veteran and their dependents of the people who have done so much to sustain this country is protected and advanced in the legislative bodies of the Nation and in every other place necessary. Let us make special efforts to assist our disabled veteran and his dear ones and, indeed, all the veterans with reference to the rights and privileges which the Congress has so fittingly extended to them—the GI Bill of Rights—education, homes, hospitalization and medical care and pensions which must be assured and provided at standards commensurate with the higher price levels and the higher cost of living which obtain in the country. In short, let us keep America strong, militarily, economically, socially and, above all, spiritually, since spiritual strength, belief in our Creator and in the great liberties we enjoy is the greatest weapon we have in combating the evil enemies that would destroy us. Let us stand by our ideals, by the principles of the Constitution and the Nation, the rights of the individual, the rights of our people to advance to a more dynamic

way of life and we will not only thus protect and secure our liberties but we will be making the greatest contribution possible to a better, more prosperous and happier America and the cause of lasting world peace.

One Hundred Thirty-fifth Anniversary of Greek Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of the 135th anniversary of Greek independence this year, I arranged, at the suggestion of Mr. Peter Chumbris, formerly assistant attorney general of my State of New Mexico, to have Father George P. Gallos, of the Greek Orthodox Church of the Annunciation in Baltimore, invited to offer the prayer at the opening session in the House on Monday, March 26. Father Gallos offered the following beautiful and inspiring prayer:

God of our Father, to Thee, author of liberty, to Thee we pray. On this occasion of the 135th anniversary of Greek independence, we ask Thee, Lord, to bless the Greek people. Keep alive in them the love of liberty for which they bravely fought and sacrificed. Grant that the Greek Nation ever may be on the side of justice, democracy, and freedom.

Lord God of Hosts, we pray for America, this land of ours, on which Thou hast bestowed so many rich blessings. Make us worthy of our inheritance. Let not Thy wrath descend upon us. Save us from new ordeals and tribulations, for wars and rumors of wars are shaking the equilibrium of the earth and heavy clouds are invading the tranquil heavens of peace.

O Ruler of the Universe, preserve in harmony those who govern us. Make them vigilant and keep them from falling into the spirit of sloth, faintheartedness, lust for power, and idle talk. Grant them, rather strength to do Thy will, wisdom to govern well, and make them worthy laborers of Thy kingdom, a kingdom of love, goodness, justice, mercy, and peace.

Lord of Love, who didst command the disciples to pray for their enemies and who didst pray for those who crucified Thee, grant that we, too, may forgive those who hate us and show brotherly love to those who maltreat us. Enlighten us, through the light of Thy truth, O Lord, and guide us in the paths of Thy precepts. Amen.

Mr. Speaker, the sons and daughters of Greece who, like Mr. Chumbris, are devoted to the democratic ideals steadfastly followed by the Greek Nation and our own, have contributed to the greatness of America. They, like all other Americans who believe in and adhere to those democratic ideals, are saddened today at the steadfast refusal of the British Government to grant the people of Cyprus the right to democratic self-determination, so that they may govern themselves or may join with Greece, their mother country, in a common government under a common heritage and culture.

And yet from Father Gallos' mouth we in the House heard these words sincerely offered in prayer:

Lord of Love, who didst command the disciples to pray for their enemies and who didst pray for those who crucified Thee, grant that we, too, may forgive those who hate us and show brotherly love to those who maltreat us.

In our hearts we all pray that the injustices occurring in Cyprus may be righted, and that the British Government and the people of Cyprus may reach a mutual understanding with our Lord's help, guidance and divine light, that will lead to peace and justice for all.

Public Policy Aspects of Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago it was my pleasure to address a Conference on Automation in Pittsburgh, Pa., cosponsored by the Pittsburgh Labor Education Council and Labor Education Service, Pennsylvania State University. My remarks were directed toward the public policy aspects of automation. Mr. Bruno A. Moski, Director of Industrial Engineering, Yale & Towne Manufacturing Co. presented the management viewpoint while Mr. Nat Goldfinger, economist from the Department of Research, AFL-CIO, presented the labor viewpoint. Delegates from AFL and CIO local unions and from lodges of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen from the western Pennsylvania area attended the conference and participated in the discussion which followed the formal presentation of the various viewpoints on this important subject.

Mr. Speaker, this Conference on Automation was an inspirational example of democracy in action, citizens meeting together to discuss the various aspects of a mutual problem which is of immediate concern to the working people of our country. The conference in Pittsburgh made an outstanding contribution toward the more widespread understanding of the impact which automation will have on our social and economic systems. I congratulate the Labor Extension Service of Penn State University and the Pittsburgh Labor Education Council for their outstanding leadership in making the conference an outstanding success and hope that this type of meeting may serve as a model of similar discussions in other parts of the United States.

The text of my address follows:

Congressional concern over the impact of automation on our citizens, our living habits, and our economy has many different aspects. I would like to discuss some of the more important of them in the brief time allotted me for this initial presentation. Others may come into our discussion as the result of questions following your buzz sessions.

I would like to devote my remarks here today to these major points in regard to automation: (1) Automation in the Federal Government; (2) the broad public policy aspects of automation; (3) the role of the Federal Government in meeting the challenge of automation; and (4) positive steps which should be taken now.

I. AUTOMATION IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

In our general consideration of automation, we have tended to direct our attention to the application of automation in industrial situations. We have learned of dramatic changes in the production-line uses of automation, whereby hundreds of workers have been replaced by a handful, because of the installation of awe-inspiring machines and electronically controlled operations.

Less has been heard about the impact of automation on various agencies and departments of the Federal Government. A recent article in the Wall Street Journal reported that machines to streamline paper work in the Bureau of Public Debt of the Treasury Department have reduced the number of employees in that office by two-thirds over the past 10 years. Records divisions of the Veterans' Administration and the Social Security Administration are drastically reducing their number of employees through the use of electronic machinery. The Weather Bureau now has a machine which automatically reproduces the weather maps appearing in our daily papers. Weather data is fed into the machine, and in 8 minutes it performs mathematical computations that would take one man 64 years to complete.

The Post Office Department will perhaps have the greatest use for electronic machinery in the years ahead. Already there are various machines in use which sort mail, and perform other similar mechanical functions. The Wall Street Journal reports that encouraging results have been obtained on tests of a new machine which can read typewritten addresses on letters and sort these letters by city of destination.

The Post Office has also installed a new stamp-vending machine for use in post offices. You drop in coins, dial the number of stamps you desire, and they are automatically dispensed. A recorded voice even says "thank you" to the stamp purchaser.

Thus, you see that all of the applications of automation are not confined to the field of industrial production, but affect workers in the Federal Government as well.

II. BROAD PUBLIC POLICY

In view of the broad social and economic ramifications of automation, what should be the role of the Federal Government? Or to phrase it another way, what are the public policy considerations in the impact of automation on our modern civilization? At the outset I feel that the advent of automation on our modern industrial scene requires us to carefully reexamine our basic philosophy of government, since the concern over the changes automation will bring to our daily lives in the years ahead intimately affects this concept of democratic government.

Our democratic system of government in America is unique because it places primary concern on the individual human being, his wants, his needs, his welfare. All power of government reposes in the hands of the individual citizens. Government is successful in terms of its ability to formulate and carry out policies which fulfill the needs and promote the welfare of the people who delegate certain powers to their government. Government which ignores the needs and welfare of all the people, in order to pursue courses of action beneficial to particular groups of its citizens, is violating our fundamental precepts of democratic government. Good government is responsive to the needs of its people and within its constitutional limitations, acts to meet problems or innovations

which conceivably could affect the well-being of its citizens. Such response of government to individual situations may be called public policy. Sound public policy, like good government, must be tailored to meet the needs of our people and must always keep foremost as its objective the promotion of human welfare and human values. Material progress at the expense of human suffering cannot be defended. This is the way of the totalitarian dictatorships and has no place in our democracy.

These are fundamental statements of fact which we must be aware of in the discussion of automation as it affects public policy. I am sure that most Americans today accept these time-honored philosophies of Government, which were written into our Constitution by the Founding Fathers and implemented by practice over the years.

In searching for a governmental policy to effectively deal with the problems raised by automation, we have certain insights gained by past experience. Automation has sometimes been referred to as the second industrial revolution. What policies were adopted by governments in the past when sudden technological changes appeared?

Most authorities agree that the first industrial revolution took place about 200 years ago, while our country was still divided into colonies of Great Britain. We all remember reading of the violent uprisings in England which accompanied the invention and application of labor-saving machinery in mills and factories. Thousands of workers were thrown out of work in the wave of social and political upheaval. As a result, human suffering under the rule of an absolute monarch caused untold misery and deprivation. Economic justification of the changes, brought about by the first industrial revolution, were expressed by the philosophy that government should not interfere in any way with the right of business and industry to carry out policies, even though they might be detrimental to the public good.

This philosophy dominated the 18th and 19th centuries and extended well into our present century. Certain reactionary elements of our business society even today still cling to this philosophy, which is evident in the lack of social responsibility in the pursuit of their policies.

In America, during the late 1800's, the introduction of mass-production methods brought about a notable acceleration of the first industrial revolution. This period marked the development and growth of giant corporate enterprises of such power as to rival our Government itself. "The public be damned," was the motto of these industrial giants. Their wealth and influence dominated the election of public officials at the State and National governmental levels. Unbridled power and wealth was a corrupting influence on the very foundations of democratic Government.

Resurging public opinion demanded regulation of these monopolistic giants. Anti-trust laws, regulatory laws, and court decisions were directed against them, but only a portion of their activities were ever brought under control. Legislation such as the Public Utility Holding Act, and the Securities and Exchange Act, passed during the New Deal years, was a later step to protect the public against further exploitation.

Governmental policy during the period of the growth of monopolistic corporate enterprises was generally one of nonintervention. When the abuses and power of these enterprises grew to such a point as to threaten our form of government, public opinion demanded action. But such action against entrenched economic interests was at best only a checkrein to further abuse.

Some people argue that our material progress during the past 75 years and our present high standard of living could not have taken

place otherwise. I am of a different opinion. It was not until corporate excesses began to be curbed that any real advancement of the welfare of the individual citizen took place. Labor was crushed by monopolistic corporate power until the depression and the New Deal afforded working people the legal right to organize and bargain collectively. It has been over the past 20 years that the real advances in our standard of living have taken place, and the role played by organized labor in winning a share of the fruits of corporate wealth is a matter of record.

Here is a lesson which was learned 75 years ago and which is applicable to our present discussion of automation. Government must not surrender its duty of protecting and promoting the welfare of all its citizens, especially in times of economic and technological upheavals. Economic and material progress must never again be permitted to travel a road paved with the bodies of workers, crushed in the mad scramble for wealth and power. Human dignity and the public good must not be subverted to personal greed.

Our Government has a legitimate right to become involved at the very beginning of this "Second Industrial Revolution" so that past abuses will never again be repeated. We, as citizens, should demand such public policies as are necessary to insure that the impact of automation will be intelligently directed toward the realization of benefits which will be enjoyed by all our citizens.

III. THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN MEETING THE CHALLENGE OF AUTOMATION

There can be no doubt that the problem of automation is a national issue. By the enactment of the Employment Act of 1946 the Congress of the United States gave legal recognition to the duty of the Federal Government to use its resources to create the conditions making for maximum employment, by fostering and promoting conditions which will afford job opportunities for all people desirous and capable of working.

If the results of automation were to take place suddenly and on a broad scale, millions of workers would be thrown out of work, competing against each other for fewer and fewer jobs at lower and lower pay. Our social and economic system would be in a chaos. Widespread depression and mass unemployment poses a dangerous threat to our democratic way of life. It would be disastrous both in terms of human suffering at home and in terms of the opportunity it would afford to Communist imperialism in its plan for domination of the free world. The stakes in the game are high. Either we adopt public policies to study, anticipate, and channel the course of automation toward human betterment, or like the Frankenstein monster, it may rise up to destroy us.

I am confident that intelligent and informed American citizens will not permit the potential blessings of automation to escape us or be turned against us. We will not permit our Government to stand idly by and await the full impact of automation without preparing ourselves for its effects. We cannot afford the luxury of inaction or failure to face up to the realities of automation. If the administration temporarily in control of the policies of our Government fails to take heed of the impending changes which automation will bring to every phase of our lives, I am sure that a new administration will be elected in its place which will take such action as is deemed necessary.

IV. POSITIVE STEPS NOW

What are some of the ways in which public policy can be effectively directed toward systematic preparation for the social, economic and technological changes brought about by automation?

First, there must be a recognition of automation, what it is, what it means, what

we estimate its effects will be, where its impact will be first felt, and other similar fact-finding questions. Meetings such as this are of tremendous importance because these types of questions are discussed. It is also important that the word "automation" and its meanings be made known to the great numbers of our people who do not have the opportunity of attending such meetings and who may not read or hear about automation. There must be widespread recognition and understanding of the problem, not in technical terms but in the basic understanding of what automation means to individual citizens and how the future of all of us depends on the adoption of sound public policy to deal with the problems which automation creates. Government is motivated into particular courses of action by an awareness of its citizens, and their ability to make their opinions known to their appropriate elected representatives who have a role in the formation of public policy.

One way of making your views known is to call the attention of your public officials to hearings before Joint Committee on the Economic Report. The hearings are entitled "Automation and Technological Change" and contain a wealth of information and statistical data submitted by the expert witnesses who appeared before the committee. A subsequent report on these hearings gives a concise statement of the basic facts of the problem of automation and offers policy recommendations to meet this problem.

Secondly, I feel that sound public policy required that every possible effort be made to strengthen our economy at its foundations so that temporary setbacks resulting from technological change may be compensated for elsewhere in the national economy. By this I mean the enactment of a broad legislative program to place greater purchasing power in the hands of the average citizens. This program would include an increase in personal income tax exemptions; an increase in the minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour and an extension of coverage; an increase in social-security benefits, a reduction of the retirement age, and a liberalization of other provisions of the law; liberalization of our unemployment compensation system; assistance to areas of chronic unemployment in the establishment of facilities for vocational rehabilitation, education, and retraining of displaced workers, especially older workers, and the attraction of new industries; an expanded health and medical research program; Federal aid for school and hospital construction; full development of our natural resources, and other similar type programs which will have a long-range beneficial effect on our economy while also meeting the most pressing economic needs of our people.

A dynamic, expanding, full-employment economy is perhaps the best way in which we can prepare ourselves for the impact of automation, and guarantee that hardships to displaced workers and their families will be kept at a minimum. A healthy, expanding economy will be able to absorb displaced workers as well as providing job opportunities for our young people entering the labor market.

Thirdly, it is the responsibility of enlightened management to face up to the broad social aspects of automation and understand and accept their full role in the process of technological change. Industry must be prepared to use part of the wealth and abundance created by more efficient and less costly production in the retraining of displaced workers so that their skills might be utilized in other parts of our economy. Industry has the responsibility of carefully planning and scheduling its production, so that loss of employment and resulting human suffering may be minimized. The institution of new automation machinery must be carefully planned so that due consideration is given to the general state of business

so that displaced workers may find new employment more readily.

Fourthly, the impact of automation places on organized labor the responsibility of meeting the challenge of technological advancement. I am proud to pay tribute to the statesmanlike position which the leaders of organized labor have taken in this regard. There will be no machine-smashing riots in the second industrial revolution in America, for the new labor-saving machines offer almost unlimited opportunities for human progress if our technical skill and ability are molded to the needs and betterment of all mankind. This does not mean that labor can afford to sit back and await the fruits of abundance created by more efficient labor-saving machinery. Labor must cooperate with enlightened management in the solution of mutual problems so that the mutual advantages which automation has in store for us may be fully realized. Labor must be prepared to offer constructive recommendations in the application of technological changes to specific situations. Labor must educate its membership to understand automation and mobilize public opinion in the community to a realization of the problems, opportunities and the challenge which we must all meet in this spirit of cooperation.

The horizon is filled with glorious opportunities. A bright new day is dawning, if only we can grasp its significance and adopt policies to meet the challenge of automation.

We look forward to shorter workweeks, more leisure time, greater cultural and recreational opportunities, travel, and an enjoyment of the good things of life with our families.

Men of good will—people in all walks of life, in labor, management, and in government—working together in a spirit of cooperation and brotherhood can achieve this goal of freedom, security, and abundance for which civilization has been struggling for thousands of years.

Congratulations, Mr. Kearns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all good Republicans and good Americans rejoice in the victory of our colleague, CARROLL D. KEARNS, in the Pennsylvania primaries yesterday. Pitted against him in the primary was one of the most formidable Republicans of his congressional district. He won, by unofficial reports, by more than 21,000 votes.

While I am not a native of Pennsylvania and know little about the political situation there, it does seem to me that this election's results indicate that our colleague, CARROLL KEARNS, is well on his road to a higher office in the great State of Pennsylvania. I believe that he would make an excellent governor, and an excellent Senator, should my good friend, Senator ED MARTIN, retire.

My wholehearted congratulations and best wishes go to my colleague, CARROLL KEARNS, for his future successes.

Slaughter of Israeli Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on April 11, 1956, a group of Arabs infiltrated into Israel and murdered in cold blood several children and their teachers while they were in the midst of prayer at Habad village. The inhabitants of that village are affiliated with a religious and philanthropic movement whose spiritual head is Chief Rabbi Menachem Schneerson, a resident of my district.

I have since received many telegrams of protest from congregations and various religious organizations in my district. Consequently, I have written a letter to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles urging him to take two steps: Condemn those who are responsible for this wanton murder and request indemnification for the families of the victims.

The following is the text of the letter addressed to the Secretary of State:

APRIL 24, 1956.

The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State, Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to you in connection with the massacre committed by Arab murderers who infiltrated into Israel on April 11, 1956, and slaughtered in cold blood a group of children and their teachers at prayer in Habad village. This is a most despicable act of atrocity committed against young and innocent children, who weren't even given a chance to defend themselves.

The children of this village in Israel are associated with the religious and philanthropic movement known as Hassidim, which is headed by Chief Rabbi Menachem Schneerson, a citizen of the United States and a resident of my district.

I have received less than 49 telegrams from congregations and various religious organizations in my district, bearing the signatures of the rabbis and presidents of these groups, in protest against the massacre at Habad village. These religious leaders implore our Government to take the necessary measures to prevent similar outrages in the future and the needless shedding of innocent blood.

Public opinion is still one of the most effective means of stopping such atrocities in a civilized world. I, therefore, urge you, Mr. Secretary, to take the following two steps:

First, to express in the strongest possible terms our Government's condemnation of those responsible for this act of murder.

Second, to request indemnification for the bereaved families of the victims.

I feel certain that if these two steps are taken it would greatly discourage such inhuman and barbarous acts in the future.

Sincerely,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

The wording of the telegram from the religious organizations and congregations, signed by their respective rabbis or presidents, is as follows:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 23, 1956.

Congressman VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Washington, D. C.:

The children slain in cold blood while at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, last Wednesday, belong with numerous congregations

and schools in America to the same family of Habad Lubavitch followers of purely religious and philanthropic Hassidic movement headed by Chief Rabbi Menachem Schneerson, American citizen, with headquarters in Brooklyn, N. Y. We are our brothers' keeper grieved and heartbroken at cold-blooded murder of young brothers in Holy Land. We demand our Government take energetic effective steps to prevent similar massacre and assure indemnification of bereaved families.

Congregation Bikur Cholim, Rabbi Sholom Hecht; Congregation Tifereth Israel, Meyer Hasper, President; Congregation Kesser Torah, Rabbi Weinberg I. Rosenberg, President; Congregation Beth Aaron Beth Sholom, Rabbi E. Berman; Congregation Chevra Thilim, M. Bernstein, President; Congregation Skwer, Mr. Holtzman, President; Congregation Emunah Sheleimo, Rabbi A. Jacobson; Congregation Chevra Kadishe, Rabbi A. Katzman; Congregation Shaar Hashomayim, Rabbi Rosenbaum; New Hebrew School, Rabbi S. Spiegel, S. Beck, President; Congregation Ollem Sholeim, M. Widovsky, President; Chevra Mishnayos Anshel Wolin, I. Y. Zwieg, President; Congregation B'nei Israel, Rabbi Samuel Baskin, L. Grossman, President; Congregation Beis Aaron Anshel Sfar, D. Weissman, President; Congregation Machzikei Emes, Rabbi Auerbach; Congregation Arugas Haboshem, Grand Rabbi L. Greenwald, Mr. Rosenberg, President; Chevra Liadi, Rabbi Klein; Congregation Pride of Israel, Rabbi Malenick; Congregation Kehal Chareidim, Rabbi Moskowitz, Mr. Friedman, President; Congregation Balchwer, Ch. Meyer, President; Congregation Anshel Ujehle, Rabbi I. Meisels, J. M. Zeldenfeld, President; Chevra Bikur Cholim, Rabbi S. Novick, A. Goodman, President; Agudas Achim, Rabbi B. Z. Peffer, H. Kuznick, President; Congregation Beth Yitzchok, Rabbi Rabino-witz; Congregation B'nal Yissochor, Rabbi L. Spiro; Congregation Adas Yeshurun, Rabbi Teitz; Congregation Beth Jacob, Mr. Pilchick, President; Congregation Shearith Israel, N. Landman, President; Congregation Bnei Issochor, Rabbi E. Shapiro, M. Mermelstein, President; Congregation Knesset Israel, Rabbi E. Cohen, Mr. Finkel, President; Congregation Torah Utefila, Rabbi A. Levine, Mr. Trattner, President; Congregation Dershowitz, Rabbi M. L. Malik, Samuel Dershowitz, President; Congregation Sheveth Achim, Mr. Jagadnik, President; Congregation Kol Israel, Rabbi Shinaller, L. Yandah, President; Boyaner Kloiz, Rabbi I. Stern, M. Weitman, President; Pirchei Agudas Israel, M. Lazar, President; Congregation B'nal Jacob Anshel Sholom, Rabbi Bunim; Congregation Glory Israel, J. Gilberglat, President; Congregation Ahavas Achim Bnal Israel, L. Kott, Secretary; Young Israel of Willoughby, Rabbi Yachnes, Joe King, President; Chasidei Belza, Rabbi M. Feder, M. Weiss, President; Congregation Or Itzhok, Rabbi E. Rosenbaum, J. Kleinbrand, President; Young Israel of Brooklyn, B. Solomon, President; Beth Hamerdrash Chasidei Amshenov, Rabbi I. Kalish; Adas Yereim, H. Lipschitz, President; Congregation Kehilat Jacob, Rabbi J. Grunwald, H. Lipschutz, President; Congregation Divrei Jechezkal, Rabbi Supnick; Congregation Netzach Israel, Rabbi M. Horowitz; National Council of Young Israel, Meyer Wiener, President, Elijah Stein, Chairman of Eretz Israel Committee.

A Well-Deserved Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for his factual, fearless, and exceptionally meritorious work, Clark R. Mollenhoff, of the Des Moines Register and Tribune and the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, has been given the Raymond Clapper Memorial Award.

Many of us in Congress have long realized that Mollenhoff's courage, ability, discrimination, and desire to get and report the facts have over the years given the Members of Congress as well as the public the facts not only in connection with the doings of Wolf Ladejinsky, but that he has been true to what I assume to be the reporter's objective—ascertaining and giving to the public an accurate narrative of the incidents he has been called upon to report.

All too often reporters have forgotten what the public has assumed to be their function—a narration of what actually was said or happened in connection with a specific incident. All too frequently, reading carefully a news story, one has found himself compelled to reexamine the article, determine if possible where the factual statement ended, where the expression of an opinion—an editorial or commentator's function—began.

Mollenhoff is not lacking in either the ability or the courage to express an opinion, but his writings make it easy for the reader to separate the two when they are joined in the same story.

Few reporters or writers have done more to clearly, accurately lay the facts on the record, expose the misuse of health and welfare funds, the dues and special assessments paid by union members, the violence and lawlessness in which some—fortunately a few—of their officials have engaged. The stories which he has written about these activities have been a warning to sincere union members and leaders, a notice to legislators of the need for sound, courageous action by them.

From the following press notice comes the notification of the award:

MOLLENHOFF GETS CLAPPER AWARD

The Raymond Clapper Memorial Award, given annually for exceptionally meritorious work by a newspaper correspondent in Washington, was won last night by Clark R. Mollenhoff, of the Des Moines Register and Tribune and the Minneapolis Star and Tribune.

Mr. Mollenhoff, 12th winner of the award established in memory of the late Washington correspondent, received a \$500 check and scroll in a ceremony at the closing dinner of the American Society of Newspaper Editors at the Hotel Statler.

The judges, five ASNE members, awarded him first prize for his stories concerning Wolf Ladejinsky, former United States agriculture attaché in Tokyo who figured in a controversy over Federal security regulations.

The Time To Help Small Business Is Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 24, 1956, I had the pleasure of addressing the National Association of Tool & Die Manufacturers at its ninth annual dinner held at the Hotel Statler in Washington, D. C. My address follows:

REMARKS OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, OF NEW YORK, AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TOOL AND DIE MANUFACTURERS

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is nice to be with you again even though this is the first time you have invited me to sing for my dinner. I probably should have declined on two grounds. First, I have no union card, and, second, your very fine entertainers would no doubt refuse to appear on the same program with me properly urging that my talent fell short of their minimum criteria for entertainment.

Nevertheless, I am prepared to leave with you some of my thoughts. I know that at least some of you may disagree with me but controversy is good for the American soul; that is, the political soul—particularly in an election year.

It has been my happy privilege to serve on the House Small Business Committee for many years. It is one of the few committees of Congress which has been truly non-partisan. I cannot recall a single recommendation coming from that committee which did not have bipartisan support.

Therefore you should bear in mind that anything I say that is critical is deliberately intended to be critical but is just as deliberately intended not to be political.

The criticisms that have come from my committee were always made constructively, never destructively, and always made without regard to the political affiliations of the appointee against whom directed.

I sincerely believe that my Republican colleagues on our committee will endorse what I say.

I will try to relate my remarks directly to your interests.

You will hear more and more as the year rolls on that small business is the backbone of our free-enterprise economy and that big business aided by big business in Government is more and more throttling small business.

While none of you are small in the colloquial sense, you are small business in accordance with our legal definition. Each of you represents a business which is independently owned and not dominant in your industry. That is the new language of the statute, which defines small business.

The Defense Department had an arbitrary legal definition that any firm with 500 or more employees was big business and any firm with less than 500 employees was small.

The reason for the change of the definition is important. The Congress found that small business must be protected against the depredations of big business and of big government and accordingly, enacted into law many aids, safeguards, and even preferences for small business.

These laws were enacted because the facts as developed in dozens of hearings, sustained by volumes of testimony and documentary evidence demanded them.

Similarly, almost a year ago we enacted a law repealing the Defense Department's arbitrary definition and making it mandatory that the Small Business Act definition, which I enunciated before, be uniformly applied in all Government agencies.

Now, I do not care whether that policy has not been implemented and enforced by the Defense Department because Charlie Wilson is big business or favors big business or because his subordinates unbeknownst to him have failed to do so for fear of antagonizing the boss. You and I are not concerned with the motives, good or bad. We are concerned that the congressional committees that urged that policy upon him before enactment of the law, were told that the policy was a good one and should be the rule.

We are more concerned with the simple incontrovertible fact that a conceded good doctrine was not voluntarily effectuated and the Congress was compelled to and did mandate it. The same agency continues to ignore and flout the law.

That is typical of how small business is being mistreated by the executive department of the Government.

We get fine speeches from the top echelon about broadening the base, integrating small business into Government procurement, both military and civilian, and about requiring the big prime contractors to subcontract a fair portion of their contracts to small business. They come into our hearings and document their slogans and shibboleths with directives and regulations.

Then we go out into the field only to learn that the complaints from small business have increased both in number and in bitterness.

What do we find?

Except for isolated instances we find the procurement offices fighting small business and making it impossible for them to get into the program, withholding plans and specifications, imposing impossible conditions, putting obstacles in the way of performance, demanding changes and extras without compensation, and delaying their payments interminably.

Our latest field investigations were made during the Easter vacation only a few weeks ago.

We found that it took 6 to 9 months for directives to reach the personnel in the field and then too frequently they were promptly ignored by the people charged with enforcing them.

Our Defense Department is still spending about \$40 billion per year. How much of it are you getting? Not very much. All the small business throughout the whole country is only getting 17.6 percent of the prime contracts.

I am amused and at the same time terrified by Government economists who prate about our prosperity and our stability.

Our national gross income is stable they tell us. Of course, it is when you add big business income to farmers' income to small business income. The total of the gross is about the same for 1955 as for 1954.

What they do not tell you is that the gross income of big business is up over a billion two hundred million dollars and the gross income of the rest of our economy is down by a billion dollars.

They tell you that bankruptcies for the whole country are no more than in the previous years. Of course, they are. Big business failures have practically disappeared and those of the rest of our economy have nearly doubled.

They tell you that the number of business firms has remained stable in the last 3 years, that is, it has not changed. They do not tell you that in the prior 3 years our economy grew to the extent of 50,000 new firms a year. What about the manufacturing firms

with less than \$250,000 in assets? We are getting closer home to you now. They are the bulk of your customers. Their prosperity or lack of it, is directly tied to yours.

In the first 6 months of 1952 they netted profits after taxes of \$175 million. Last year for the same period they netted only \$60 million. Did you get the difference of \$115 million? I doubt it.

From 1952 to 1955 these same firms had 40 percent less funds available for reinvestment and expansion. That means 40 percent less with which to buy your tools and dies.

But neither you nor they need investment capital. Oh, no. You just call up your banker and tell him what you need—and try to get it.

A recent survey shows that 10,000 manufacturing companies, many of them your customers, will need about \$100 million this year to fulfill their contracts.

Big business borrows long-term money at low rates from the insurance companies, sells bonds to the banks and investment houses or sells stock to the underwriters and the public.

What do you and your customers do?

If the bankers have not yet told you they will. They will say:

"The Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board are afraid of inflation. They are tightening up on credit. They are raising reserve requirements so we will have less to lend. They are making us buy more Government bonds for the same reason. They are raising the discount rates so we must charge you more interest, so that you cannot afford to borrow."

Congress set up a Small Business Administration which should be able to help you but don't be too optimistic about that. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, both big businessmen control the Loan Policy Board of that Administration. Believe me the Congress wants the Small Business Administration to succeed in serving you.

But the latest figures do not augur too well. They show an average of 11,000 inquiries a month. During the first 2 years of operation only 395 direct loans had been made.

In the insecure world in which we live today, America must always be alert and prepared. It is essential in order to maintain a defense potential that we stockpile the necessary machine tools needed in any war effort. Therefore, let us look at a program in which you, the National Tool & Die Manufacturers, are vitally interested. An industrial mobilization program was developed after the Korean incident. Under this program it was intended that the Government spend up to \$800 million a year for the acquisition of machine tools considered essential to maintain our defense potential. If this program had been followed America's bastion of defense now would contain about \$2,400,000,000 worth of long-lead-time machine tools; the large and complex machines that require for their own engineering and building a period of many months. The economy aspect of this policy is striking. It was reasoned that instead of actually producing weapons in great volume and taking the chance that these might become obsolete before they were needed, it would be more economical to mobilize capability of production equipment, build and keep up-to-date numerous machines which would be available for defense tasks when the need arose. Although the administration developed such a program, little has happened under it. Congress appropriated \$250 million for that specific purpose. Only \$29 million has been utilized.

Long delays, continual procrastination, and failure to plan ahead have resulted in the almost complete failure of that part of

our industrial mobilization program. Purchasing was cut short by a pretended economy in the Defense Department after only a negligible volume of orders had been placed. This great failure has caused fears that in the event of war there will be a repetition of the same difficulties, the same problems, the same desperate need for complicated weapons, and the same restrictions that hampered output of vital weapons in the last two emergencies.

Is that business that was intended for you, now being channeled into big business?

I do not know.

But my committee intends to find out unless blocked by the favorite but much abused answer to congressional committees—the information is classified.

There is another aspect of our economy which is very bad and needs attention. Small businesses complain of the inability to obtain steel, steel scrap, aluminum, copper, nickel, lead, newsprint, plate glass, and almost every essential material. They point out that the historical allotment pattern used by the suppliers discriminates against the small business firms because they are unable to obtain greater allotments as their orders increase. If they are new users, they are not able to get supplies at all. As prices of basic materials rise the small businessman is squeezed by the inability to raise the price of its products or to pass the increased cost on to its customer. I do not pretend to know the answer. I can only say that I am not satisfied with the administration's answer that in a free economy there is no remedy.

Criticism without suggested remedy may in turn be criticized as ineffective. My suggested remedies are simple:

1. Tax relief to small business that will permit it to retain as much of its earnings as it needs for modernization, expansion, and working capital.

2. Appointments to high Government positions of men who understand that small business is the backbone of our economy and who will devote themselves to executing our laws in the spirit in which they were intended to operate so as to aid, not hinder, small business.

3. Finally, to the big businessmen in Government who give me a big pain, every time they tell you they, too, were small once, you should say, "big boy, move over and give me a chance, too."

Thank you for listening to me.

Address by Hon. Herbert C. Bonner, of North Carolina, Before the Hampton Roads Maritime Association, Norfolk, Va., Thursday, April 19, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, recently the distinguished chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee addressed the 36th annual banquet of the Hampton Roads Maritime Association at Norfolk. It was my privilege to present Mr. BONNER to this gathering of outstanding business people in my district.

The Hampton Roads Maritime Association represents the shipping and

maritime interests in the entire Hampton Roads area. Although the majority of its members are residents of my district, its membership includes the leaders of this industry in the Newport News community, represented by my colleague, Mr. ROBESON. This association has been a moving force in harbor development and in the stimulation of the movement of overseas commerce through the great world port of Hampton Roads. It has been tremendously effective because of the outstanding leadership provided by its able officials.

Mr. BONNER's address includes much valuable information which I believe would be of interest to the entire membership of the House, and for that reason I have asked permission to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. HERBERT C. BONNER, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BEFORE THE 36TH ANNUAL BANQUET OF THE HAMPTON ROADS MARITIME ASSOCIATION, NORFOLK, VA., APRIL 19, 1956

President Black, members of the Hampton Roads Maritime Association, distinguished guests, nothing could please me more than to have the privilege to speak to you here in Hampton Roads today in celebration of the 36th anniversary of the Hampton Roads Maritime Association. My interest in your excellent port is twofold.

As chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee in the House of Representatives, I feel deeply concerned about the maritime commerce in and out of all the ports of the United States—and their adequacy to serve the needs of the Nation in times of peace and in times of emergency.

In addition, as a North Carolinian, I view with personal feeling the capacity, the health, and the growth of the great harbor of Hampton Roads which provides a vital link between my home State and the other Southeastern States to the markets of the world. I feel a very close affinity with all you gentlemen and your port when I think of the fact that during 1954, out of more than a quarter of a million net tons of unmanufactured tobacco exported from the combined customs districts of the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, shipments from the Virginia ports totaled over 200,000 net tons, representing better than 60 percent of the total.

I have been thinking back over the years since your association was formed, early in 1920, to organize the efforts of this combined community in the development of the port and the area, in bold effort to hold and develop the overseas commerce which suddenly grew during and immediately following World War I. Our great \$3 billion wartime ship-building effort was still not quite completed. Private enterprise was beginning to wake up to the possibilities of American-flag shipping. And, remembering the costly and near tragic consequences of our prewar blindness to the importance of participating with our own ships in the development of foreign commerce—remembering the absolute necessity for maintaining an effective posture of readiness on our sea frontiers—th.t same year saw the enactment of our first legislative program for a merchant fleet in the Merchant Marine Act of 1920. In 1920 Hampton Roads exported nearly 7½ million tons of goods, worth over \$226 million, with imports of 331,000 tons worth well over \$10 million. Business was good, and the population of about 200,000 was expanding.

The intervening years have seen many ups and downs—years of recessions, depressions, and prosperity—years of hot and cold wars. They have seen the high hopes of the early postwar years fade from the great expansion with the new ships of World War I, when we carried more than 50 percent of our total exports and imports, to 1935, when, despite efforts in Congress and in the industry to carry out our maritime policy, we found our merchant fleet 2d in tonnage, 5th in speed, and 8th in age, among the fleets of the world. In 1939, when war broke out again in Europe, we were only carrying 22 percent of our foreign trade.

By a miracle of coincidence, some of the errors of World War I were avoided as the result of the timely enactment and implementation of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. This was followed by the tremendous construction program of modern merchant ships during the war, without which the struggle for democracy would have been lost to the Axis powers. After the war we tried to establish a definite and realistic policy for returning our shipping to privately operated peacetime commerce.

Over the years we have made some progress—but not enough. And the signs, again, point to the old pattern which must be avoided at all costs. During the first 6 months of 1946 the United States merchant fleet carried an average of 67.5 percent of our exports and imports. In 1949, we carried 45 percent, and today we are carrying less than 25 percent of our foreign trade.

The diligent and informed efforts of groups such as yours, which have survived the ups and downs of the dramatic—and sometimes violent—events following the First World War, are perhaps more vital right now than ever before. Today your port ranks third on the Atlantic coast, after New York and Baltimore. Exports from Hampton Roads have more than doubled, both in tonnage and value, since the foundation of your association. More impressively, your imports are 8 times the tonnage of 1920, with a value more than 13 times greater. You are the leading coal port in the United States, and commodities of all kinds move through Hampton Roads to and from all areas of the world. You have modern facilities, excellent shipbuilding and repair yards, good labor relations, and industry of all kinds establishing or expanding plants in the area.

This great development of your port has coincided with the period when we, as a Nation, have adopted a national maritime policy—a policy which, sometimes strongly—sometimes feebly—we have sought to make effective in the interests of our economy and national security.

Yet, with business so good and with the firm bonds of friendship and alliance with the maritime nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, is there a national and economic necessity for our Government to support an American merchant marine?

This Nation had so neglected its merchant marine prior to the outbreak of the First World War in Europe that our ships were carrying only nine percent of our export-import trade. In 1914, while we were still a neutral Nation, we found ourselves without ships for even our basic needs. Our foreign trade was paralyzed, and goods and materials were piling up on the docks.

During that period, much of the foreign-flag shipping upon which we had so heavily relied was withdrawn because of the outbreak of war in Europe. Thus, even before the heavy movement of munitions, ocean shipping rates went up 700 percent. By the time this country entered, these rates skyrocketed to 2,000 percent.

Our experience in World War II was a little better. At least the beginning of a modern American-flag merchant marine had been started under the impetus of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. Despite the

vastly greater demands upon shipping, at no time during that period did American shipping rates rise higher than 70 percent.

Think of where we—and probably the world—would be today if we had not come out of World War II with a strong merchant marine in operating condition, ready to serve in the rehabilitation of the war-torn and weakened countries of Europe and Asia—and thereby provide a bulwark against the insidious advances of communism.

Then we had the years of the Korean conflict, which was supposed to be a United Nations war. At that time, even though the fleets of friendly nations had been extensively restored through purchases of surplus vessels from the United States at bargain-basement prices, it was American ships that supplied better than 80 percent of all ocean transportation to Korea.

I hate to think of what would have happened to ocean shipping rates if there had not been an American fleet to hold the line.

In one sense, it seems incredible that the need for an American-flag merchant marine can still remain a subject for debate. Yet, even today, there are many Americans, including some in high quarters, who fail to realize that a reasonably powerful American merchant marine is more than an arm of our military defense. Of equal if not greater importance, the merchant marine is the protection which provides against a strong enemy on the economic front. It is our guarantee that American exports will reach their markets speedily and in competition with other producing countries of the world. And it is our insurance that we will receive the imports that are so necessary to maintain our economy.

Of 38 critical industrial metals and minerals vital to our industrial society, the United States is self-sufficient in only 9. We import by ship two-fifths of our copper, and nearly one-third of our lead and zinc—all classified as strategic minerals by the Munitions Board. We are almost entirely dependent upon foreign sources for tin, nickel, and platinum. And, of the 20 alloying elements necessary for steel production, the United States is deficient in about a dozen. These facts speak for themselves as to the vital necessity for an American merchant marine.

Less than 2 years ago, the Congress enacted Public Law 664, known as the Cargo Preference Act. I am sure you are all familiar with this legislation. It provides that at least 50 percent of all the United States cargoes given away or sold for foreign currencies must be transported overseas on privately owned United States-flag vessels, if such vessels are available at fair and reasonable rates. Prior to the enactment of the permanent 50-50 law, beginning with the Marshall plan, there was an annual fight each time a foreign-aid bill came up in Congress over the inclusion of the cargo preference clause. This happened no less than 11 times.

This policy has been the salvation of the American merchant marine during these postwar years. Foreign-aid programs have constituted the bulk of our export foreign commerce. These programs have been conducted on a government-to-government basis, and are totally lacking in the characteristics of ordinary commercial practices. Had it not been for this policy of assurance of 50 percent of these cargoes for United States-flag vessels, I am certain that much, if not all, of the freight would have been directed to the shipping of other maritime nations.

In 1955, when the Cargo Preference Act was less than a year old, charges appeared in the press to the effect that the administration's program for selling farm surpluses

overseas was "running into a bottleneck because of a ship-American provision in the law." It was alleged that the Department of Agriculture was having trouble finding space on American vessels.

We, on the Merchant Marine Committee, were deeply concerned by these allegations and scheduled an immediate investigation.

After full hearings, the committee found no basis in fact for the charges. There was no evidence that shipments to foreign countries of surplus agricultural commodities were being delayed in any way by reason of the Cargo Preference Act. The plain truth is that the act could not have any such effect.

Despite the convincing and objective record of our investigation into the administration and operation of the Cargo Preference Act, an effort was made to nullify its effectiveness by an amendment to a foreign-aid bill reported to the House in May of last year. After spirited debate on the floor of the House, the amendment was defeated by an overwhelming majority, and the 50-50 principle again received a resounding vote of confidence.

But the attacks upon the law did not cease. They shifted to other flanks, but increased in intensity. Allegations were made during the latter part of last year by farm groups and others that the surplus disposal program under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.) was suffering by reason of the application to it of the 50-50 cargo preference law. It was said that foreign countries refused to enter into agreements subject to the 50-50 shipping provision; that the operation of the law results in American agriculture providing an indirect subsidy to American shipping, to the detriment of the disposal program; and that the existence of the 50-50 law establishes an undesirable precedent in world trade and offers encouragement to countries which are disposed to adopt similar discriminations in favor of their own national flag.

Again, the House Merchant Marine Committee felt obliged to examine the operation of the law in relation to the farm surplus disposal program.

In hearings held over a period of 3 weeks, during which some 38 witnesses appeared before the committee, we heard expressions of every possible point of view. We spent 2 full days receiving testimony from the administrator of Foreign Agricultural Services and other top officials of the Department of Agriculture, in order that we might overlook no fact bearing upon the opposition which the Department had expressed to the application of cargo preference to the surplus commodity program. The State Department likewise expressed objections to the law. This was, of course, no surprise and nothing new for the State Department. Since I have been in Congress they have opposed almost every bill designed to strengthen the American merchant marine. Opposition was also expressed by the International Cooperation Administration. In addition, we invited the testimony of agricultural groups who were known to have expressed objections to the 50-50 principle. We went still further. We took the unusual step of inviting one of the leading shipping men of Northern Europe. He came all the way from Norway and gave us his views. The American shipping industry was called upon to account for its stewardship in carrying out the 50-50 law and of assuring the success of the agricultural surplus disposal programs.

These two exhaustive and objective studies of the operation of the Cargo Preference Act have proved conclusively that it has not, does not, and cannot work any serious detriment to American agriculture. Now, let me say a few words of what it means

to American shipping. The implications of it are devastatingly simple.

The Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board brought out some interesting but, in some respects, disturbing figures. During the years 1953-54, American-flag vessels carried only 23 percent of the dry cargo exports from the United States. In other words, this low percentage obtained even with the assistance provided by the 50-50 provision; the loss of those aid cargoes by the removal of 50-50 would reduce our carryings from 23 percent to 19.5 percent.

In the past 2 years the 9½ million tons of aid cargoes produced estimated freight revenues of \$142½ million. The Board Chairman concluded that the financial return to the United States from the application of 50-50 far exceeded the small differential of \$3 million charged to Department of Agriculture appropriations. Much of this freight revenue was returned to the Government in taxes. Another substantial part was deposited to statutory reserve funds to be used for the construction of new vessels to replace those which are now becoming obsolete. And, of course, bearing in mind the portion of those cargoes carried by American-flag tramps, that segment of our merchant marine was virtually kept in existence by earnings from foreign aid freights. Living in our greatest coal port, you here in Hampden Roads can appreciate the dangerous significance of the loss of those 70-odd Liberty ships that make up our tramp fleet.

I like to think our efforts to bring out the truth about 50-50 have not been in vain. It was reassuring and gratifying when the Senate voted overwhelmingly to strike a provision from the farm bill which would have seriously crippled the 50-50.

I realize I have devoted considerable time to the Cargo Preference Act and its meaning to the American economy and security. I have done so because I believe it is one phase of the problem where we, in the Congress, have been most effective.

If there were such a thing as a free international trade, I, for one, would favor the full, open and fair competition. Unhappily, we do not have today anything approaching free international trade. On the contrary, we have our vast Government-sponsored foreign aid and rehabilitation programs, a program for the disposal of agricultural surpluses, at reduced prices with payment in foreign currency, and programs for the importation of strategic materials—all conducted outside the normal channels of trade. We are confronted with currency exchange problems in many countries. We are confronted with numerous instances of Government monopolies in foreign countries where nationalistic policy directs transportation on vessels of their own flag. In the face of these overwhelming obstacles, the survival of our merchant marine is heavily dependent upon continuing interest and support of our Government.

We, in Congress, are trying to do our share to develop and maintain the merchant marine which we need. But we cannot do it all.

In my many years with the Merchant Marine Committee, I have been concerned with the expense involved in the Government's support of our maritime policy, and yet each year we seem to be falling behind in progress toward the goals set forth in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

Today, more people with higher incomes are creating an expanding market for homes, durable goods, and for many items which were once considered luxuries or nonessentials. Along with all this demand for new goods has come new demands for travel, brought on by paid vacations and a reduction in the workweek. At present the population of the United States is increasing at

the rate of almost 3 million persons per year. I have heard estimates that by 1965 it will be one-fifth larger than it was in 1953—while production will be one-half again greater—disposable income per person will be one-third larger—and the hours of work one-tenth less.

These trends are not something which developed this year, or this administration, or the previous one—they have been clearly present for years. Yet, today, this Nation, which prides itself on its greatness—its technical and inventive genius—and its productivity, is able to provide only a small fraction of the means for transporting its foreign commerce, upon which it depends more than any other nation in the world.

At present levels, our export foreign trade is almost three times the monthly average of 1.9 million tons exported in 1938. Our 1955 imports are double the 1.7 million tons imported monthly in 1938.

While overseas passenger traffic is expanding at an unprecedented rate, we have much less than one-third the passenger capacity that we had in 1939. In 1954, American-flag steamship lines, operating their passenger vessels at near capacity, carried only 18 percent of the tremendous passenger movement between the east coast of the United States and the tourist mecca of northern Europe. Today the percentage is undoubtedly even less, in view of new foreign ships which have entered the services.

I am keenly aware that nearby we have one of the greatest shipyards in the United States. So it is particularly appropriate that I refer briefly to a hope—yes, an intense desire—that the members of my committee have entertained for some time. You all know that the flagship and pride of the American merchant marine is the great superliner, *United States*. To watch that ship glide majestically up the North River in New York is a wonderful sight. It is as much a part of America as the Star Spangled Banner.

The trouble is we need another, a sister-ship, in order to provide a well-balanced passenger service to northern Europe under the American flag. With 1 ship it is like walking on 1 leg. So, it is our hope that before many months go by we will hear the familiar and heart-warming sound of those giant cranes and see the hustle and bustle of activity in the building of another great merchant ship—a new steamship *America*—with all the speed, comfort, and safety of the steamship *United States*. At this time I wish to pledge the full and wholehearted support of the Merchant Marine Committee to the fulfillment of that purpose. If legislation is, or becomes, necessary, I am sure I speak for my colleagues on the committee when I give public assurance of speedy, careful consideration to a feasible proposal.

In the extensive inquiries which the Merchant Marine Committee has made into all phases of our merchant marine, I have seen deficiencies which should be corrected. For example, there are problems in the labor-management field. But I do see hope for improvement in those relationships. There are serious problems in other areas too, that we are struggling to remedy.

I do not mean to imply that all is bad or hopeless. Nevertheless, shortcomings stand out like a sore thumb in every phase of our merchant marine. Part of the reason for this lies in the fact that so much Government money is involved. By the same token, we must all be vigilant and strenuous in our efforts to preserve the merchant marine of this country against attack from both within and without. This means, first of all, cleaning out all the dirty corners, and then, keeping the house in good order at all times.