

Spain, and friendly Far Eastern nations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2630). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 277. An act for the relief of Jean Pfeifer; without amendment (Rept. No. 2600). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1893. An act for the relief of Harold D. Robison; without amendment (Rept. No. 2601). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAMER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 908. A bill for the relief of August J. Strigga; with amendment (Rept. No. 2602). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAMER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 540. Resolution to provide for sending the bill H. R. 7740 and accompanying papers to the United States Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 2603). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6185. A bill for the relief of the E. B. Kaiser Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2604). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAMER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9755. A bill for the relief of Elmer L. Henderson; with amendment (Rept. No. 2605). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 12108. A bill to revise the Alaska game law; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 12109. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide an opportunity for tenants in certain rental housing projects to present written objections to proposed rent increases, and to make the eviction of such tenants subject to regulation by the Federal Housing Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FALLON (by request):

H. R. 12110. A bill to provide for the appointment of a Federal Highway Administrator in the Bureau of Public Roads, one

additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 12111. A bill to prevent the loss of longevity grade benefits of postal field service employees by reason of 1-day intervals in certain service under temporary appointments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 12112. A bill to amend section 72 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 12113. A bill to incorporate the Boys' Clubs of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 12114. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for refund or credit of internal revenue taxes paid or determined and customs duties paid on distilled spirits, wines, beer, tobacco products, and cigarette papers and tubes lost, rendered unmarketable, or condemned by authorized officials as a result of a major disaster; to provide for refund of internal revenue tax paid on beer lost or rendered unmarketable as result of floods of 1951; and to provide for refund or credit of taxes paid on distilled spirits and wines of Puerto Rican manufacture lost or rendered unmarketable or condemned by health authorities as result of hurricanes of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 12115. A bill to provide for additional Federal aid for highways to those States which do not levy a third structure highway-use tax; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 12116. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the Maritime Administration Reserve Shipyard at Wilmington, N. C., in exchange for certain lands to be conveyed by the North Carolina State Ports Authority to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 12117. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort De Soto as a national memorial; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 12118. A bill to make the library of Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, a depository for Government publications; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 12119. A bill relating to clerk hire of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 12120. A bill to provide increases in service-connected disability compensation

and to increase dependency allowances; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 12121. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. Con. Res. 262. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to print 40,000 additional copies of the hearings of the Research and Development Subcommittee on Progress Report on Research in Medicine, Biology, and Agriculture Using Radioactive Isotopes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. Res. 576. Resolution authorizing an investigation of damage claims resulting from sonic blasts; 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 Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 12122. A bill for the relief of Sadie Lobe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 12123. A bill for the relief of Shmuel Zwi (Herman) Adler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 12124. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emmeline Carter Gay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 12125. A bill for the relief of Gordon Sidney William Barson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 12126. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yoshiko Szymanski; 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:

1186. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Macie E. Johnson and other women of the Friendly class in the Bible School of the First Christian Church, Carthage, Mo., urging the passage of the bill preventing the advertising of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1187. Also, petition of Mrs. M. O. Purvis, chairman of community missions, First Baptist Church, Appleton City, Mo., and other citizens of St. Clair County and Christian mothers, urging the passage of H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising from radio, television, and national magazines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### Declaration of Independence, 1776-1956

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we have just celebrated our greatest national holiday, July 4, or, as it is sometimes called, Independence Day.

It might be well at this time to renew acquaintance with the document that was the result of pioneer action in declaring the 13 United States free and independent.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the Declaration of Independence as originally executed:

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, 1776—IN CONGRESS, JULY 4, 1776—THE UNANIMOUS DECLARATION OF THE THIRTEEN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

WHEN in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected

them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.—That whenever any Form of Government becomes

destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shewn, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security.—Such has been the patient sufferance of these Colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former Systems of Government. The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these States. To prove this, let Facts be submitted to a candid world.

He has refused his Assent to Laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

He has forbidden his Governors to pass Laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his Assent should be obtained; and when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.

He has refused to pass other Laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of Representation in the Legislature, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only.

He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their public Records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures.

He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly, for opposing with manly firmness his invasions on the rights of the people.

He has refused for a long time, after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected; whereby the Legislative powers, incapable of Annihilation, have returned to the People at large for their exercise; the State remaining in the mean time exposed to all the dangers of invasion from without, and convulsions within.

He has endeavoured to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the Laws for Naturalization of Foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migrations hither, and raising the conditions of new Appropriations of Lands.

He has obstructed the Administration of Justice, by refusing his Assent to Laws for establishing Judiciary powers.

He has made Judges dependent on his Will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.

He has erected a multitude of New Office, and sent hither swarms of Officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance.

He has kept among us, in times of peace, Standing Armies without the Consent of our legislatures.

He has affected to render the Military independent of and superior to the Civil power.

He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his Assent to their acts of pretended Legislation:

For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us:

For protecting them, by a mock Trial, from punishment for any Murders which they

should commit on the Inhabitants of these States:

For cutting off our Trade with all parts of the world:

For imposing Taxes on us without our Consent:

For depriving us in many cases, of the benefits of Trial by Jury:

For transporting us beyond seas to be tried for pretended offenses;

For abolishing the free System of English Laws in a neighbouring Province, establishing therein an Arbitrary government, and enlarging its Boundaries so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these Colonies:

For taking away our Charters, abolishing our most valuable Laws, and altering fundamentally the Forms of our Governments:

For suspending our own Legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

He has abdicated Government here, by declaring us out of his Protection and waging War against us.

He has plundered our seas, ravaged our Coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people.

He is at this time transporting large Armies of foreign Mercenaries to compleat the works of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of Cruelty and perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the Head of a civilized nation.

He has constrained our fellow Citizens taken Captive on the high Seas to bear Arms against their Country, to become the executioners of their friends and Brethren, or to fall themselves by their Hands.

He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavoured to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian Savages, whose known rule of warfare, is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes and conditions.

In every stage of these Oppressions We have Petitioned for Redress in the most humble terms: Our repeated Petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A Prince, whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a Tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.

Nor have we been wanting in attentions to our British brethren. We have warned them from time to time of attempts by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement here. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured them by the ties of our common kindred to disavow these usurpations, which, would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence. They too have been deaf to the voice of justice and of consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity, which denounces our Separation, and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind, Enemies in War, in Peace Friends.

WE, THEREFORE, the Representatives of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, in General Congress, Assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the Name, and by Authority of the good People of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, That these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be FREE AND INDEPENDENT STATES; that they are Absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as Free and Independent States, they have full Power to levy War, conclude Peace, contract Alliances, establish Commerce, and to do all other Acts and Things which Independent States may of right do. And for the support of this Declaration with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other

our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor.

New Hampshire: John Hancock, Matthew Thornton, Josiah Bartlett, Wm. Whipple; Massachusetts Bay: Saml. Adams, John Adams, Robt. Treat Paine, Elbridge Gerry; Rhode Island: Step. Hopkins, William Ellery; Connecticut: Roger Sherman, Sam'l Huntington, Wm. Williams, Oliver Wolcott; New York: Wm. Floyd, Phil. Livingston, Frans. Lewis, Lewis Morris; New Jersey: Richd. Stockton, Jno. Witherspoon, Fras. Hopkinson, John Hart, Abra. Clark; Pennsylvania: Robt. Morris, Benjamin Rush, Benja. Franklin, John Morton, Geo. Clymer, Jas. Smith, Geo. Taylor, James Wilson, Geo. Ross; Delaware: Caesar Rodney, Geo. Read, Tho. M'Kean; Maryland: Samuel Chase, Wm. Paca, Thos. Stone, Charles Carroll of Carrollton; Virginia: George Wythe, Richard Henry Lee, Th. Jefferson, Benja. Harrison, Thos. Nelson, Jr., Francis Lightfoot Lee, Carter Braxton; North Carolina: Wm. Hooper, Joseph Hewes, John Penn; South Carolina: Thos. Heyward, Junr., Edward Rutledge, Thomas Lynch Junr., Arthur Middleton; Georgia: Button Gwinnett, Lyman Hall, Geo. Walton.

### Thirty-fourth Annual Slovak Day, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., July 4, 1956

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

#### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

ADDRESS BY MR. FLOOD AT 34TH ANNUAL SLOVAK DAY HELD AT SANS SOUCI PARK JULY 4, 1956, WILKES-BARRE, PA.

Reverend chairman, clergy, the route from Washington to Wilkes-Barre and return covers a little over 500 miles. My willingness to travel that distance to address this splendid gathering is in some small way a measure of my esteem for the thousands of Americans of Slovak extraction living in the congressional district which I have the high honor to represent at the seat of our Federal Government. It is a rare privilege for me to be here, and I am grateful to Father Matircho and his committee for extending me this gracious invitation.

This occasion in reality is a quadruple celebration. This day marks the 34th annual Slovak Day in historic Wyoming Valley and it is the 180th anniversary of the signing of the American Declaration of Independence. Moreover, this year also marks the 150th anniversary of the incorporation of Wilkes-Barre, and for a span of over three-fifths of its incorporated life, Slovak immigrants and their descendants have played an outstanding role in the civic and cultural life of the community. You have also gathered here to commemorate that great moment in history, when the intrepid and beloved Sts. Cyril and Methodius left Macedonia to bring the religion of Christ to your forefathers in the shadows of the Tatra Mountains more than 1,100 years ago. Just as the Irish venerate St. Patrick, the Poles cherish St. Stanislaus, and the Welsh revere St. David, so do the Slovaks pay deserved tribute to Methodius, first bishop of their

beloved Nitra, and to his scholarly brother Cyril, the inventor of the first Slavic alphabet.

And it is particularly fitting that Slovaks should combine a religious anniversary with a patriotic celebration. Anyone who knows them as well as I do, who has grown up with their descendants, is familiar with their magnificent history and has drunk deeply of their folklore in song and story, could not expect them to do otherwise.

For to a Slovak, religion and freedom are concomitant; love of country and devotion to God go hand in hand. In all of their turbulent and colorful history, Slovaks have held steadfastly to the faith, and no amount of oppression, however long or arduous, has been able to stamp out their yearning for liberty and freedom.

It is now more than 90 years that immigrants from the land of Slovakia began arriving in the United States in large numbers. But this land we now call America has felt the Slovak leaven long before the Civil War. Slovak ingenuity and craftsmanship were highly valued by the redoubtable Capt. John Smith, when on September 25, 1608 the sailing ship "God Speed" sailed into Jamestown harbor with 6 skilled craftsmen on board, 2 of whom, Juraj Mata and Jan Bogdan, were Slovaks. These men, with the 4 Poles, Lowicki, Stefanski, Zrenica, and Sadowski, came in answer to an urgent plea by Captain Smith to his London agents, to "send 30 carpenters, blacksmiths, and bricklayers rather than a thousand of the kind we have here." It was largely due to the skilled efforts of these craftsmen that the Jamestown colony was able to secure a foothold on the American continent.

And in the War of the Revolution, Slovak love of liberty was exemplified in the military exploits of Count Maurice Benovsky who served with Pulaski at Savannah and who was born in storied Nitra, that ancient See of St. Methodius. Shortly after the first shot was fired at Fort Sumter, Slovak immigrants living in Chicago, under the leadership of Gejza Michalovich, petitioned the President of the United States for permission to organize the Lincoln Brigade which served so valiantly on the side of the Union Army. Hundreds of Slovaks served in the United States forces in the Spanish American War, and of course, thousands were doughboys in World War I and more thousands served as GIs in World War II and Korea.

It is clear therefore, that the thread of Slovak history in the New World is long and unbroken from earliest colonial times to the present. And nowhere have Slovak immigrants and their descendants taken firmer root than in the mining communities of northeastern Pennsylvania. Here the first Slovak churches were organized. Here were founded the first fraternal societies, and the earliest schools, social groups and cultural organizations. The roots of the Slovaks are deep in the soil of Wyoming Valley, and it is heartening to recognize that the third and fourth generations are carrying on in the footsteps of the early arrivals.

When your Slovak forefathers disembarked at Ellis Island by the thousands in the period between 1860 and 1895, it was not just chance that saw them endowed with solid potentials for American citizenship. For one quality they had in abundance—faith. Religion for them was not an isolated phenomenon; their devotion to God was an integral part of their lives and the more than 300 parishes in America founded by Slovaks and their descendants serve as eloquent testimony to a rich spiritual heritage. And it was this very heritage, coupled with the Slovakian love for liberty that enabled the early pioneer leaders, the Furdeks, the Rovnianeks, the Novomeskys, the Jankolas and their later compatriots like Murgas, Onda, Porubsky, and Mamatej—to integrate themselves so firmly in our American democracy and im-

bue their followers with the essentials of loyal citizenship. A good Slovak could not help but be a good American because he has always known his true relationship with God. Like the 56 men who prepared and signed our Declaration of Independence, your pioneer Slovak forefathers knew that man is a creation of God and is graced with qualities that are his, at birth, as a special gift from God.

In these days of intellectual and moral confusion, we ought to ponder the illustrious words that comprise the Declaration of Independence. Nations come and go in history, their real strength powered by a spiritual dynamism. Their decay is rarely the product of material deterioration or defeat in armed conflict. These are just results, not causes. A nation really decays when it begins to weaken its spiritual motivation. To exist, a nation must have faith in its traditions if it is to have faith in itself. All lovers of liberty can well emulate those doughty inhabitants of Slovakia today. Notwithstanding the pratings of dictators and the mouthings of Communist bosses, the gallant sons and daughters of Slovakia know there is no substitute for true democracy, even if it is enclosed in an attractive package with a red wrapper on it.

It is indeed heart-rending to contemplate the cruel Communist yoke under which the 3½ million Slovaks in the old country are constrained to live their lives. But knowing the Slovaks as I do, I know that the glory of Slovakia will not long be dimmed, and that the Slovaks unquenchable thirst for liberty, freedom and democracy will prevail. Just as liberty-loving Slovaks have refused to live under enslavement by the Turks, Magyars, and other conquerors, so will they in the end repudiate the hammer and the sickle for the torch of liberty. I proclaim this confidently: The flaming spirit of the Slovaks that nurtured the magnificent Janosik, whose exploits live in song and story, will no more yield to Communist domination than the Janosiks succumbed to their oppressors. You thousands of Americans of Slovak descent should take heart and have abiding faith, for you have come from ancestors who have rejected enslavement of the spirit even when the flesh was in bondage.

My friends, in these turbulent days of the mid-twentieth century, we Americans can hold our heads high, humbly proud in the knowledge of the heritage that is America. That heritage is in good hands when it is entrusted to the likes of the more than 1½ million Americans of Slovak descent. You can have no nobler destiny as Americans than this, that following in the footsteps of your intrepid pioneer ancestors, and heeding the example of the framers of the Declaration of Independence, you too hold aloft the banner of freedom, love of God and sound Americanism.

### Sale of Alcoholic Beverages on Air Carriers

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to learn that H. R. 8000 has been approved by the Rules Committee, and I am hopeful that this legislation may be scheduled as early as possible for the consideration of the Members of the House.

This bill provides that no air carrier shall sell to its passengers any alcoholic beverages, including wine and beer, for consumption while in flight between points within the limits of the 48 States, and the District of Columbia.

I have received, as other Members of the House have, communications from the organizations representing the airlines' pilots, who have the responsibility of flying these planes and protecting the safety of the public, urging the enactment of this legislation into law.

I believe this speaks very highly for the men, who better than anyone else realize the necessity of this proposal being enacted into law before the close of this session.

I am sure that the great majority of the American people who use the airlines for transportation also favor such legislation. I sincerely hope that this legislation can be considered and written into the law before the end of this session, and, as we all know, time is growing short before its close.

### A Workable Program for Fighting Slums

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under existing law a local community may not receive Federal loans or capital grants for urban renewal projects, nor may it receive special FHA mortgage insurance aids for urban renewal housing unless the community has an approved workable program for the prevention and elimination of slums and blight. This provision was enacted by the Housing Act of 1954. The purpose of the provision in the 1954 act is to achieve maximum results in slum elimination and prevention by requiring localities assisted by Federal funds to utilize their own local facilities and powers in the prevention and elimination of slums. As originally enacted by the Housing Act of 1954, this requirement was applicable to Federal assistance to low-rent public housing. Its applicability to public housing was removed by the Housing Amendments of 1955. In his legislative program for this year President Eisenhower proposed that the law be amended so as to restore the applicability of the workable program requirement to future low-rent public housing.

H. R. 11742, the bill reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and referred to as the Housing Act of 1956, fails to restore the workable program provision. That is one of the reasons why a bipartisan Committee on Rules voted to table it. The bill is defective in that it presents public housing as an end in itself. That is certainly not the basis on which public housing was originally presented to the Congress. It was offered as a means of ridding our cities of slums. I believe, as does Albert M. Cole, the Housing Administrator, that

public housing should be a part of an integrated attack on slums and blight and that communities undertaking public housing with the assistance of Federal funds should develop their own plans for meeting their overall problems of slums and blight and make their public housing projects a part of those plans.

That is what a workable program is—a community's plans for meeting its overall problems of slums and blight. It is in no sense an onerous or impossible requirement. Basically, it consists of the following seven elements:

First. Codes and ordinances: The objective is to assure adequate minimum standards of health, sanitation, and safety through a comprehensive system of codes and ordinances which state the minimum conditions under which dwellings may be lawfully occupied.

Second. A comprehensive community plan: The objective is the formulation and official recognition of a comprehensive general plan for the community as a whole. A general plan should be developed under procedures provided by State and local legislation, and should be supervised and administered by an official local planning body with adequate resources and authority to insure continuity of planning.

Third. Neighborhood analyses: The objective is the identification of the extent and intensity of blight and logical patterns of specific neighborhoods for purposes of developing a basis for planning of healthy neighborhoods of decent homes and suitable living environment.

Fourth. Administrative organization: The objective is a firmly established administrative responsibility and capacity for enforcement of codes and ordinances, and for carrying out renewal programs and projects.

Fifth. Financing: The objective is the development of means for meeting the financial obligation involved in carrying out urban renewal activities.

Sixth. Housing for displaced families: The objective is to facilitate the rehousing, in decent, safe, and sanitary accommodations, of families displaced by governmental action.

Seventh. Citizen participation: The objective is communitywide participation on the part of individuals and representative citizens' organizations which will help to provide, both in the community generally and in selected areas, the understanding and support which is necessary to insure success.

There are many reasons why the adoption by the community of a workable program for dealing with slums and blight should again be made a prerequisite for Federal aid to public housing, just as it is a requirement for Federal aid to urban renewal and special FHA mortgage insurance assistance for urban renewal housing. Among them are the following:

First. Federal aid to public housing should be given only where the community has an overall plan to prevent and eliminate slums. Public housing is only one of several instruments to be used in fighting slums and blight. A workable program is essential to assure that other available instruments which are appropriate under local conditions will be used

by the community for this purpose and will be coordinated with public housing.

Second. The removal of this requirement resulted from a misunderstanding. The workable program requirement was repealed last year when it was confused with other provisions which required detailed calculations by the communities concerning displaced families, their incomes, existing low-rent public housing, and the timing of the construction of public housing in relation to the progress of urban-renewal projects. The workable program requirement never caused any difficulty or confusion in public housing, and the Housing Agency never asked that it be removed.

Third. The requirement for a workable program is not burdensome for either large or small communities. Communities are not expected to undertake protracted and unrealistic slum-prevention planning and other activities. Rather, they are merely expected to adopt sensible, long-range programs within their capabilities and suitable to their local conditions. Proof is that, as of June 1, workable programs had been approved for over 100 communities. More than half of them have populations of less than 50,000. About 45 percent have populations of less than 25,000. Twenty-two communities have populations of less than 10,000, 5 communities have populations of less than 5,000, and 2 have less than 2,000 population.

Fourth. The workable program does not have to be carried out before a public housing contract can be entered into. What is required is demonstration by the community that it is serious about carrying out its own program for dealing with slums and blight. It is recognized that it takes time to enact and put into operation housing codes and other actions contemplated by the workable program, and that it would be unreasonable to withhold Federal assistance to public housing until the program is carried out. The program looks only to future action.

Fifth. The workable program requirement would not preclude communities which do not have urban renewal powers from obtaining public housing. Requiring a workable program means merely that the community must have a plan of action for removing and preventing slums and blight. In some communities a program utilizing the city's normal police powers for rehabilitation and conservation would be sufficient. In other communities the program would be adequate if it coupled police powers with the usual exercise of eminent domain powers to acquire land for public improvement, such as parks, playgrounds, or other public facilities. Even in cities where extensive slum conditions cannot be eliminated without the use of eminent domain under urban renewal powers, this does not preclude such cities without those powers from having approved workable programs. It is only necessary that the city recognize its problems and have a plan for working toward this solution, even if this includes a reasonable plan of action for obtaining necessary State legislation or other legal action.

Mr. Speaker, the workable program requirement for the prevention and elim-

ination of slums and blight is sound and desirable. The Congress should have no hesitancy in making it applicable to public housing in order that the public housing program may better serve its primary objective of helping to solve the slum problem.

### The American's Creed and the Fourth of July

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as Independence Day comes around each year it brings to mind The American's Creed and its connection with the Fourth of July.

One need only to recall the author of The American's Creed, the Honorable William Tyler Page who for many years was Clerk of the House of Representatives. He was accustomed each Independence Day to go into his library and read the great and fundamental documents on which this country was founded. From such study was born his inspiration to write The American's Creed.

He began his life work at the age of 13 as a page boy, and held numerous offices in the House of Representatives. He completed 60 years of service—the longest any individual ever worked on Capitol Hill. He served under 14 Speakers of the House. Every office he ever held he filled with simple dignity and distinction. His personal charm and superior mental ability were known to all.

William Tyler Page carried in his veins the blood of many great Americans, and his philosophy of life and of Government upheld the finest traditions and ideals of his ancestors.

He was born 88 years ago in Frederick, Md., and early in life formed a friendship with a boy named Schley. Later on Schley went to Annapolis while Tyler Page went to the Capitol. This warm friendship between these two boys continued for many years. Finally, in the Spanish-American War, Schley, who had risen to the rank of commodore of the Navy, and who was temporarily in charge of the American Fleet, won a glorious American victory on July 3, 1898. The marvelous news of the victory of his old friend Schley, thrilled Tyler Page and filled him with patriotism.

He made the resolve that instead of celebrating the next day, the Fourth of July, in the usual way, he would shut himself up in his library and read the great and fundamental documents of the beginning of our country, such as the Constitution, Declaration of Independence, and the Farewell Address of Washington. That evening, after reflection on what he had read during the day, he made the further resolve that he would continue this practice of reading the

great historical writings upon which our Nation was founded each Fourth of July thereafter, and he kept that promise for forty-odd years.

In the war of 1917 a contest was held to write an American creed. Page submitted his manuscript and won the contest, and the Congress officially recognized it as the American's creed of our country. It would have been strange indeed if William Tyler Page had not eventually written this creed, for unconsciously, from the reading of these great works, he had been formulating in his mind such a creed for many years. It was the welling up from the soul of this man all of the devotion to liberty, all the ideals of his love of country.

Knowing the Apostles' Creed to have been a compilation expressing their doctrines and principles, which they practiced long before the creed was formulated, and the sources of its articles were the books of the Bible, he resolved that his American creed must also come from recognized authoritative and historical writings. He did not want to use his own words, and every word of the American Creed is taken from such documents as the Constitution of the United States, the Declaration of Independence, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, Washington's Farewell Address, the National Anthem, and other similar references.

I could do no better in paying tribute to William Tyler Page than to quote the American's Creed of exactly 100 words:

I believe in the United States of America as a Government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies.

## The National Rivers and Harbors Congress

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

### HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I present the following report which I made as president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at the 43d annual convention held at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on May 11-12, 1956:

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT, REPRESENTATIVE OVERTON BROOKS, OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, TO THE 43D ANNUAL CONVENTION, AT THE MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 1956

Ladies and gentlemen of the convention, it now becomes my duty to make a report concerning the activities of the congress during the year since we last met on May 31

and June 1, 1955, for our 42d national convention. I am happy to report that we have had a fine year marked by progress in every direction toward our goals.

Our 42d annual convention achieved a new high in enthusiasm for conservation of water resources. An outstanding event in the organization's long history of accomplishment, the gathering attracted 346 registered delegates from 44 States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia. There were many additional unregistered guests and representatives of press and radio. Louisiana led the States in number of delegates, with 57; North Carolina was second, with 28; and Michigan was third, with 20.

During consideration at the Capitol of the public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1956, a delegation from our organization appeared at the hearings to present its recommendations to the House committee. The delegation included your president, the projects committee chairman, Representative SID SIMPSON, and vice chairman, H. H. Buckman, of Florida; the resolutions committee chairman, Representative FRANK E. SMITH, of Mississippi, and vice chairman, E. W. Rising, of Idaho; and the executive vice president, William H. Webb.

When the bill was reported to the House by the Appropriations Committee on June 10, reducing the budget estimates of President Eisenhower by 28 percent, the largest cut made in any appropriations bill to that date, Representative SIMPSON and I joined in an invitation to all Members of the House of Representatives to a meeting in the Old House Office Building caucus room to take action toward restoring the budget figures.

This meeting was very largely attended by both Republicans and Democrats. After a full discussion, four resolutions were adopted unanimously, pledging support to amendments to increase the amounts in the bill for construction and planning of flood control, navigation, and irrigation projects.

Such amendments were accordingly prepared in consultation with the House legislative counsel, and when the bill came to the House floor the following day, all four amendments were adopted by very large majorities, increasing the amounts by more than \$88 million. They provided the full amounts requested in the President's budget message, and also the full amounts recommended by the House Appropriations Committee for 12 projects not included in the budget estimates.

Shortly thereafter a delegation from our organization called on the chairman of the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee of the Senate, the senior Senator from Louisiana, Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, to present the reports of our projects and resolutions committees which had been recently adopted at our 42d annual convention. Senator ELLENDER gave us a very fine reception and assured us that he and his committee would give sympathetic consideration to our recommendations.

Subsequently the Senate, following the recommendations of its appropriations committee, increased the amounts for fiscal year 1956 by more than \$100 million over the amounts recommended by the budget and the House Appropriations Committee. Finally, the conference committee reached an agreement on an amount slightly less, viz., \$590,251,500 for the civil functions of the Army engineers, or for rivers and harbors and flood control projects, as compared with \$560 million recommended by the budget and \$500 million recommended by the House Appropriations Committee.

This was a splendid victory after a long and arduous campaign, and one for which our organization may rightfully take a large share of the credit.

In November of last year when the budget estimates for the year 1957 were under consideration, a delegation from the National

Rivers and Harbors Congress called at the Budget Bureau to present our recommendations to officials of the Bureau. These recommendations embodied as a goal a long-term program of internal water development in the United States of \$1 billion per annum.

The delegation recommended that \$750 million be included in the budget figure for 1957 for rivers and harbors improvement and flood control and \$250 million for irrigation and reclamation. It urged that there be a continuation of the administration's policy of new starts and that an adequate amount be included for planning and general investigations, and maintenance of completed projects. I took occasion to point out the action of the Congress last year in increasing the budget recommendations and stressed the general feeling throughout the country that there should be provided additional sums for general internal improvement, including the development of our water resources.

The President's budget message to Congress in January of this year recommended \$583,997,000 for the civil-works program of the Corps of Engineers in fiscal year 1957. In the general construction program, funds were requested for 39 new starts and 3 resummptions of construction, in addition to 30 small authorized projects, and continuing projects, and 1 new start in the requested funds for the Mississippi River and tributaries flood-control project.

The first test of the sentiment in Congress toward our program came early in this year when the Appropriations Committee of the House reported out an urgent deficiency appropriations bill for fiscal year 1956, and slashed \$3,046,000 from the amount requested by President Eisenhower for flood control in the New England States, New York, and Pennsylvania. The committee also knocked out \$330,000 recommended by the President for a complete review of existing flood-control plans in the Northeastern States.

The Capitol Hill battle for flood-control appropriations found the National Rivers and Harbors Congress staunchly supporting the stricken New England areas, and when the vote was taken in the House, the action of the Appropriations Committee was reversed and the amounts recommended by the President were restored to the bill. This action was subsequently approved by the Senate and the bill was approved by the President on February 14 appropriating the full amount requested by the Army engineers and recommended by the Budget Bureau.

So we have started this session of Congress with another splendid victory, and shall hope for continued success in the weeks to come.

A special meeting of your board of directors was called by me for January 21 in this city, and was attended by a majority of the members of the board. The board studied copies of the President's report on water resources policy, recently submitted to Congress, and took especial note of the comments on user charges on water transportation, which our organization has consistently opposed for many years. The board meeting received reports from various officers which showed gains in membership and the treasury, and found encouragement in many directions of its overall program. During the board's meeting, a proposal for the establishment in Washington of a permanent headquarters building was laid before the directors by Mr. H. H. Buckman, consulting engineer of Jacksonville, Fla., and one of our oldest directors in point of service. A special committee appointed by me has been studying this matter and may be ready to report to the meeting of the board of directors scheduled to follow our adjournment today.

During the past year, two regional conferences were held in the New England region, one in Hartford, Conn., in October of 1955

and one in Boston, Mass., in April of this year. A regional conference was also held in the South Atlantic region at Raleigh, N. C., in February of this year. Our regional directors for the New England and South Atlantic regions will report to us later in the day concerning these conferences and the splendid work which has been carried on in their areas.

Our projects committee has also been at work during the past year on a method of procedure to be followed by it and by the organization in following up its recommendations and rendering assistance to the proponents of the many hundreds of projects which have been processed by that committee. We shall anticipate the recommendations of that committee with keen interest and hope that we shall be able to work out a procedure and policy which will contribute to advancing the interests of the various projects and speeding their construction.

A membership certificate was designed and has now been furnished to every individual and organization maintaining an active membership in the congress, as evidence of their active participation in the work of the organization. It is hoped that these certificates will be found suitable for framing and displaying in the offices, or other suitable place, of the members. Additional new members are constantly being added to the rolls so that we will soon reach an alltime high in number of members as well as in total membership dues. During the calendar year 1955 our total receipts were nearly \$27,000, and the indications are that this will be exceeded during the present year. We still have quite a ways to go to reach the goal of \$50,000 per annum set by our board of directors some time ago, but we shall continue our efforts in this respect.

And now in closing, may I say just a word about our congress. As most of you know, it is the oldest and most influential organization in its field. Originally organized at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Md., in October, 1901, it is now entering upon its 54th year of service to the Nation. It is generally agreed by those who know of its work that America owes her present system of improved harbors and waterways directly to the efforts of the congress. Through the years, the organization has cooperated closely with the United States Congress which has always received its recommendations and advice and gives a ready ear to its counsel.

The congress is dedicated to the sound and orderly development of our water and land resources for all beneficial purposes, and the approval of worthy and meritorious projects throughout the country. It provides a forum for discussion of all problems relating to land and water development and use, serves as a clearinghouse for coordinating the activities of local and sectional organizations, and affords a means for securing united action by all the interests concerned with the various phases of land and water conservation. Its work has been endorsed by every President of the United States from Theodore Roosevelt to Dwight Eisenhower. Its members are located in every State in the Union.

At the last session of Congress, it was successful in increasing the appropriation for flood control, navigation, and reclamation by nearly \$100 million, and it will continue its efforts in the present session to see that an adequate amount is provided in view of the recent devastating floods and the continuing need for improved navigational facilities.

Members of the National River and Harbors Congress, we are now in a new age, when scientific progress and development have almost outstripped the human imagination. New problems have arisen and new methods of approach which would solve the old problems have been worked out, often scientifically. Almost every speaker who has

addressed this convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has referred to the increasing water shortage throughout the United States. This naturally leads to speculation as to how such shortages might be relieved. Of course, you may approach this problem from the viewpoint of reclamation and irrigation. I, however, have been convinced that further scientific studies regarding artificial rainmaking, hurricane control, and conversion of sea water into fresh water may be of great scientific benefit to this country. I do not necessarily believe that any one of these matters has yet been brought to the point that it is practicable and feasible at the present time.

More attention, however, should be given by Congress and by the executive branch of Government to these matters, and with increased experimental effort it is entirely possible that water shortages may be relieved through the development of these types of projects.

We all know with what devastating effect Hurricane Hazel and other hurricanes struck the Atlantic seaboard. We know that these turbulent conditions, through use of proper experiments, might be reduced in devastation and perhaps in some way used for the benefit of mankind. In a like manner, projects for water conversion have reached a point where the important question is the cost of taking the saline content out of salt water and thereby making it fresh water and fit for human consumption and industrial purposes.

The tremendous development of the H-bomb and the A-bomb bring forth other problems which may affect our weather and disturb rainfall over wide areas. It is yet too early to draw conclusions from scientific findings in this respect, but it is known that contamination may cover great areas and the upset condition of the atmosphere may result in tremendous precipitation. It is even suggested that a contamination of water reservoirs in farflung areas might result from these explosions. All of these problems are new and tax the brains of the best scientists which we have available. They present challenge to the Government for proper solution.

We have now crossed the threshold of the last half of the 20th century. There are 20th-century, or even 21st-century, problems. They are problems to which we may close our eyes temporarily but they are not problems which in the long run can be sidestepped or evaded by Congress, by the executive branch of Government or by our population. Survival of a nation and normal methods of living throughout the world are going to be affected by these matters until scientific solutions, backed up with proper governmental guidance, give our people the support to which they will be entitled.

### Sale of Surplus Vessels

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. JOHN H. RAY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 5, 1956*

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a joint resolution to permit the sale of two transport and cargo vessels to any citizen who has sufficient financial strength and operating experience to undertake the project and secure approval by the Federal Maritime Administrator. The purchaser must recondition the ships at his own expense

in American yards and must operate them under the American flag on essential trade routes 3 and 4. These routes run between the United States and Cuba and the United States and Mexico. The ships are now idle in the reserve and have been declared surplus by the Government. They can be repossessed by the Government if needed. Use of these ships will restore the American flag to these essential groups and should help expand our trade with Cuba and Mexico.

I think passage of the resolution will be very much in the public interest, and I hope the resolution will receive widespread support among the Members of this House.

### Speech of Hon. Sidney R. Yates Before the National Convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, San Francisco, Calif., June 29, 1956

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. SIDNEY R. YATES**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 5, 1956*

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

SPEECH OF HON. SIDNEY R. YATES BEFORE THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., JUNE 29, 1956

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am grateful for your invitation to speak to you tonight and to participate in this convention. Your kind invitation gives me the opportunity to pay tribute to your fine organization for its devoted fight for freedom for all Americans.

"Freedom is more than a word \* \* \* freedom is a creative spirit that summons the energies of all men to the task of building the kind of community, the kind of nation, the kind of world in which they want to live. It is a dream of a world in which all men, women, and children are encouraged to grow to their fullest—physically, mentally, spiritually—so that they may fulfill the great promise of their inner potential."

It is for this freedom—so aptly stated by President Edward J. Sparling, of Roosevelt University of Chicago—that the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has been making a great fight, and for which it deserves the thanks of all Americans. I have been in the Congress for 8 years. In that time I have come to know and to appreciate the dedicated work being done by the NAACP. In the courts, working with Congressmen and with officials in the executive branch, the NAACP has indeed served as one of the most active guardians of the conscience of the community. As one of society's good housekeepers, it lifts the rug under which the Nation has swept and tried to forget the difficult problems of human relationships, in order that they may be exposed to the light of decency and cleaned up.

This is an important meeting for both political parties. It is to be expected that I would meet with Mr. SCOTT at this meeting because he is one of the few members of his party who remembers that it is the party of Lincoln. Knowing this, whenever there is

a meeting on civil rights, the Republican National Committee appoints Mr. Scott as the party spokesman in order to try to convey the impression that the other members of the Republican Party are like him. Every time there is a meeting of the NAACP you will find HUGH SCOTT present as a party spokesman. The Republicans don't have anybody else they can substitute in his place.

And Mr. SCOTT is about as good a spokesman as the Republicans have. Unfortunately for him, he has no product to sell, because the Republican Party's record on civil rights is a blank—a real dud. Regardless of this fact, however, the Republican Party still tries for the votes of those who want civil rights progress.

The NAACP recognized the potency of the ballot as a sword and shield to obtain justice almost a half century ago. In the first issue of the Crisis in November 1910, Dr. W. E. B. DuBois sounded the clarion call to Negroes everywhere to qualify and vote so that they might have a part in shaping their country's destiny and their own. "Let every colored man who can, vote," urged Dr. DuBois, "whether he vote the Republican or Democratic ticket, let him vote it, not because his father did or because he is afraid, but because, after intelligent consideration, he thinks the success of that ticket best for his people and his country."

Negroes are like all other Americans in seeking the blessings of this democracy. They want equal protection of the laws. They want no more, no less than is their just birthright under the Constitution. They want to enjoy the equal opportunity to work in any position for which their training and education qualify them. They want to see an end to discrimination by employers and by unenlightened labor unions.

They want the right to engage in the election of candidates for all offices and to run for office themselves, without fear of becoming the victims of a bigoted, lawless mob. They want the right, too, to be considered for appointive office on all levels, including that of the President's Cabinet itself.

They want the end of separate but equal facilities, with the tag of inferiority which such separation brings. They want the elimination of Jim Crow everywhere—in transportation, in hotel accommodations, in restaurants, in recreation and entertainment. They want the opportunity for their children to obtain the same good education that is offered to the other children of our country, and they want fulfillment of the Supreme Court's decision in the school case.

In short, they want the eradication of second-class citizenship. In this respect, the ballot has been and will continue to be a most potent weapon.

It was the ballot, bringing the Democratic Party into power in 1932, which contributed most toward projecting America's minority peoples closer to their goal of equality than any other influence in our history. Led by Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, the New Deal and Fair Deal brought hope and courage to the masses of American people to replace the despair which had been their lot under Republican administrations. The Democrats brought, too, the opportunity to earn a decent living after the Republicans had left deep poverty and depression in their wake.

The New Deal and the Fair Deal brought a social revolution which changed the people's attitude toward their Government. As explained by Republican editor William Allen White, the victory of the Democrats indicated a firm desire on the part of the American people to use government as an agency of human welfare.

Under this concept, the powers of government were used by Democratic administrations to assure the American people of the right to a useful and remunerative job; of the

right to earn enough to provide adequate food, clothing, and recreation; of the right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which would give him and his family a decent living; of the right of every businessman to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies; of the right to a decent home; of the right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health; of the right to a good education for their children; of the right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment.

Taking action to achieve these goals, the Democratic Party initiated legislation for a minimum wage law; for a full employment law; for a Federal aid to education bill; for raising health standards through adequate medical care; for good housing, including public housing; for unemployment compensation and for social security; for a farm bill that would permit farmers to live in decency.

And all this time what were the Republicans doing? They were opposing every single one of the New Deal measures. The record shows that all the social reforms which are recognized today as being an essential part of our democratic way of life were enacted into law in spite of—not because of—the Republican Party.

Why did they oppose such reforms? They said they were socialistic.

Socialistic? Not to all Republicans. The Democratic program wasn't socialistic to Dr. Channing H. Tobias, for example, who at the time was an Independent Republican. He said that he proposed to support President Roosevelt in 1944 "because his philosophy of government and the generally progressive course he has followed for the past 12 years have vested the common man of every race, creed, and color with a dignity and inspired him with a hope that he has never known before."

Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, after looking carefully at the record, was convinced "without the slightest doubt that Franklin D. Roosevelt has done more for the uplift and progress of the American Negro than any president since Abraham Lincoln."

And with respect to President Truman, Mr. Thurgood Marshall, whom I think you know, and is one of the most respected attorneys in Washington, had this to say in a recent radio interview when he was asked about possible presidential candidates: "The candidate that gets nearest to Harry S. Truman will more than likely get the votes of the people who believe in civil rights. That's my belief."

It is to be expected that these outstanding leaders would so express themselves. Mr. SCOTT stated that the New Deal improved the economic condition of Negroes in this country. It certainly did. The rise of the average American under the Roosevelt reforms was amazing. Knowing that there could be no true freedom unless there is freedom from want, the New Deal of the Democratic Party set about first the elimination of the ravaging effects of poverty, and bringing a dignity to the forgotten man that he never before enjoyed. Both the President and Mrs. Roosevelt gave him a recognition and the feeling that he was a necessary part of the community—that he belonged.

And as for Harry Truman, he became the symbol of progress in the field of human rights. It was he who established the famous Commission to study the complex problems of assuring every citizen's constitutional rights. It was he who fathered the greatest all-around legislative program in the field of civil and constitutional rights this country has ever known.

Yes, and it was Harry Truman who stuck by that program right through the 1948 Democratic Convention and right through

the election, even though he knew it might split his own party and cost him the Presidency.

Harry Truman is a man who knows what it is to stand up and fight for what he believes in, no matter what the cost. More important, perhaps, is the fact that his civil-rights program was not just an election-year matter. Year after year, he kept urging his program on the Congress.

Just compare President Truman's actions with those of the present administration. What a difference. Under President Truman the Federal Government stood squarely behind the constitutional rights of all individuals. Shortly before he left office he stated his view of the responsibility of Federal Government in this field. "I am not one of those," he said, "who feel that we can leave these matters up to the States alone, or that we can rely solely upon the efforts of men of good will. \* \* \* The full force and power of the Federal Government must stand behind the protection of rights guaranteed by our Federal Constitution."

No wonder Thurgood Marshall is searching for a candidate that "gets nearest to Harry S. Truman."

I was in the 81st Congress when the civil-rights bills were filed to implement the civil-rights program, as recommended by President Truman's Commission. They might have been passed if the northern Democrats had received the cooperation rather than the opposition of the northern Republicans. But because most of the members of the Republican Party chose to work with reactionary Dixiecrats from the South, the bills were defeated.

For example, I remember very well the fight on an FEPC bill in 1950 because I was right in the middle of it. After months of maneuvering the bill finally came to the floor on Washington's Birthday, February 22. The southern Congressmen who opposed the bill fought it with the only filibuster that the House knows, quorum calls and rollcalls. Even though the bill had been made the legislative business of the day, after completion of the reading of Washington's Address, which is always done on his birthday, Congressman Cox of Georgia got up and moved that the House adjourn out of respect to the memory of George Washington. Time after time that day I watched Republican Members of the House walk off the floor so that a quorum call would be necessary. A quorum call takes 40 minutes. There were about 10 of them.

We got a vote on FEPC at 3 o'clock the next morning. Those of us who favored the strong bill, watched with dismay when a substitute bill which took away all the enforcement powers of FEPC was offered. Was it offered by a southern Democrat? It was not. It was offered by the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Education and Labor, and the Republicans approved it. On that vote, a majority of the Democrats voted against the substitute bill. Sixty-eight percent of the Republicans voted for it.

You have heard, too, that no civil-rights bill can get through the Senate because of the threat of a southern filibuster.

In 1949 the Republicans in the Senate had an opportunity to strike a blow for civil-rights progress. They could have helped by supporting Vice President Barkley in his ruling to close a loophole in the antifilibuster rules. But nearly three-fifths of the Republicans voted against Mr. Barkley. As a result the Senate today is shackled by the infamous rule 22, which makes it virtually impossible to stop a filibuster. Was the author of that rule a southern Democrat? He was not. The author was the late Senator Wherry, of Nebraska, who was then the Republican floor leader of the Senate.

As a matter of fact, when southern Democrats have proposed anti-civil-rights measures, northern Democrats rather than Republicans have been in the forefront to resist them. A few years ago, Congressman WINSTEAD, of Mississippi, offered an amendment to the Selective Service Act which gave the right to every inductee to serve in a segregated outfit, if he chose. That amendment, which was approved by the House Armed Services Committee, was defeated on the floor of the House because of a magnificent speech delivered by Congressman WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Chicago. Congressman DAWSON, a Democrat, is the first Negro chairman of a major congressional committee in the history of the Nation.

The record shows that the Republican Party has fought public housing; it has fought the minimum-wage law and subsequent increases; it has fought social security and increased coverage and benefits; it has fought unemployment compensation; it has fought appropriations for health measures and hospitals; it has fought FEPC; it has fought Federal aid to education. It has fought all progressive legislation.

But now the Republicans say—forget the past. We have a new Republican Party. We are now the party of Eisenhower. Forget the fact that the Republican Party did little to help the average man when it was in power. Forget that the Republican Party fought all measures for the people. Forget that it is the party of big business. This is a new party, say the Republicans.

Well, let me say this, former President Calvin Coolidge was once asked the question: "Mr. President, do the people where you come from say a hen lays or a hen lies?" Mr. Coolidge replied: "The people where I come from, sir, lift her up to see."

Let's lift up the hen and take a look at the new Republican Party. What has the President done in the field of civil rights? In contrast to the fighting leadership given to the civil-rights program by Harry Truman, President Eisenhower has done little or nothing. During the first 3 years of his administration he presented no civil-rights program at all to the Congress. This was the first year in which he made any recommendations. He came forward with a limited program of civil-rights legislation.

Did President Eisenhower include FEPC in his program? He did not. The President has stated that he is opposed to FEPC. A few years ago when Secretary of Labor Mitchell testified before a Senate committee that he favored a strong FEPC with enforcement provisions, the President declared that Secretary Mitchell was entitled to his opinion. As far as he, the President, was concerned, he did not agree with him.

Nor did President Eisenhower recommend passage of the antilynching bill or the anti-poll tax bill, which have traditionally been recognized as necessary parts of the civil-rights program. Why did he refuse to sponsor these bills?

Last year, Democrats sponsored several measures to advance the progress toward our goal of equal opportunity. Congressman POWELL introduced an omnibus civil-rights measure in January of 1955, providing for all the recommendations called for by President Eisenhower in 1956.

A comparable measure was sponsored by Congressman CELLER last year. Congressman CELLER is chairman of the Judiciary Committee which has charge of civil-rights bills. It is customary to ask the opinion of the Department of Justice on such bills. Did the Republican Attorney General approve such bills? He did not. He didn't even reply. He took notice of the bill only after a House Judiciary Subcommittee had ordered the bill reported.

Literally dozens of similar bills were sponsored by Democrats last year. On all of them the Department of Justice was conspicuously silent.

In February of last year, Congressman DAVIDSON's bill calling for a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice under an Assistant Attorney General got the same treatment from Mr. Brownell. Congressman Diggs' effort was treated the same way.

Why should the Attorney General take this position? Why shouldn't Government help implement the Supreme Court decision rather than leaving that burden to the NAACP?

I think this is the answer. This morning's Washington Post carried a column by Marquis Childs. The heading reads "Brownell Hedges on Security Issue," and this is what the article says: "Although the Senate Committee on Constitutional Rights is about to make a concluding report, that committee has not had the benefit of the views of Attorney General Herbert Brownell Jr., who is the officer of the Government most directly concerned with the Constitution and its interpretation in law enforcement.

"Repeatedly for many months the committee chairman, Senator THOMAS C. HENNING, JR., of Missouri, has invited Brownell to testify and repeatedly Brownell has found one reason or another to evade the invitation.

"This is perhaps the most conspicuous example of a trend more and more evident in the administration to avoid taking any stand on issues that might be considered in any way controversial. It is too often the press agent's approach to Government."

Can anyone tell me how you can be for civil rights and be afraid of controversy at the same time. If any organization knows that you can't make progress in the field of civil rights without a fight, it's the NAACP. You can't get freedom by wishing for it or uttering pious phrases. You've got to fight for it like you did in the Supreme Court or like you are doing in Montgomery, Ala.

Marquis Childs is right—much too often this Government is a government by press agents. Their actions are like the cotton candy you get at the circus—all air and no substance.

It is no secret that there exists within the Democratic Party divergent views on the question of civil rights. We have our Dixiecrats it is true. You know what a Dixiecrat is—it's a man who is elected as a Democrat and then spends his time in Congress voting like a Republican. We have our Dixiecrats because the Democratic Party is truly a national party—a party that knows no regional boundaries. Despite this fact, the record shows that every key motion for civil rights in the United States Congress has been supported by a majority of the Democratic Members.

But is there any reason why the Republicans should act like Dixiecrats? The Republican Party has virtually no representation in the South. The Republicans are not bound by the customs and prejudices of the Southern attitudes on civil rights. The Republican Party represents itself as the party of Lincoln, but Lincoln would turn over in his grave if he saw the way the Republican Party was voting against civil-rights matters.

Mr. SCOTT called the roll of Democrats who would be chairmen of congressional committees next year if the Democrats won the Congress again. He also called the roll of Republicans who would be chairmen if their party wins the election. But Mr. SCOTT forgot to mention the fact that Senator McCARTHY would also be a chairman. Why Mr. SCOTT omitted the name of Senator McCARTHY, I don't know. It may have been inadvertent, but he cannot deny that Senator McCARTHY will be a chairman if the Republican Party wins. And you will remember that Mr. McCARTHY is the man who a few days ago said that Chief Justice Warren was following the Communist line.

Mr. SCOTT also threatens you with the fact that Senator EASTLAND will be a committee chairman if the Democrats win. Well, Mr.

SCOTT—who voted against Senator EASTLAND's confirmation as chairman? Two Democrats voted against it; MORSE and LEHMAN. Every Republican voted in favor of his confirmation.

Mr. SCOTT threatens you by saying that a vote for the Democrats is a vote for EASTLAND. He says this to get you to believe that a vote for the Republicans is a vote for civil-rights legislation. But how gullible does he think you are? If what he is saying is true, why didn't the Republicans come out with a program on civil rights in the Republican 83d Congress. They controlled the Congress. They controlled the committees. Senator EASTLAND wasn't chairman then. No Democrat was a chairman during that Congress. And what happened? Not one civil rights bill was voted out.

Why is it that the Republican Party has voted solidly against fair employment practices legislation in State after State? Right here in California, for example—assembly Republicans voted solidly against an FEPC bill in committee, and in the assembly itself—they voted nearly 3 to 2 against forcing the bill out of committee. Democratic assemblymen, I am proud to say, voted 34 to 1 in favor of the bill.

The story is the same in my home State of Illinois. In 1949, when Governor Stevenson recommended an FEPC bill, it passed the Democratically controlled house, but died in the Republican-controlled senate. In 1951 with both houses of the legislature in the hands of the Republicans, it never even got out of the house committee, and was reported unfavorably in the senate.

That's how the "party of Lincoln" behaved in the land of Illinois.

And in Michigan, in 1952, when an FEPC bill finally reached the house floor, 25 Republicans got up and left the house chamber, refusing to listen to one of their Republican colleagues speak on behalf of the bill. And here is what the Republican said:

"My grandfather and my father voted for Abraham Lincoln. I never expected to see the time when Republicans would leave their seats rather than hear a Republican discuss human rights."

So much for the Republican Party and civil rights. It is a field in which the administration and the administration's party cannot take pride.

What about other legislation? The NAACP is interested not only in civil rights matters—it is interested in all legislation which will help the average American.

In the field of housing, the President has been content to recommend the annual construction of only 35,000 public housing units, an amount that could be absorbed by the New York City itself. The Senate of the United States almost each year passes a bill providing for the construction of 135,000 public housing units. The House always scales it down. The President always accepts the lower figure.

Is this the attitude of a new Republican Party?

Over the President's opposition, the House passed a new social security bill providing benefits to be paid to women at age 62, rather than age 65. The bill also provides for totally and permanently disabled people to obtain social-security benefits at age 50. This is the provision to which the administration is violently opposed.

Is this the attitude of a new Republican Party?

And in the House Committee on Education and Labor a few weeks ago, the bill sponsored by Congressman UDALL of Arizona, which would help solve many of the problems of desegregation by offering additional funds to school districts making the change, was voted down by a vote of 14 to 10. Every single one of the Republicans voted against it.

Is this the attitude of a new Republican Party?

Congressman POWELL has declared that if the Udall bill were approved there would be no need for his amendment to the school bill.

The Eisenhower administration can hardly be called an administration devoted to the interests of the average man. The school bill was forced on the President by outraged mothers of the Nation, who pointed out the enormous educational deficit which had accrued. The Congress has approved appropriations far in excess of the recommendations of the administration for health and welfare measures.

But you don't find the administration reluctant to heed the call of big business. If this is a new Republican Party, how can it justify the Dixon-Yates contract; the Tidelands giveaway; and other giveaways of the people's natural resources?

The administration makes much of the fact that it has given important jobs to Negroes. Yet, for each such job given, it has discharged almost a hundred Negroes under the security order. The greatest number of people who have been fired under the security order have been porters, charwomen, janitors and other custodial employees. They have been dismissed from Government service as security risks because of some minor gambling infraction.

This, then, is the record of the new Republican Party—a party, which, according to the New York Times, "is going after the votes of Negroes in the large urban areas of the north in an effort to regain control of the Congress." This is the record of a party, which, it seems, is going to try to persuade the voters that everything from Supreme Court decisions to President Truman's Executive orders are official property of the Republican Party. They have even taken over the victories of the NAACP, like the District of Columbia desegregation case. Did Mr. SCORR ever hear of Mrs. Mary Church Terrill? It was Mrs. Terrill and the NAACP who won that fight.

Take, for example, the statement of Mr. Richard Tobin, public relations director of the National Citizens for Eisenhower. "In the context of Supreme Court decisions under a Chief Justice appointed by the President," said Mr. Tobin, "decisions as historic as the Emancipation Proclamation of Lincoln, we have a wonderful story to tell, and it is my opinion that it has not yet been told sufficiently well to the average Negro voter."

I am sure the Court and I am sure the people of the United States resent this politicalization of the Supreme Court of the United States—this identification as part of the Republican Party. Certainly the Democrats would never claim that the Supreme Court decision was a Democratic decision because 7 of the 9 Justices who voted on the decision were Democrats.

Apparently, the Republicans will tell the people anything to win. The Republicans in the north say one thing. They say the opposite in the south. Just recently, Mr. Charles McWhorter, national chairman of the Young Republicans, journeyed to Mississippi. There he said that Republicans will be campaigning this fall on a States rights platform. He expressed the opinion that the "Republican" record as a conservative party, moderate on civil rights, best suited the interests of Mississippians.

Is this what Republicans have been saying in the north? Is this what Republicans have been saying to minority groups?

The new Republican Party today is a confused party of inaction and political opportunism. The story is told on Capitol Hill of veteran GOP congressmen who are trying to affiliate themselves with the new Eisenhower look and don't know quite how to do it. They used to be isolationists—now they have to vote for foreign aid and

mutual security. They used to call public housing socialism—now they have to go along with it. As one observer put it—they're like the Australian bushman who was given a gift of a new boomerang and went crazy trying to throw his old one away.

It takes aggressive national leadership to chalk up new gains in human rights now and in the future. It takes an active role—as this organization so well knows—not a passive one—to record progress.

You've got to believe in the cause of human rights if you expect to get anywhere in overcoming prejudices and bigotry. You've got to have heart and courage to fight for the things you believe in. You've got to have a feeling—a deep emotional feeling—to do away with discrimination and segregation and second-class citizenship. You've got to have the very qualities that this administration does not possess.

Where has this administration shown any disposition to fight on any issue?

The only important legislation the President has vetoed has been the fixed price support program, and the natural gas bill, and he said he vetoed the natural gas bill not because he wanted to protect the consumers. He said he was for the bill in principle, but he just didn't like the way the gas people were lobbying.

The cause of human rights is served best by the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party ask only that you look at the record. Don't be taken in by sweet words and smooth phrases and glib promises of what you may expect in the future. Don't be taken in by an administration that rests on press agents' ideas. Look at the facts. Look at the record and ask yourselves:

Which party consistently fought for progress through national legislation? Which party stands firmly on the side of equality—of human rights?

The questions are important ones. The answers are important, too. There comes to my mind the time a Boston minister visited Abraham Lincoln early in the Civil War. "Let us pray, Mr. President," he declared solemnly, "that in this conflict the Lord is on our side."

Lincoln paused a moment and said:

"Reverend, I'm not concerned about the question whether the Lord is on our side. I know the Lord is always on the side of the right. But it is my fervent prayer that we may be found on the Lord's side."

1956 will be a fateful year. Let us pray, too, that in making our choice we may be found on the Lord's side. For my part, the Democratic side is the Lord's side.

### Foreign Aid Benefits American Industries

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, regardless of whether the foreign-aid programs are justified from a national security standpoint they do benefit our economy.

Eighty-two percent of all the money appropriated is spent right here in the United States and the remaining American dollars must eventually be spent in this country.

I have the distinct honor of representing what is often referred to as the farm equipment capital of the world. A close examination of purchases made

under foreign-aid programs discloses that the farm equipment industry and allied manufacturers in this area benefited to a large extent under these programs.

In the period May 1949 through December 1955, the International Cooperation Administration and its predecessor agencies have financed orders from the following companies in the amounts shown:

J. I. Case.....	\$11,330,000
John Deere.....	15,248,000
International Harvester.....	75,454,000
Minneapolis Moline.....	1,448,000
Caterpillar.....	62,714,000
R. G. Latorneau.....	7,547,000
Butler Manufacturing Co.....	2,200,000
Clearing Machine Corp.....	6,648,000
Rockford Machine Tool.....	638,000

### The Contribution of Oil to Illinois and the Nation

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, today I want to discuss the oil industry which has made such a great contribution to the defense and to the economy of our Nation, and to southern Illinois and the Congressional District I have the honor to represent.

First, I want to tell you why, for the 14 years I have been in Congress, I have constantly supported the oil industry.

I have supported the oil industry because of the tremendous and constant flow of wealth it has brought to the citizens of most of the counties of my Congressional District, and to the State as well for the past several years.

To give you an idea of the great wealth the oil industry brings to Illinois, may I point out that Illinois in 1954 produced 81,130,000 barrels of crude oil, the value of which was \$242,500,000, and, mind you, that was for just one year.

It is important to note that in the 23d District I represent, we produce about two-thirds of all the oil produced in the State, or 60,849,000 barrels in 1954—an income to this area for that year in the amount of \$181,875,000, and millions of dollars from oil will keep coming in for many years in the future.

Now to emphasize the tremendous value of oil production to the 23d Congressional District, if you would multiply the production in 1954 of \$181,875,000, by the 14 years I have been in Congress, it would amount to \$2,546,250,000. This does not take into account the early production for the first 5 years, from 1937 to 1942, which would amount to many more hundreds of millions of dollars.

In addition to the income from oil that is actually produced, in Illinois there is now more than 1 million acres of land, not now producing oil, under lease. From this source, the farmers of Illinois have at least another million dollars annual income.

I have been alert and active in protecting the legitimate interest of the oil industry because I want to continue, as long as possible, this great source of wealth and prosperity for our people.

By protecting the rights of the oil industry, I am representing the best interests of many thousands of farmers who have oil on their land, or who have sold royalties, or leases, upon which land they hope some day oil will be found.

#### BENEFITS BUSINESS AND LABOR

I am also representing the best interests of all of the businessmen who benefit from the millions of dollars of prosperity that has been brought to the farmers, and countless thousands of people who are employed, at good wages, in the various fields of the oil industry.

Back in 1936, before the Clay City and Salem-Centralia oil fields were discovered, the economic conditions throughout this area, as you will remember, were at a low level; in fact, in 1936 thousands of farms in this entire area were mortgaged for about all they could stand. Within a few years after the discovery of oil, thousands of farmers were able to sell their oil leases, oil, and royalties, thereby paying off their mortgages. In other words, the oil industry is of particular interest to practically every citizen in our entire area. This great production of wealth furnishes thousands of jobs, and the necessities and luxuries of life for our citizens. It pays a big tax to the State, to our local subdivisions of government, which helps pay the running expense of government, and the building of schools for the education of our children. The industry makes its full contribution to the civic welfare of our communities, and the support of our churches.

To give you an idea of the wealth it has brought to the counties in the 23d Congressional District in one year, 1954, I am inserting a table containing this information, as follows:

#### Report from Illinois Geological Survey

County	Amount of barrels	Volume in dollars
Bond.....	79,000	\$237,000
Clay.....	4,895,000	14,685,000
Clinton.....	1,735,000	5,205,000
Edwards.....	1,440,000	4,320,000
Fayette.....	6,693,000	20,079,000
Hamilton.....	3,326,000	9,978,000
Jefferson.....	2,281,000	6,843,000
Lawrence.....	3,258,000	9,774,000
Marion.....	6,525,000	19,575,000
Montgomery.....	6,000	18,000
Richland.....	3,515,000	10,545,000
Wabash.....	3,638,000	10,914,000
Washington.....	940,000	2,820,000
Wayne.....	7,067,000	21,201,000
White.....	8,010,000	24,030,000
Total.....	53,408,000	160,224,000

This great wealth that has come to the communities in my section of Illinois—not only in one year, but it has been repeated each year since the discovery of oil, in major quantities, in 1937. In total it runs into several billions of dollars. The good that it has done for all of our people is generally known throughout this area.

#### WHY PROTECTION OF OIL INDUSTRY?

You may ask why and how oil needs protection. The answer is very plain and

CII—748

understandable. The independent oil operators in particular, and at times the large operators need protection against the effort that has been made a number of times in the 14 years I have been in Congress to reduce, or wipe out, the 27½-percent depletion deduction. The demagogues in the Congress and those socialistically inclined, and the leftwingers of the Nation will tell you it should be wiped out, and they have tried to do it. This crowd generally is against the free enterprise system, and all legitimate business. They prefer Government controls, which are the forerunners of socialism.

#### WHAT IS DEPLETION DEDUCTION?

Let me explain it. Back in 1926 a group of the ablest tax attorneys in the Internal Revenue Department in Washington, and the Congress agreed upon allowing a 27½-percent tax depletion deduction on the sale of oil. They did it because under the Constitution the Government could not tax capital of any kind. After a year's study by the Government's tax experts and the Members of Congress, they determined that 27½ percent of the value of a barrel of oil represented the capital of the owner, and could not be taxed. They provided that the profit made on a barrel of oil should be taxed. From that date until this, the capital, or the oil under the ground that belonged to the farmer, or to the farmer and producer when they made a contract, represented 27½ percent of the value, and all above the 27½ percent, less operating cost, is profit, and is taxed as income the same as all other income. This principle has been made applicable to substantially all minerals, including coal, zinc, and so forth.

Several times in the 14 years I have been in the Congress a fight has been made to reduce this depletion allowance; however, so far, we have been able to defeat each attempt, and I will help to defeat every attempt in the future as long as I am in Congress.

If the depletion deduction was wiped out, it would hurt the farmers and the oilmen because it would slow down their drilling and exploration for more oil. That would strike a hard blow at the economy of southern Illinois and the Nation; two-thirds of the oil rigs in southern Illinois would be stacked in lots, or the operators would move away. Thousands of wage earners would be out of jobs, and the millions of dollars that come from the ground in southern Illinois, to enrich our communities, would be left underground because new fields would not be explored and developed. This is an undeniable fact.

#### OIL IMPORTS

Now, there is another threat that has been developing rapidly over the past few years to the independent oil producers, like most of them operating here in southern Illinois. That threat comes from a few big oil companies, about seven in all, which have developed a great deal of oil in the rich oilfields of the Middle East in particular, which produce unlimited millions of barrels of oil each year, at a very low cost.

Because of the abundant production, it is being imported into this country in such great amounts that the smaller oil producers of our entire Nation have been forced to cut back their production further than it should be. In the interest of defense, we must maintain production at a high level, and keep exploring and bringing in new fields and new oil reserves if we are to make certain that if another world war came we would be able to produce enough oil to keep industry in this Nation going at a high level. And enough oil to supply our Army, our great Air Force—so necessary to the protection of our country—and to keep our thousands of ships in position to transport our men and military supplies to any nations which would become our allies.

The Office of Defense Mobilization, the President of the United States, and all of those from the highest level in Government, realize that we must make certain that our production of oil and gas in this country must always be kept at a high enough level to sustain ourselves for many months if we are to assure the defense of this country.

May I point out in the last world war the submarine menace cut off, to a very large extent, the importation of oil from Venezuela and South America, and from the Far East.

Fortunately, even though the submarines cut off a large part of our import oil for several months before we were able to get them under control, our oil industry had been kept in such high production that we were able to increase our industry for war, and to supply our Army, Navy, and thousands of airplanes during this great crisis.

Since peace came, in 1945, oil imports have continued to increase year after year, and as they increased, our production of wells in the United States has been cut back and cut back until the Congress, and later the President, for the first time in our history recognized that excessive imports of oil had become a problem that must be dealt with.

In 1954, I introduced a bill that would not permit imports to reach the level of more than 10 percent of our national consumption, and after a major fight on the floor of the House, the bill failed to be passed by only a few votes.

We continued our fight against excessive imports in the Congress until in 1955 the President appointed a Cabinet-level committee, headed by Dr. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, to study energy supplies and resources including oil. That committee, after making a thorough study, rendered a decision that in the future the proportion of oil imports to domestic production be held at the 1954 level. Since that time, Dr. Flemming, acting for the executive department, and the Congress have been making every effort to get the seven major oil-importing oil companies to voluntarily reduce their imports and comply with the expressed will of the Congress and the executive department.

Some of them have shown an inclination to comply to a greater extent than others. Some few have not. Dr. Flemming recently issued his third letter to all

of the major companies urging compliance, and asking for specific information as to their program of imports in the future. The oil people, generally, agree that it would be better to limit excess imports on a voluntary basis rather than to pass legislation if it is possible to get them to do it.

My information is that the executive department hopes that third quarter imports this year may be substantially reduced based on recent reports to the Office of Defense Mobilization, in reply to the recent letter he sent out and the personal conferences Dr. Flemming has had with some of these importers.

This is a problem that must be met in the interest of our economy, and in the defense of our country if legislation is to be avoided.

Unless voluntary compliance is met which will result in the proportion of oil imports to domestic production being held at the 1954 level, as recommended by the President's Cabinet Committee at the close of their study, I shall join with other Members of the Congress in introducing and supporting legislation which I predict will be passed by the Congress in the next session to accomplish this.

I would like to make a comparison between the attitude of President Eisenhower and his administration with the attitude of the two past Presidents, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman, with reference to the oil industry.

#### COMPARISON

President Eisenhower has shown by his friendly attitude toward the oil industry that he understands and appreciates the great contribution it has made to the economy of our Nation, and the necessity for keeping it strong as one of the first lines of defense of the Nation. For instance, one of his first acts was to support legislation to turn the oil tidelands back to the States, which had been in possession of them for over 100 years before the Supreme Court in a split decision brought the tidelands under the control of the Federal Government.

By comparison, President Truman had previously vetoed a tidelands bill, overriding the will of the Congress that had passed it by a substantial majority.

#### DEPLETION DEDUCTION

The late President Roosevelt, upon the recommendation of Mr. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., and others, made more than one attempt to reduce, or wipe out the oil industry's 27½-percent tax depletion deduction, but was prevented from doing so by the Congress.

Then again, after Mr. Truman became President, he made the same attempt to wipe out, or reduce, the 27½-percent tax depletion deduction, but was also prevented from doing so by us in the Congress.

By comparison in the 3½ years President Eisenhower has made no attempt or suggestion to do so.

#### IMPORTS

Because of the rapid increase in imports since World War II, President Eisenhower was the first Chief Executive to recognize the danger of excessive imports as a problem that had to be dealt with. He thereby brought into being the

Cabinet-level study committee, which, under the chairmanship of Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, rendered a decision that in the future the proportion of oil imports to domestic production be held at the 1954 level. Furthermore, the President showed his interest in this problem by authorizing the Director of Defense Mobilization to follow up on the recommendations of the Committee, and to make recommendations to the oil-importing companies designed to bring about substantial compliance with the Committee's recommendations.

I would also like to point out that in the veto of the gas bill the President said, in substance, that he reluctantly vetoed the bill because he thought that legislation should be enacted to prohibit Federal control of the price and gathering of gas at the wellhead, but that certain lobbying activities had been engaged in that caused him to feel he should take such action. He, in a manner, left the door open for the consideration of such legislation by a subsequent Congress.

I would also like to point out that the Cabinet-level committee, in making their report recommended against the Government's control of the price and gathering of gas at the wellhead.

By comparison, again, when the Kerr bill in 1950 was passed by the Congress to remove Federal control of the price and gathering of gas at the wellhead President Truman vetoed it.

The above comparison of records plainly shows the difference in the attitude of the Eisenhower Administration toward the oil and gas industry. The Eisenhower administration has been favorable to the oil industry. The past administrations were unfavorable.

### Slum Clearance Authorization Adequate

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, on July 13, 1956, there appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Hon. ELMER J. HOLLAND, which deplored the action of the House Rules Committee in tabling the house bill, H. R. 11742. The statement attempts to point out the allegedly serious effects on the Federal slum clearance program should the housing bill not be enacted.

The statement points up one of the great fallacies concerning the pending housing bill and that is its purported relationship to slum clearance.

Actually if the pending housing bill is not enacted, it will in no way affect the program of Federal grants for slum clearance and urban redevelopment. The Congress has appropriated \$1 billion for this purpose and, since 1949, \$700 million has been earmarked for Federal grants for slum clearance, leaving \$300 million remaining in this fund.

The statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania contends that if the housing bill is not enacted that slum clearance will be set back because there will be no public housing available for displaced persons. Actually it is the omission from the pending bill of this important relationship between public housing and slum clearance that prompted the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Albert M. Cole, recently to criticize the measure as "excessive, unrealistic, and ill conceived," and has influenced the House Rules Committee to table an application for a rule.

The administration in its endorsement of a modest public-housing program seeks to make public housing one of the instruments in the fight to clear the Nation's slums. The other body and the House Banking and Currency Committee rejected such a use for public housing and approved an unrealistic program which seeks to project public housing on the Nation's communities as an end in itself and not as one of the instruments in the Nation's fight against slum clearance.

The proponents of public housing for years sought to justify public housing as necessary in the fight to clear slums. Yet when the administration sought to tie in public housing with slum clearance this was rejected. The administration believes that any community in order to qualify for public housing must have a workable program for the prevention of slums. This requirement was rejected by the other body and the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

I have here a letter from Frank P. Zeidler, mayor of the city of Milwaukee, Wis., dated May 25, 1956, and addressed to the regional director of the Housing and Home Finance Agency in Chicago, Ill. Mayor Zeidler points out that originally he opposed the whole concept of the workable program because he saw it to be a maneuver on the part of those opposed to public housing to put another stumbling block in the way of obtaining Federal funds for public housing or for slum clearance.

Now in this letter which I am inserting as part of this statement the mayor endorses the workable program requirement as something that is long overdue.

If the champions of public housing were sincere in their efforts to clear slums, they would accept the workable program requirement and insist that all units be earmarked for slum dwellers who are displaced by code enforcement, slum clearance, or other governmental action. By so doing they would remove the principal roadblock to the consideration of the pending housing bill.

The letter follows:

#### OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,

Milwaukee, Wis., May 25, 1956.

MR. IVAN D. CARSON,

Regional Director of Urban Renewal  
Housing and Home Finance Agency,  
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. CARLSON: When I discussed with you at East Lansing the effects of the workable program of urban renewal, I said I would express in writing some of the experiences which Milwaukee has had with the program in order that you might have some material for analysis of the course and direction of the program.

I was originally opposed to the whole concept of the workable program because I conceived it to be a maneuver on the part of the real estate interests, who are hostile to public housing, to put another stumbling block in the way of obtaining Federal funds for public housing, or for slum clearance. I still believe that this was partly the reason for the creation of the workable urban renewal program.

However, I also recognized at the time that there were other persons interested in the workable program who had a genuine concern about slum clearance and felt that cities could and should do more on their own in order to accomplish the objectives of city restoration. I think that those who conceived the workable renewal program as being a means of forcing cities onward in their housing standards are being justified now to a considerable extent.

The necessity of having a workable urban renewal program certified by the Federal Government permitted the forces for better housing conditions in Milwaukee to pass a housing code which is somewhat stiffer than the one that we have had in the past. I note that this code is not what the URA felt to be ultimately desirable, but, nevertheless, this code is much more than we could have obtained without the Federal spur to create such a program. At the present time the staff of the health commissioner, who administers the program, has gone over a considerable portion of the rooming house district and has come forward with many orders for improvement. Of course, there is a considerable amount of protest against the orders but I believe that they are desirable from the public point of view.

Secondly, the necessity of having a certified workable urban renewal program has brought about the passage of a resolution by the Milwaukee Common Council which permits the creation of the post of an urban renewal coordinator. Coordination is absolutely necessary for urban renewal, and the task is so great that the responsibility for it must be centered.

A citizen urban renewal committee, established to comply with the urban renewal law, is a strong force for improving standards of the community, because the citizens appointed are, in the main, completely interested in their work.

The workable urban renewal program also sorted out some planning difficulties that existed in the city. It was decided that the board of public-land commissioners should have the major responsibility for improving the master plan and for selecting planning sites and areas to be demolished, rehabilitated, or conserved. In my opinion, this was an important step forward, because the staff of the land commission did not concentrate on urban renewal until the Federal demand for a workable program came through.

Perhaps the principal way in which the workable program is having a good effect is through the office of the building inspector. The building inspector was able to secure additional assistance for inspection resulting in demolition. He has already caused to be demolished this year hundreds of substandard buildings. If the city had to pay for the razed buildings under a land-purchase plan, or under a forceable condemnation, the city simply could not have afforded a program of this type.

It would appear now that, on the basis of his present experience, the building inspector is taking down enough buildings every 4 months to amount in total to the number of buildings that would be taken down in a major clearance project in the city. This work is done at very little cost to the city government. It does not disturb communities and does not upset land ownership. As a result of this experience, I am thinking of asking the State legislature to give us a stronger condemnation law.

The necessity of qualifying in 1957 for a recertification of having a workable urban renewal program has caused work to move forward on the creation of a civic center. This work is long overdue.

The workable program is also spurring the completion of the Milwaukee Building Code. I believe that the Milwaukee Common Council will hire a special consultant to complete the last six chapters of the code, which has been in the making a long time.

On the basis of our current experience, I think the workable program for urban renewal should be given several years of additional life in order to see what further advantages it will bring to the cities which have been compelled to meet its standards.

Yours truly,

FRANK P. ZEIDLER, Mayor.

### Fallacy of Democratic Claim To Be Party of Common Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOS. E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, on April 11, former President Harry S. Truman, at Des Moines, addressed the people of Iowa. He indulged in his usual unsupported charges which have characterized his political speeches.

In discussing foreign policy, he said:

My friends, I have spoken to you tonight mostly about the agricultural situation. However, there is another matter which should never be absent from our thoughts—that is the question of foreign policy and world peace. I have spoken on this subject a number of times recently and I shall not dwell upon it tonight. But we should always remember that this subject is so important it overshadows all our other problems here at home. And in this field, unfortunately, the Eisenhower administration has made the worst mistakes of all.

They have made a mockery of bipartisanship in foreign policy. They have put politics first and the national interest second. The result has been to dismay our friends, comfort our enemies, weaken the position of the free world, and drive other nations closer to the Communist bloc.

One would think from this statement that Harry Truman thought there was really something basically wrong with President Eisenhower's foreign policy. He supplied the refutation for his own statement. In Rome on May 21, he said:

I am for the foreign policy outlined by the President of the United States. I only wish everyone on the other side had done the same for me (New York Times, May 22, 1956).

On April 26 I placed in the RECORD an answer to many of Harry Truman's charges in his speech at Des Moines. His own statement in Rome repudiating his foreign policy charges at Des Moines must now be included as a part of that record.

The entire tenor of his speech at Des Moines followed the familiar Democratic theme that the Democrat Party holds

a monopoly in serving the interests of the common man. He said:

Really the only people who haven't been messed up are General Motors, big business, and the stock market gamblers.

On April 26, in answer to his attack on this particular point, I said:

From Harry Truman's speech, you would gather the impression that this administration is only interested in the very rich. He said: "Really, the only people who haven't been messed up are General Motors, big business, and stock market gamblers." The distribution of the increase in both personal and national income does not support the repeated Democratic claims that this administration is operating solely in the interests of big business. The repeated attacks by Harry Truman, Adlai Stevenson, and Senator KEFAUVER on the businessmen in Government is a terrible disservice to the American people.

Let me remind you that prior to 1939 President Roosevelt used to indulge in attacks on the leading members of the business community. However, when the chips were down and it became necessary to mobilize our resources to fight the Nazis, to whom did President Roosevelt turn? He asked William S. Knudsen, then president of General Motors; Edward R. Stettin, then chairman of United States Steel; Donald Nelson, the president of Sears Roebuck; Charles E. Wilson, the president of General Electric; and William H. Harrison, a vice president of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., along with countless others of similar capacities and abilities, to enter the Government service. What happened? A certain Senator from Missouri, Harry S. Truman, proceeded to impugn the integrity of these people. He questioned the distribution of defense contracts and asserted that undue favoritism had been shown big business. Early in 1941 the Truman committee was established which plummeted Harry Truman into the Vice Presidency, and then the Presidency. A few years later, when confronted with the Korean emergency what did Harry Truman do? He asked Mr. Charles E. Wilson, the president of General Electric, to take over the Office of Defense Mobilization, one of the most important positions in the entire Federal Government.

Do the Democrats imply the people of the United States can only secure the service of competent people in a period of acute emergency—that the rest of the time we must be content with mediocrity, political hacks, and intellectual theorists? As a matter of fact, the Democrats when in power have recruited business leaders for many important posts. Let me remind you that our first Secretary of Defense—an unusually capable man, James Forrestal, was a Wall Street banker. W. Averell Harriman, President Truman's Secretary of Commerce after he kicked Henry Wallace out, was not exactly a barefoot boy. The Biddles and the Morgenthau would not qualify as little-business men.

It is time that we stopped peddling this kind of nonsense, that we ceased appealing to the basest of human motivations—envy and jealousy of the achievements of others. President Eisenhower is to be commended for having secured the most capable people he could find to operate what is the biggest business in the world, our Federal Government.

The staff of the Senate Republican policy committee has recently completed an extensive study of the record which disposes of the Democratic claim to be the party of the common man. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this study may be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I am advised by the Public Printer that the excerpts I have asked to have printed in the RECORD will exceed by 2½ pages the two pages which may be printed in the RECORD without a statement of cost, and that the entire cost will be \$346.50.

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

**NOTES ON THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY CLAIM TO BE THE PARTY OF THE COMMON MAN**

Campaign oratory is usually dissolved in the ballot box. But occasionally some political claims and slogans are made to stick in the public memory and become part of the folklore of political parties.

One of these is the claim that the Democratic Party "is the people's party" while the Republican Party "is the party of special interests." Stated another way, Democrats assert theirs "is the party of the common man" while Republicans favor "the privileged few."

This claim is utterly false, but Democrats have pressed it so boldly, for so long, and in so many forms that they have achieved for it a measure of popular acceptance.

**DEMOCRATIC PLAY ON THE THEME OF THE COMMON MAN**

The theme has a double-barreled effect (1) to praise the Democratic Party and associate it with the interests of "the common man" and the "average man"; and (2) to condemn the Republican Party and associate it with the interests of the "rich," the "bankers," "big business," and the "privileged few."

**SPURIOUS NATURE OF THE DEMOCRATIC CLAIM**

The Democratic Party claim to be the "party of the common man" and the corollary that the Republican Party is "the party of the privileged few" is a flagrant sample of the big lie in politics.

No major party could function successfully in a country the size and diversity of the United States if it served only the common man or only the privileged few.

It is one of the virtues of our nationwide two-party system that the voters may switch from one major party to the other and find each one an adequate instrument to serve the Nation as a whole. If this were not true, our political system would soon degenerate into a multiplicity of small special interest parties incapable of governing, as we see in some countries abroad. The very health and vigor of our two-party system—each drawing strength from all four corners of the union, belies the Democratic Party claim.

One reason behind the Democratic Party claim to be the party of the common man is the fact that for years the Democratic Party has followed a philosophy and has labored hard to mold the American people into common men.

Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell observed this tendency of the Democrats to turn our people into common men in these words:

"The keepers of this doctrine were interested not in individual men but in collective man, massed man. For them social problems were quite simple. One merely had to determine what was good for collective man and then shove it down his throat like castor oil. The government was of the people, for the people, but by the social planners."<sup>1</sup>

And Dr. James B. Conant, former president of Harvard University, put his finger on the source of the doctrine of massed man when he said: "The Soviets seek uniformity and strict adherence to the creed of Marxism-Leninism."<sup>2</sup> In that creed man is nothing

as an individual. He exists only as an unidentifiable atom in a collective mass. And men and mass exist only for the state.

Recent history shows the many steps through which the New Deal-Fair Deal Democrats, who were in control of Government, attempted to deprive our people of their individuality. These Democrats strove to centralize government of everyday affairs in Washington, leaving less and less for people to do in their home States and localities. They handed out billions in relief, grants, and aids from Washington, making a large number of people dependent upon the Government at the Nation's Capital. The centralized administration of these activities operated to reduce the individuality of persons to numbers in electronic computing machines. The list of laws, acts, and regulations systematically designed to rob people of their individuality and pile them up in collective masses could be extended a mile long.

No one can deny that the Democrats responsible for these operations intended to do good by them. But it also cannot be denied that an inescapable and most harmful byproduct of such operations has been the weakening of individual personality and self-reliance.

The Democratic Party under New Deal-Fair Deal domination has done its utmost to pour our people into the mold of common men and to deal with them in the mass. This is the basis of their political philosophy and voting appeals. They have had some measure of success, especially where our technical progress has emphasized collective or mass action. But the success has been superficial because deep down our people are proud and jealous of their individuality. They resent being compressed into the mold of the common man. Behind the mass production and the collective this and that our people still have wide diversities and at heart remain individualists. This is clear when we examine some of the deep-seated diversities in American life.

**AMERICA HAS NO "COMMON MAN"**

Where Democrats are sincere in making the claim to be the party of the common man, as some undoubtedly are, they see the forest and not the trees. They look at the material uniformities in American life—the same trains, hotels, restaurants, cooking, and newspapers—and quickly come to the conclusion that all our people, too, are of a common mold.

What they fail to see is that this conformity is merely an expression of our technical, material progress. They fail to understand or deliberately close their eyes to the fact that underneath the common material veneer is a people still highly individual in talents, aspirations, and with the intense desire of each to fulfill his or her individual personality.

The greatest fallacy in the Democratic Party claim is that in America there is no common man.

Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell declared: "We were told for some years that government was supposed to minister to the 'common man.' This doctrine of the common man was as singularly unfree a doctrine as we have ever witnessed in this country. The idea that we are all alike, a common mass, the products of some sort of biological punch press, seeking the same end, through the same means, with the same ideas, desires, and needs, is indeed a devastating one."<sup>3</sup>

**REAL BASIS FOR THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY CLAIM TO BE THE PARTY OF THE COMMON MAN**

Democratic Party leaders who make the claim that theirs is the party of the common man are well aware that ours is a Nation of great diversities, and that there is no such thing as a common man in our midst.

They even play upon these diversities by making demagogic appeals to minority racial, religious, occupational, and class prejudices. They do not hesitate to develop and inflame class distinctions in their aim to separate a few of our people from all the others.

One doesn't have to think hard to find the reasons for such Democratic trickery. One reason, as explained previously, is that the Democrats have been running the Government on the doctrine of the collective man, massed man.

A second reason lies in the field of raw politics.

Political history shows that present-day Democratic Party leaders will make any claim and follow any line which promises them the votes to gain control of the country and remain in power.

They have shrewdly calculated where the bulk of votes lies and they make their appeals accordingly. That is why they label Republicans as the party of the "rich," the "bankers," "big business," and the "privileged few." They know that such labels carry an unpleasant, even sinister implication; and that few votes can be had from those sources.

They label their own party the party of the common man, the average man, and include among these the farmer, the laboring man, the white-collar worker, and the small-business man because such labels sound wholesome and the bulk of votes can be found in those sources.

It does not trouble such Democratic spokesmen in the least that this deliberate inflaming of class distinctions can do great harm to the peace and unity of the Nation.

It does not bother them to malign good men and women among our people.

Their consciences aren't troubled when it is pointed out that their party, too, has its share of millionaires, its quota of advisers from banks and big business, and a much sordid record of favors to "the privileged few." It doesn't seem to bother them, either, that a great many of the things they have done with professed intentions to help the so-called "little man" have resulted in great harm to the bulk of our people.

In using the inflammatory phrases of class distinction, they have had but one thought in mind—to get in power and stay there.

**MILLIONAIRES AND BIG BUSINESSMEN IN DEMOCRATIC PARTY ADMINISTRATIONS**

Common observation of political debate readily shows that Democratic Party leaders never leave off criticizing Republicans for having businessmen serve in Government posts. "Eight millionaires and a plumber" is the way Adlai Stevenson expressed it. The same idea is phrased in many other ways.

Since Democrats seem to think it bad for Government to avail itself of the talents, abilities and competence of businessmen, one would think that no Democratic administration would touch a millionaire or a businessman with a ten-foot pole.

Let us look at the record on this point. Does the Democratic Party of the "common man" rub shoulders with millionaires? Does it seek the aid of bankers—big bankers and big-business men?

**MILLIONAIRES SERVE DEMOCRATS, TOO**

A cursory examination of the men in the United States Senate discloses at least a half dozen multimillionaire Democratic Senators, more it seems than can be found on the Republican side of the aisle (BYRD, GREEN, KERR, LEHMAN, MURRAY, SYMINGTON).

It is a matter of common knowledge that John J. Raskob, multimillionaire contributor to the Democratic Party, bailed out Franklin D. Roosevelt (a millionaire in his own right) when Roosevelt was reluctant to run for Governor of New York for fear of losing his investment in Warm Springs, Ga.

Bernard M. Baruch, who got millions out of Wall Street just before the 1929 crash,

<sup>1</sup> Address at Flint, Mich., January 20, 1956.

<sup>2</sup> The Citadel of Learning, Yale University Press, 1956.

<sup>3</sup> Address at Flint, Mich., January 20, 1956.

is well known as an adviser to Democratic Presidents.

Four out of five prominent contenders for the 1956 Democratic Presidential nomination—Adlai Stevenson, Averell Harriman, W. Stuart Symington, and G. Mennen (Soapy) Williams—are men of wealth.

#### BANKERS ALSO SERVE DEMOCRATS

Big bankers are not neglected in the roster of Democratic Party aides. Former Secretary of Defense Robert A. Lovett is a partner in the influential Wall Street firm of Brown Brothers, Harriman & Co., Averell Harriman, holder of a half dozen top-level posts under Truman, and now Democratic Governor of New York, was associated with the same firm. The late James Forrestal, first Secretary of Defense, was president of Dillon, Read & Co., one of the Nation's largest investment houses.

#### DEMOCRATS CALL UPON BIG BUSINESS

Nor has big business been neglected by Democratic Presidents in their search for executive talent. W. STUART SYMINGTON, before he was elected to the Senate, served in the Defense Department and several other high Government positions after he was brought to Washington from the presidency of the Emerson Electric Co., St. Louis, Mo.

A mainstay in high level Democratic administration posts was Charles E. Wilson, president of General Electric Co. Roger L. Putnam, chosen to head the Economic Stabilization Agency with virtual power of life and death over American industry, had been connected with the Nation's largest manufacturers of package machinery, a director of a large machine and gear firm, and of a Springfield (Mass.) bank. Putnam's predecessor as Economic Stabilizer was Eric Johnston, former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, now president of the Motion Picture Association of America, and a director of United Air Lines, the Bank of America, an insurance firm, and several banks. Paul Hoffman, automobile magnate who reportedly made his first million before he was 35, was head of the Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA) in the Truman administration.

Ex-Secretary of State Acheson has been associated between periods of Government employment with a law firm which has drawn huge retainers as representative of foreign governments, some of them seeking large loans from the United States.

In May of 1952, Senator CAPEHART inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list which provided a quick glance at men of wealth and big business connections who are either prominent Democrats or who served Democratic administrations in recent years.<sup>4</sup> A thorough survey would multiply this record many times, especially if it included the thousands of businessmen participating in Franklin D. Roosevelt's National Recovery Administration (NRA). But the list presented by Senator CAPEHART should be enough to prove the point.

In setting forth the list, it was not the Senator's purpose to direct criticism at any of the men listed. The purpose was to brand as contemptibly false the Democratic Party insinuation that the employment of big business executives in Government is against the interests of the "little man."

Some of the men listed are Republicans, more are Democrats, judged by voting registrations, by intent, or by repeated and substantial contributions to the Democratic Party. But all who are listed are men whose talents, abilities, initiative, and effort have served the American free enterprise system with distinction. If any administration failed to use such men of proven ability, the people would have cause to charge Govern-

ment with stupidity, or worse, dereliction of duty.

Memory need not be long to recall the early days of the Roosevelt administration in 1933 when a host of crackpot economists, lawyers alert for the main chance, poets, social planners, and intellectual freebooters swarmed to Washington to inaugurate the more abundant life. After having spoon-fed the Nation's ailing economy for 5 years from sundry bottles of elixir bought with billions of taxpayers' money, these assorted buccaneers only succeeded in having the 1937 depression take the country back to 1932 levels.

Then it was that the Democratic Party of the "common man" turned to the businessmen they pretended to despise in every election campaign. Then began the process of replacing the social adventurers with men whose outstanding performance for American business and industry testified to their talent, ability, and competence.

Once the door was opened no field of private industry and enterprise was left unexplored in the scramble for talent. After World War II began, the Democratic administration's appeal to businessmen was intensified and thousands upon thousands came to Washington to help produce the production miracle which insured victory.

In the roster we find representatives from the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., Aluminum Co. of America, Standard Oil, United States Steel, Republic Steel, General Electric, and General Motors.

Roosevelt and Truman obtained officials for Government posts from General Foods Corp., Eastman Kodak, United States Rubber Co., Lever Bros., Merck & Co., the Union Pacific, and several other railroads, half a dozen air and steamship lines, the Greyhound Corp., many insurance companies, the National Broadcasting Co., and other radio chains.

Investment and international financiers were brought to Washington from Dillon, Read & Co.; J. P. Morgan & Co.; Kuhn, Loeb & Co.; and others.

Mention could also be made of John W. Davis, wealthy lawyer and lifelong Democrat; Owen D. Young of General Electric Co.; Melvin A. Traylor, president of the First National Bank of Chicago; Henry Bruere, president of the Bowers Savings Bank, New York; Basil O'Connor, a lawyer with whom President Roosevelt had been associated and who once asked a fee of \$200,000 in an RFC loan, according to Jesse Jones, RFC Administrator; Joseph E. Davies, Roosevelt's millionaire Ambassador to Russia; Col. James W. Flanagan, formerly president of the Imperial Oil Company of Canada who went as RFC representative to South America; Louis Johnson, former Secretary of Defense and who also served the Democratic administration as counsel of General Aniline & Film at \$50,000 per year; John M. Hancock, industrial banker who worked with Bernard Baruch on Government missions; Walter Dunham, banker and Detroit businessman of RFC notoriety; Kaiser and his sons who received millions in Government loans which interested his large creditors, the Giannini Bank of America and the Mellon National Bank & Trust Co.; and Delos W. Rentzel of American Air Lines whom Truman made head of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

In the appendix of his book, Fifty Billion Dollars, RFC Administrator Jesse Jones presented a list of former employees of RFC (alumni, he called them) with their connections in business, industry, finance, and other associations. All served the RFC with honor and distinction under a Democratic administration whose leaders now denounce businessmen when they serve in a Republican administration.

The use by the Roosevelt and Truman administrations of wealthy bankers and businessmen is not subject to condemnation, Democrats, like Republicans, simply discovered that these men were the best men for

the large jobs in which the Government engaged in depression times, war years, and during the postwar transitions.

It does make the case, however, that the Democratic Party has made lavish use of men from the very sectors of American life their leaders constantly denounce. Republicans, even in their most active days in control of the Government, never had such extensive big business connections.

#### MEASURES OF NATIONAL WELL-BEING UNDER DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS OR WHICH PARTY BENEFITS THE COMMON MAN?

The test of a political administration, Democratic or Republican, does not lie in comparing benefits given to particular groups in our population. It does not lie in making general conclusions from bits and pieces of data. Yet this is the method Democratic politicians repeatedly use to show that Republicans favor big business, or are against the farmer, or hurt the little man. The method is just as phony and just as meaningless as it would be so say that a husband favors his wife when he buys her a dishwasher, is against his daughter because he does not get her a piano, and hurts his children because he denies them candy before supper.

The true test of a political administration must be found in the general effect the administration has on the national interest and the well-being of the people as a whole.

The chief measures of the well-being of a nation are not hard to find. Does the Nation enjoy peace? Is the Nation secure from external danger? Is individual freedom preserved? Is the Nation prosperous? Is there plenty of work at fair wages for all willing and able to work? How burdensome is the level of taxes? Is the Government operated economically and free from corruption?

Questions such as these indicate the true measures of well-being in a nation. A political administration can be judged good or bad by how its performance affects these measures of national well-being. If such tests are applied with regard to the people of the Nation as a whole, the Democrats who claim so loudly to be the party of the common man have much to explain.

#### WAR AND PEACE

Few events are more important to the average man—the people as a whole—than war and peace. When a nation goes to war the rank and file of people pay the heaviest price. Their sons do the fighting and make up the biggest list of dead and wounded. They and their succeeding generations pay the cost in money. They suffer the shortages and privations of wartime economy. The Nation suffers a tremendous loss in resources, many irreplaceable forever. The life of the Nation generally is deeply upset and its troubles continue long after the last shot is fired.

While no political party can be absolutely charged with blame if the Nation becomes involved in war, yet the diplomacy and foreign policy of a political administration has a considerable bearing on whether the Nation goes to war or not. With a nation as powerful as the United States, the influence of its diplomacy and foreign relations also has a strong bearing on whether the world generally remains at peace or sinks into war.

Each of our major political parties has been in office for approximately half the time since 1900. Their diplomacy and foreign policies worked completely opposite results.

#### THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY RECORD ON WAR AND PEACE

It is a singular fact of history that the United States has gone to war three times since 1900—each time under Democratic administrations; not once under Republican administrations.

In World War I, 4½ million men were engaged in the Armed Forces. The battle

<sup>4</sup> CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 20, 1952, vol. 93, pt. 4, pp. 5555-5561.

deaths numbered 53,407, other deaths 63,156, and 204,002 were wounded.<sup>5</sup>

In World War II, 16 million were engaged. The battle deaths totaled 293,986, other deaths 113,842, with 670,846 wounded.<sup>6</sup>

In the Korean war, which Mr. Truman entered without prior authority from Congress, 5¼ million men were engaged. The battle deaths numbered 33,629, other deaths 20,617 and 103,284 were wounded.<sup>6</sup>

The full money cost of these three wars cannot be computed finally until many generations have passed because the people of our country will be repaying the borrowed money and continued obligations stemming from these wars beyond the year 2000.

Some measure of the immediate cash cost of these wars can be inferred from figures on the national debt. The average gross public debt of the Federal Government for the period 1911-1915 was \$1,191,000,000. For the period 1916-1920, under Democratic administrations, which covered World War I, the debt rose to an average of \$24,299,000,000. In 1941, just prior to World War II, the debt stood at \$42,968,000,000. By 1946, which finally reflected the influence of World War II, the debt stood at \$269,422,000,000. Some reduction was thereafter made by cancellations of war contracts and other financial adjustments. So that on the eve of the Korean war the debt stood at \$257,357,000,000. When that war was finally over in 1953, the debt had jumped again \$266,017,000,000.<sup>7</sup>

The interest charges on the Federal debt at the end of December 1955 totaled \$6,913,000,000 and must be paid currently out of taxes.<sup>8</sup> This amount is approximately \$2 billion more than it cost to operate the entire Government in President Hoover's last year, just before the Democrats took over in the interest of the common man.

While these figures are astronomical, they do not amount to a fraction of what these three wars will cost by the time the last dollar is paid on the public debt and the last veteran, his dependents, and survivors are paid off in the distant future. Taxes, of course, are also an important part of war financing and will be treated in the section below devoted to that subject.

Woodrow Wilson in 1916 was elected on the slogan, among others, that "He kept us out of war." Some 5 months later the United States was involved in World War I.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected on the Democratic Party platform which declared, "We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval, or Air Force to fight in foreign lands outside the Americas, except in case of attack." In a speech delivered in Boston, October 31, 1940, Mr. Roosevelt reaffirmed this pledge in emphatic terms. He said: "While I am talking to you mothers and fathers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again: Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars."

Historians have since shown that at the time this speech was made, Mr. Roosevelt had already taken enough unneutral steps (many of them secretly) to make our involvement in World War II almost inescapable.

Mr. Truman engaged American forces in the Korean war without ever placing the matter before Congress.

One can hear anguished cries from Democrats that it is unfair to label them the war party in American politics. Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, gave the definitive answer to this outcry in the following words:

<sup>5</sup> Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1955, table No. 266, p. 227.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., table No. 407, p. 349.

<sup>8</sup> Treasury Bulletin, February 1956, table 4, p. 20.

"If members of the Democratic Party wish to charge the depression to the Republican Party, a depression which was worldwide but which they wish to charge to the Republicans solely because it happened in a Republican administration, then I want the Democratic Party to take full blame for the wars which occurred in the Democratic administrations. If they boast of the artificial prosperity which accompanied those wars let them have full credit for the wars."<sup>9</sup>

That is fair political rejoinder to a purely political charge. Democrats took political credit in 1916 for keeping the country out of war. Democrats campaigned successfully for more than 20 years on the 1929 depression which they charged to Republicans. But they do not find it so amusing to find themselves on the target end of a comparable charge.

But whether they are responsible for the wars or not, it can hardly be said that the war years in their administrations redounded to the benefit of the "common man."

#### THE REPUBLICAN RECORD ON WAR AND PEACE

While the campaign of 1952 was being waged the United States was still locked in a stalemate war in Korea. President Eisenhower promised that he would make every effort to end that bloodshed. He kept that promise. Furthermore, he kept the Nation out of another war in Indochina. Despite all the menacing ups and downs in world politics, the American Nation is still at peace and enjoying unprecedented prosperity not based on wars.

President Eisenhower, in sharp contrast to his predecessors, declared his attitude in these words: "I will never be guilty of any kind of action that can be interpreted as war until the Congress, which has the constitutional authority, says so."<sup>10</sup>

These are an attitude and a record which pay substantial dividends in well-being to all the people of the Nation, the "common man" included.

#### DEMOCRATIC PARTY RECORD ON EMPLOYMENT

At the height of the depression some 12 million or more people were out of work. After the 1932 elections, the Democratic Party took control of the Federal Government and remained in office for 20 years.

In the period 1933-37, the Democrats spent tremendous sums of money on relief, public works, and other Federal projects. They tried every economic nostrum in the books. But at the end of that period the national economy slid back to 1932 levels. Never in the entire period did unemployment fall below 7,500,000. By 1939, there were again 9 million persons out of work.

By that time World War II had commenced. The United States was swept into the war atmosphere first, in rebuilding its own defense which had been neglected for many years; second, in helping Great Britain and her associated allies; and finally, by America's entry—at the end of 1941—into the war itself.

That solved the employment problem for the duration of the war.

In the years immediately after the war, employment remained substantially high because of the pent-up demand for civilian goods released by the ending of war in 1945.

By 1949, however, another sharp economic recession set in and unemployment rose to approximately 4 million persons.

In the summer of 1950 the United States became involved in the Korean war. Once again unemployment fell away to negligible proportions. This continued throughout the remainder of the Truman administration.

Now what do we see here in summary?

<sup>9</sup> CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 10, 1955, p. 2192.

<sup>10</sup> Press conference, April 5, 1956.

One fact stands out: Democratic administrations, with full control of the Federal Government and a practically unlimited treasury of 20 years, completely failed to solve the problem of unemployment, except by war.

Democrats failed in a crucial matter touching the well-being of the "common man."

#### REPUBLICAN RECORD ON EMPLOYMENT

President Eisenhower's first year, 1953, set all-time records for employment, economic activity, and general prosperity. This is all the more remarkable because the Nation was finally at peace, war spending had tapered off, and the difficult transition was begun from a war economy to a peacetime economy.

The high level of prosperity thus begun continued through 1954 and 1955. It is continuing in 1956.

The one dark spot in an otherwise healthy and prosperous economy is the drop in farm income. Net income of farm operators from current operations dropped from \$14.9 billion in 1952 to \$11 billion in 1955.<sup>11</sup> The index of prices received and paid by farmers (parity ratio) which had dropped 15 points under Truman (from 107 in 1951 to 92 in 1953) fell another 8 points under the Republican administration to 84 by 1955.<sup>12</sup> However, between April and May of 1956 the parity ratio rose to 85.<sup>13</sup> The parity ratio decline reflected two maladjustments in agriculture: The difficulty in cutting production back from wartime levels, and the high price supports which encouraged increased production to the point where huge surpluses of farm products hang over and depress the market. The Eisenhower administration seeks to return agriculture to a healthy condition by flexible price supports aiming at parity income in the market place, by a soil-bank proposal to take a portion of farmlands out of production, and by other measures short of making the farmer a ward of the Government.

By May 1956, employment on farms, in factories, and in other nonagricultural pursuits stood at more than 65 million.

Personal income in the Nation in April 1956 ran at an annual rate of \$317 billion, an increase of \$18 billion over the same month a year ago and a jump of \$51 billion over April 1952, the last year of the Truman administration. Wages and salaries in the same month of 1956 reached an annual rate of \$218.7 billion, or \$14.1 billion above the April 1955 rate and \$98 billion more than the April 1952 rate.<sup>14</sup>

During the 3 years of the Republican administration the compensation of employees averaged 69 percent of the national income compared with 65 percent during the 7 years of the prior Democratic administration.<sup>15</sup>

Corporate profits on the other hand, after taxes, averaged 6 percent of the national income during the first 3 years of the Eisenhower administration, compared to an average of 7.7 percent during the Truman administration.

The highest gross national product reached in prior Democratic administrations was \$346 billion in 1952. Under Republicans it reached approximately \$365 billion in 1953, rose to \$387 billion in 1955, and in the first 3 months of 1956 it reached an annual rate of \$398.5 billion.<sup>16</sup> Constantly higher rec-

<sup>11</sup> Economic Indicators, May 1956, p. 7.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., p. 25.

<sup>13</sup> USDA Parity Price Index Reports, May 31, 1956.

<sup>14</sup> Office of Business Economics, Department of Commerce, June 5, 1956.

<sup>15</sup> Address of Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce Carl F. Oechsle in Baltimore, Md., April 9, 1956.

<sup>16</sup> Office of Business Economics, Department of Commerce, May 10, 1956.

ords were set during the period in industrial production, construction, wages, and income.

On January 20, 1956, the Labor Department reported that its Consumer Price Index (often called cost-of-living index) during 1955 reflected the greatest period of stability since the index was started 15 years ago. In 1955, the index changed very little, ranging from 114.2 percent of the 1947-49 average to 115 percent. As the year started, the January figure was 114.6, only three-tenths of 1 percent above that for January of a year ago.

The Department also announced that the gross pay of the average factory worker with three dependents in April 1956 reached \$78.99 per week, \$4.03 a week more than in April 1 year ago and \$13.32 more per week than in April 1952.<sup>17</sup> Net take-home pay for the average factory worker with three dependents set a record of \$72.42 in April 1956, compared with \$69.20 in the same month of 1955 and \$61.81 in April 1952. The purchasing power of the average American worker's paycheck at the end of 1955 was more than 6 percent higher than at 1954's end.

Thus, under Republicans, we have more employment and higher wages than were ever achieved under previous Democratic administrations who like to refer to themselves as the party of the common man.

Democrats talk about benefiting the common man, but Republicans deliver.

#### TAXES AS A MEASURE OF NATIONAL WELL-BEING

Taxes reflect the cost of government. Every cent the Federal Government spends ultimately comes out of the pockets of the American taxpayer. How has the common man fared in the matter of taxes under Democratic and Republican administrations?

#### DEMOCRATIC PARTY RECORD ON TAXES

The Democratic Party was in office from 1933 to 1953.

When it came into office in 1933, Federal taxes were approximately \$3 billion. When it left office in 1953 Federal taxes reached the enormous total of \$65 billion.

In 1932 the so-called "little fellow" paid small or no income taxes. Over the years, under Democratic administrations, the real burden of income taxes shifted to the common man. This is best shown by the number of income-tax returns. In 1932 there were only 1,900,000 taxable returns. After 20 years of Democratic administrations the number of returns increased to 46,800,000. The simple meaning of these two figures is that Democratic Government spending and high taxes shifted the main burden of taxes to the common man.

The plain truth of the tax story is that, since 1913, the income tax has changed from a rich man's tax to everyman's tax. It began as a 1 percent levy ranging upward to 6 percent on incomes of half a million or more. Corporations paid a 1 percent income tax in 1913.

Nowadays the basic income tax rate is 20 percent, and it ranges up to 91 percent on incomes in excess of \$300,000 for individuals. Corporations pay 52 percent.

The burden on the little man was further increased by reductions in tax exemptions for himself and family. In 1932 a single person had a tax exemption of \$1,000 which Democrats progressively reduced to \$600 by 1952. A married person's exemption in 1932 was \$2,500 which Democrats reduced to \$1,200 by 1952.

In 1932 a single person earning \$2,000 paid \$32 in Federal income taxes; in 1952, he paid \$266. A married couple without dependents with the same income in 1932 paid no taxes; but paid \$133 in 1952.

<sup>17</sup> Latest revised Department of Labor figures for monthly report to be published June 30, 1956.

A \$5,000 income is more realistic in today's circumstances. In 1932 a single person paid only \$140 in taxes; but in 1952 he paid \$911. A married couple with no dependents and the same income in 1932 paid \$80 in taxes as against \$733 in 1952. Owing to the reductions in allowances for dependents, the married couple in the \$5,000 income bracket with 2 dependents pays a little more than half as much—\$48 in 1932 and \$466 in 1952.

The per capita burden of Federal income taxes in 1932, the last year of the Hoover administration, was \$170. After 20 years of Democratic administrations this burden was increased to \$659, according to official Treasury figures.

During the same span of years excise taxes on almost everything the common man has to buy were greatly extended and in some cases set as high as 20 percent of the price of the article.

#### TAX INCREASES AND TAX REDUCTIONS

Democrats not only passed the first Federal income tax law in 1913, but they also voted 14 out of 15 tax increases since that time.

Republican Congresses voted 7 tax cuts out of the 10 reductions since 1913.

#### REPUBLICAN RECORD ON TAXATION

The Republican Party has always pressed for reduced Government spending and lower taxes.

The first Republican Congress since 1932 (the 80th Cong., 1947-48) enacted bills to lower income taxes on three occasions. Three times, Democratic President Truman vetoed these bills. On the last occasion, Republicans won the battle to override his veto and the Revenue Act of 1948 became Public Law 471 on April 2, 1948.

Briefly, this law provided tax relief for more than 40 million American taxpayers. It relieved 7,400,000 taxpayers in the lowest income brackets entirely of income taxpayments. Most of the benefits went to persons earning less than \$5,000. Individual income tax rates were reduced by 12.6 percent in low income brackets, graduated downward to about 5 percent reduction in higher brackets. Dependent exemptions were increased from \$500 to \$600. Married couples were allowed to file joint returns, giving them additional tax cuts. The aged and blind were given additional allowances.

Again in 1954, another Republican Congress made possible the largest tax cut ever given in any single year. The total reduction amounted to \$7.4 billion and 62 cents of every dollar in tax cuts went to individuals; almost 25 cents to taxpayers with incomes of less than \$5,000 a year. The tax cut included reductions in excise taxes on articles in everyday use. A tax cut of this size would have been wholly impossible if a Republican President and a Republican Congress had not sharply cut Government spending by billions of dollars.

#### INFLATION

From 1932 to 1952 the Democrats did more than just take a bigger chunk of the "little fellow's" paycheck by way of taxes.

Democrats fired the engine of inflation, so that whatever the "little fellow" had after taxes bought less groceries, clothes, and shoes in the market place.

When governments spend lavishly and go deeper into debt each year, as did the New Deal and the Fair Deal, the buying power of the dollar goes down inflation sets in.

In March 1933, the end of the Hoover administration, the buying power of the dollar (with 1935-39 as a yardstick) stood at 111. After 20 years of Democratic administrations, the buying power of the dollar fell to 52 cents. That is why prices are practically doubled for everything people buy today.

Few people realize how inflation robs the average family. Like a sneak thief in the night, it is difficult to see. But, according to a survey of the National Committee on Monetary Policy, Americans lost \$158 billion in purchasing power because of inflation between 1938 and 1952. Some \$97 billion was lost by holders of life insurance policies, \$31 billion by holders of bank deposits, \$21.5 billion by owners of Government savings bonds, and \$8.5 billion in other channels. This is in addition to the losses in the daily buying power of wages and salaries.

When conditions like this set in, it is the little fellow—not the rich or the corporations—who suffers. Yet the Democrats constantly talk of their sympathetic interest in the common man. If they loved him less vocally at election time and remembered him more often as they dipped into his tax purse, John Q. Taxpayer would be a lot better off today.

Immediately upon taking office, Republicans began to reduce Government spending. Looking over the full 3 years of the Eisenhower administration, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz declared: "During the first 3 years of the present administration, the Government will spend \$36 billion less than it would have, had the spending policies of the preceding administration been continued. That represents a saving of nearly \$1,000 for every farm and city family of 4 in the United States."

At the same time not a single element of security in national defense or social welfare of our people has been sacrificed.

Once again, it is clear that the self-styled Democratic Party of the common man has followed courses of action with results completely the opposite and against the interests of the rank and file of citizens.

## H. R. 5550

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it looks as if it were quite unlikely that H. R. 5550, a bill to authorize the United States to enter into the OTC will be brought out on the floor of the House for debate in this Congress.

I regret this. Regardless of whether entry into the OTC is authorized or not, the subject matter is one that needs as much public debate and consideration as possible. My personal views are that the Ways and Means Committee needs to conduct further studies and hearings upon the broad subject of the delegation of congressional powers to the Executive in the field of the regulation of foreign trade if we are to adequately advise the House on OTC or any other matter in this area.

Inasmuch as the OTC probably will not be debated in this Congress, I am herewith inserting in the RECORD the supplemental views I wrote to accompany the report of the Ways and Means Committee on H. R. 5550, in which I discuss this general subject in some detail:

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF THOMAS B. CURTIS  
ON H. R. 5550

I joined in voting H. R. 5550 out of committee primarily because I felt that it was a

measure of such importance that it should be presented to the House. This matter of United States foreign trade needs as much public airing as it can get. This committee has held lengthy hearings on the aspect of our foreign trade presented by H. R. 5550. However, a major question for this House to decide is whether these hearings provide sufficient data upon which the House can base an intelligent vote.

The first question to be resolved in considering H. R. 5550 granting the President authority to join the United States in the OTC is whether this can be considered intelligently on its own bottom without relation to the GATT.

#### AREA COVERED IN COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The decision was made to confine the subject to the OTC by the manner in which the hearings were set up, by the selection of witnesses and by the understanding given to witnesses that the subject matter before the Committee was limited. The executive-department witnesses who appeared before the committee supported this approach. They argued that the delegation of power sought by the executive in H. R. 5550 did not require congressional consideration of GATT, even though Congress has never had the question of GATT directly before it.

On the other hand, the chairman of the committee was very fair in permitting the witnesses to be questioned extensively on the subject of whether approval of OTC amounted to an approval of the GATT; and also on the subject of the jurisdiction, procedures, and operation of the power allegedly delegated by the Congress to the Executive to enter into GATT.

However, if the various executive department heads who testified before this committee had been instructed that they were to be prepared to discuss the GATT and the executive department's authority to enter GATT, a great deal more pertinent information would have been made available to this committee and to the House membership through the hearings. As it is, much of the information in the printed hearings merely was supplied for the record and there has been no opportunity to question the witnesses on this material. Furthermore, the persons from the executive department who have first-hand information on the manner in which trade agreements operate and are negotiated, particularly members of the Committee on Reciprocity Information, of the Departmental Trade Agreements Committee, of the Tariff Commission, and of the United States Board of Trade Negotiators for GATT were not called before the committee for statements and examination.

#### CAN OTC BE CONSIDERED WITHOUT CONSIDERING GATT?

H. R. 5550 grants to the executive the power to enter into OTC, an organization designed to make GATT more effective and more permanent. It seems foolish to try to consider OTC without knowing what GATT is; what the President's authority to enter GATT consists of, its limitation, if any; how the President has exercised this authority; what procedures have been established for United States industry, agriculture, and labor to present their views and to have their views considered in the negotiation of trade agreements and with what degree of formality these procedures have been established; what control the Congress has retained in this area of regulating foreign trade, which is so explicitly designated in the Constitution as a power and responsibility of the Congress.

The position of the executive department witnesses that approval of OTC does not require a study of GATT is difficult to understand in the face of the fact that three times the Congress has explicitly stated in legislation collateral to GATT that by approving

this legislation it is neither approving nor disapproving GATT. These congressional caveats spring from a series of doubts. Doubts as to the authority of the Executive to enter GATT at all and more serious doubts as to whether the authority of the GATT exceeds the President's authority to enter into multilateral trade agreements. Doubts about the procedures under which the Executive has exercised whatever his authority may be. Doubts as to whether foreign trade barriers have actually been decreased and whether foreign trade has actually increased as the result of GATT.

The Randall Commission, which was certainly friendly to the GATT, recommended that the subject matter of the GATT be presented to the Congress for its approval. Many of the nongovernmental witnesses appearing before the committee in favor of H. R. 5550 were forthright. They said, of course, Congress approving H. R. 5550 meant approval of GATT. Several witnesses stated that Congress by extending the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 from time to time with full knowledge that the Executive had used this act as the source of his power to put the United States in GATT had given approval to GATT, in spite of the insertion of the caveat clauses.

To sum it up then. It is time Congress considered GATT. To vote intelligently on H. R. 5550, establishing the OTC, we must consider GATT. The caveat clauses from a practical standpoint are meaningless. A caveat clause in H. R. 5550 saying that approval of H. R. 5550 neither approves nor disapproves of GATT is meaningless.

#### WHAT COURSE CAN BE TAKEN?

So let us look at GATT with the information we have been able to gather to see (1) whether we have enough information to go on and, (2) if we have, whether it is to the best interests of our country to approve or disapprove OTC and GATT.

My personal views are that this committee has not obtained enough information about GATT and the United States Government's relation to it to intelligently understand it. The hearings on H. R. 5550 were not set up to study GATT and most of the information about GATT in the printed hearings comes from data supplied for the record in answer to questions. As I pointed out before, there was no opportunity for asking questions about this data or questioning the witnesses who had firsthand information about the manner in which the executive department enters into trade agreements under GATT. The best place, of course, to amend our procedures in writing trade agreements is in the extension of the Trade Agreements Act when it comes up again in 1958, but it could have been done at this time in considering the OTC.

Not having enough information about GATT would indicate that H. R. 5550 should be defeated. This, however, is not necessarily so. Two other possibilities exist. 1. To recommit the matter to the committee for further study. Of course, the public has been conditioned already to look upon this as a defeat of OTC; but if a further study by the committee were really made by going into the matter of GATT, this would not be a defeat, but a delay. 2. To approve OTC provisionally, on the theory that for the very immediate future our country stands to gain from a more rigid enforcement of the present trade agreements made under GATT and what defects there may be in the GATT and the manner in which Congress delegated power to the Executive to enter into GATT, can be corrected at a later date.

There is much to my mind that recommends this second course. I trust that the following discussion based upon our limited studies of GATT will bring out some points that bear on the course of action this House should pursue.

#### DELEGATION OF POWER BY THE CONGRESS OVER FOREIGN TRADE

Has the Congress constitutionally delegated the power to regulate foreign trade which the Constitution vests in the Congress, to the President, in the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 as amended?

There were some witnesses who questioned whether the Congress could constitutionally delegate any of its power to regulate foreign trade to the Executive. In my judgment, there is no question that the Congress can delegate its power in this area if it does so in a correct manner.

The constitutional question becomes, Did the Congress in the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 as amended delegate its power in a correct manner? This raises two basic points: (a) Was the delegation of power sufficiently limited as to extent? (b) Was the delegation of power sufficiently defined in the manner in which it should be exercised?

One witness who felt that the language in the Trade Agreements Act, although very broad and general, was sufficiently definitive as to the extent of the power conferred, cited similar broad and general language delegating power over interstate commerce by the Congress to the executive in the act creating the Interstate Commerce Commission. However, the Congress in delegating these broad powers created a very specific agency to carry out these powers, the Interstate Commerce Commission. Congress did not create a similar type agency to carry out the powers over foreign trade delegated in the Trade Agreements Act.

To fully study this question, however, the powers of the Tariff Commission, an agency previously established and of some years standing, must be reviewed. It is interesting to note, however, that the Trade Agreements Act in delegating whatever power that it did in the area of foreign trade did not refer to the powers previously granted to the Tariff Commission although it must be remembered that the Reciprocal Trades Act itself is an amendment to the Tariff Act of 1930. It is further pertinent to note that the two major amendments to the original Reciprocal Trades Act, the escape clause and the peril point provision confer additional powers on the Tariff Commission. Yet there has not been a clear delineation of powers in this area between the Tariff Commission and the executive under the Trade Agreements Act.

Furthermore, the executive department by Executive Order No. 10082 of October 5, 1949, established the Committee on Reciprocity Information and the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements to handle certain matters which arise in the United States preparation for entering into multilateral trade agreements under GATT. It is not quite clear just where the Tariff Commission fits in this scheme of things, particularly as in this same Executive order the Tariff Commission is directed to file an annual factual report of the operation of the trade agreements program with the Congress. This portion of Executive Order No. 10082 was enacted into law by the Congress last year in the extension of the Trade Agreements Act. These reports by the Tariff Commission are by no means confined to the subject of tariffs; they cover a wider area of foreign trade. Yet apparently the Tariff Commission has been given no jurisdiction in this area other than to "at all times keep informed concerning the operation and effect of provisions relating to duties or other import restrictions of the United States contained in trade agreements. \* \* \*

Regrettably, though these reports have been filed with the Congress for several years, no Committee of the Congress has been designated to receive these reports, study them and in turn report to the Congress on them. Many Congressmen bewail the loss of power of the Congress to the executive branch of

the Government, some even call it usurpation of power—yet in all too many instances—as in this specific case—the loss of power comes from the Congress falling to exercise the prerogatives it has retained for itself. I am hopeful that in the future the Ways and Means Committee will receive, study, and if necessary, hold hearings on the Tariff Commission's annual report on the operation of our trade agreements. Had we been doing this in the past we would be in a position now of making a more intelligent and meaningful report to the House on H. R. 5550.

Furthermore, the Tariff Commission in its inception was designated to be an arm of the Congress. Just what it is an arm of today is questionable. This broad subject of the status of the Tariff Commission in multilateral trade negotiations and agreements remains unstudied by this committee and, as near as I can tell, it remains unstudied by anyone.

#### CREATION OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES

However, even though the Congress may not have created an agency similar to the Interstate Commerce Commission to carry out the delegation of authority to the executive branch of the Government over the regulation of foreign trade, and though the Tariff Commission's position in this area is rather vague and undefined, the executive department has done some definitive work itself.

By Executive Order No. 10082 it created the Committee on Reciprocity Information. This Executive order is set out in the hearings and should receive the study of the House. The Executive also created an Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements. Its structure and duties are not as well defined as those of the CRI. The personnel of the ICTA seems to be identical with CRI. The relationship of these executive committees with the Tariff Commission is likewise vague and undefined although there is a relationship.

The purpose of these two committees, essentially, seems to be to provide a forum whereby industry, agriculture, labor, and other groups concerned with the operation of the trade agreements and the possible negotiations of future trade agreements may present the facts and arguments surrounding their particular situation and concern.

The function of these committees is not that of administering the peril-point provisions. That is specifically a function of the Tariff Commission, although apparently the Executive uses these committees and whatever findings they make in order to exercise the further prerogatives he has to not abide by the findings of the Tariff Commission.

The difficulty in dealing with the CRI and the ICTA from the standpoint of industry, agriculture, and labor seems to be, according to the testimony of witnesses who had dealings with them, that one never knows what action the committees have taken, if any. Whether any findings have been made and, if made, whether they are reduced to writing and forwarded and, if forwarded, to whom. There is no opportunity to know whether the data and arguments presented by a special interest have been considered, ignored, or partially paid attention to.

#### BOARD OF TRADE NEGOTIATORS

Above all, the difficulty experienced by industrial, agricultural, and labor groups lies in the fact that neither the CRI, ICTA, or the Tariff Commission have any function in the actual negotiation of the trade agreements. Who compose the United States Board of Trade Negotiators is a question mark. There has been no formalization of the Board of Trade Negotiators by Executive order. Apparently the personnel may change from day to day, the number of negotiators

may change, the qualifications of the negotiators may be anything. In fact, there is no real name for our group of negotiators. I have referred to them as the Board of Negotiators because I don't know what else to call them. How the board obtains information about American industry, agriculture, and labor is uncertain. Theoretically the CRI and the Tariff Commission pass information to them. But this is pure theory. If the CRI reduces its factfinding to writing and recommendations and then passes this data in this form to the Board of Negotiators it does so as the result of no established procedure. Furthermore, any such findings or data, according to the Government witnesses, is secret.

One thing seems to be certain, however, that on the United States Board of Negotiators there are to be no special economic interests represented nor are special interests permitted to be around to give advice in the area of their special interests, either before or during negotiations. Nor does any group know what the Board regards as factual information about its economics, upon which it conducts the negotiations.

Certain witnesses have raised objections to this procedure on the grounds that other nations do not follow similar practices. For example, there was testimony that in recent negotiations involving textiles one of Britain's negotiators was a person in the textile industry who because of his special knowledge in the field was able to give Britain great advantage over the United States negotiators who were unfamiliar with the detailed economics of the industry.

It seems clear to me, without hearing further testimony, that the Congress has not done a proper job in spelling out in detail the procedures which should be followed in negotiating trade agreements. There is little question but that American industry, agriculture, and labor do not know where to go or how to go in presenting their cases before negotiations are entered into.

I am not talking now about a matter which has reached such an extreme position that the peril point or escape clause provisions in the Trade Act come into play. I am talking only about the ordinary negotiations where our negotiators should be in a position of strength through knowledge and where our economic groups should be assured that our negotiators are dealing in knowledge and not in ignorance. Above all, our economic groups at least should know by name and qualifications who our negotiators are and not be placed in the position of having their economic welfare placed in the hands of unknown persons operating under no known set procedure.

(I again want to point out that the information supplied for the record by the State Department on this subject was not available at the time of the public hearings, so there has been no opportunity for this committee to dig into the data for checking.)

#### ARE THERE SUFFICIENT PROCEDURES ESTABLISHED IN THE DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY?

Whether the congressional inaction of this area is such that the delegation of authority to the Executive is so vague and undeterminative as to be unconstitutional is almost academic. Certainly the congressional action is ill advised and not conducive to the national economic well-being and has put our citizenry in a position of not knowing how either to promote or to protect their economic welfare in the area of vast importance to them such as foreign trade is.

If Congress thinks it advisable to confer upon the Executive vast powers over the regulation of foreign trade, it should do so in a fashion that the citizens' basic right to petition the Congress is protected by adequate administrative machinery. I suggest

it was the need of the people to have this right in regard to their economic interests that prompted the writers of the Constitution to confer the powers over both interstate trade and foreign trade to the Congress rather than to the executive department. I believe that the difficulty we are presently experiencing and have been experiencing with increasing difficulty in continuing with the reciprocal trade formula for handling our foreign trade does not lie in the concept of granting the executive the broad power to negotiate multilateral trade agreements or of Congress divesting itself of the power to write the details into our tariff schedules, but rather lies in the fact that our citizens feel that they have not had a fair opportunity to have their cases heard and considered \* \* \* that faceless negotiators, loyal Americans and dedicated public servants though they may be, have through ignorance been hurting badly various domestic economic interests.

Furthermore, there was nothing more than the most general sort of testimony concerning the overall betterment of our foreign trade through GATT. The statements made were so general that one could only conclude that the witnesses felt the matter did not require proof. The only specific data presented to the Committee during public hearing on the economics of foreign trade whether it has increased or decreased, what the trends and causes were, was from Professor Glenn O. Saxon, of Yale. He argued from the data he presented that foreign trade had not increased as could have been anticipated in light of the increase in overall world gross national products. Certainly this committee should have more information than it has on the economic statistics of world trade. The data was supplied by the State Department on this subject for the record, but again this data, though interesting, pertinent and valuable, has not been subjected to examination or public scrutiny. It is a mystery to me why the witnesses for the executive department did not come prepared to testify at the public hearings with data rather than with general conclusions. The whole issue before the Congress and the people of our country in this area is what governmental action will help us best in increasing our foreign trade. It is important that we dig in and study this to see how well we really have been doing under our present approach and not just take it for granted that we are doing well.

#### GATT'S JURISDICTION IS GREATER THAN UNITED STATES PRESIDENT'S AUTHORITY OVER FOREIGN TRADE

There are many additional areas of confusion in this foreign-trade picture. The present Executive states through his Cabinet representatives that his sole authority to regulate foreign trade through the reciprocal trade formula and to enter into GATT comes from the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 as amended. It is important to review the testimony in previous hearings on the subject. This has not been a consistent position of the Executives. There have been claims to certain implied powers. The report of this committee, I understand, contends that the language in the Trade Agreements Act has implications which broaden the scope of the Executive authority. This committee did not discuss such a theory, and any such conclusion stated in the committee report is not yet the considered judgment of the committee. This matter should be clarified.

Be that as it may, the authority of the President to enter GATT stems from an amendment to the Tariff Act of 1930 which is called the Trade Agreements Act. Section 350 of that act states "whenever he (the President) finds as a fact that any existing duties or other import restrictions of the United States or any foreign country are

unduly burdening or restricting the foreign trade of the United States he may act."

Article I of GATT states as follows:

"2. The contracting parties desire to contribute to these objectives through this Agreement by entering into reciprocal and mutually advantageous arrangements directed to the substantial reduction of tariffs and other barriers to trade and to the elimination of discriminatory treatment in international commerce."

It is quite clear, furthermore, from reading the preamble of GATT and the preamble of the Trade Agreements Act that the word "trade barriers" used in defining GATT's jurisdiction is an extremely broad term and encompasses considerably more than "duties or other import restrictions," even if the broad interpretation of these words claimed by the Executive and approved in the Committee Report is accepted. Health measures, currency exchange, quotas, etc. are just a few items included as "trade barriers" which would not be considered properly under the terms "duties and import restrictions" as they are used in an amendment to the Tariff Act of 1930.

The very fact that the United States obtained a waiver from the other countries to GATT in regard to our agricultural quotas set up in the Agriculture Act bring home the fact that GATT is considerably beyond the scope of authority delegated by the Congress to the Executive to enter into trade agreements.

#### A PRACTICAL REASON FOR ENACTING H. R. 5550

A practical point made in behalf of OTC is that foreign countries have utilized "trade barriers" other than "duties and import restrictions" extensively, some of which are considerably more restrictive to modern trade than duties and conventional import restrictions. By creating OTC it is argued these other barriers to trade used by other countries but which they have agreed to eliminate by agreement, may be eliminated.

It is for this practical reason I have suggested that it is probably to the immediate advantage of the United States to enter provisionally into an organization that will make the trade agreements under GATT more enforceable. We have already made concessions along the lines of tariff reductions, but the reciprocity which we have anticipated has been long in coming. OTC would assist in the very immediate future in getting rid of some of these foreign trade barriers.

But in trying to gain this momentary advantage the Congress is certainly putting its stamp of approval on executive action in entering into a general agreement on trade which contemplates subject matters way beyond the subject matter Congress specified, in its delegation of power to the Executive in the Trade Agreements Act. It could be said that the United States entry into GATT applied only to the subject matter contemplated in the Trade Agreements Act, but that it was perfectly proper for the United States to get concessions from the other countries of GATT on these other trade barriers. But then I would think we would have the question on the part of other countries of whether they have the same understanding of the limitation of the United States participation in GATT. Obviously they do not have the same understanding because some of the other countries in GATT raised the question on the United States agricultural quotas which was outside the United States Executive's delegated jurisdiction to deal with in the first place.

Should we continue in this uncertain state of either fooling our friends abroad or fooling our own people at home? Isn't it the better course of wisdom and valor to clear the matter up for all concerned? And as quickly as possible?

#### AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 5550 MADE BY THE COMMITTEE

The committee tried to correct some of the alleged dangerous possibilities in H. R. 5550 by amendment. First, language was inserted which attempts to limit the powers of the Executive in the area of foreign trade to those powers already delegated in the Trade Agreements Act. However, the idea of a previous Executive that certain implied powers exist in the Executive over the subject of foreign trade was left unexamined and untouched and, as stated, the committee report gives credence to an extended interpretation of the language in this act.

An amendment was adopted putting some responsibilities, authorities and qualifications on the head of the United States delegation to the OTC. Senate confirmation of this appointment is required. This is a big improvement.

An amendment to enlarge the voting power of the United States was discussed but not formalized and put to a vote. Information was given to the committee in executive session that the subject of voting power was discussed at the conference which gave birth to the OTC but that criteria such as population and amount of foreign trade were found to be more faulty than sovereignty as a basis for apportionment of vote. Why a compromise which reflected all these criteria could not have been developed remained unanswered. The writers of the United States Constitution when confronted with a very similar problem regarding the voting powers of the big and small States in the Federal Congress were able to successfully reflect a compromise between population and sovereignty. It seems little short of ridiculous that the concept of sovereignty should be so rigid that a nation of 165 million people and an annual gross national product of \$400 billion should be classed in trade matters with nations of a million or less people and less than \$100 million gross national product.

#### EFFECT OF CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF H. R. 5550

Finally, I come to the feature of this proposed legislation and the circumstances surrounding it which cause me the greatest concern. In discussing the course of action this Congress might take, I said in reference to a recommitment of this bill to the committee for further study: "Of course, the public has been conditioned already to look upon this as a defeat of OTC." So have the foreign nations in GATT been conditioned to look upon a recommitment of this bill, or anything but an almost blind passage of OTC by the Congress, as not only a defeat of OTC but a defeat of the entire conception of multilateral trade agreements. The executive witnesses as well as nongovernmental witnesses who testified for H. R. 5550 have resorted to this argument time and again during hearings and during executive sessions. It is a powerful argument. But I raise the question of who is responsible for this conditioning of the minds of our citizens and the minds of citizens and governmental leaders of foreign states on a matter which should be the subject of considerable objective study by the Congress?

Indeed, is the question of handling foreign trade and the implication of the establishment of OTC so simple and so cut and dried that no honest arguments can be presented other than those that openly and intentionally are designed to kill the technique of multilateral trade agreements? There are those who are convinced that the Reciprocal Trades Act and GATT have not benefitted the United States or world trade and who, therefore, seek to cut it down as much as possible and to even eliminate it, if that were possible. I do not agree with this position. I think that in spite of the poor case made for

the GATT that it has accomplished an overall benefit for our country and foreign countries by contributing to an increase of foreign trade. However, I also think that it has accomplished much less than it could have accomplished if it were better organized and more clearly set up. Certainly I believe that it could have accomplished what it has accomplished without the accompanying damage it has done to certain segments of our domestic economy. I do not believe the OTC is the best way to remedy these basic structural defects in our procedures for negotiating multilateral trade agreements through GATT. The best way is to restudy and then rewrite the delegation of congressional authority to the President over foreign trade.

The failure of the representatives of the executive to present economic data to this committee on the status of our foreign trade and the effect the GATT has had upon it, if such effect can be determined at all from what economic data there is, is such as to negative their case that through GATT we are following the best course possible to increase world trade. It is true that the Congress has been badly at fault in not following yearly the progress of our foreign trade through the reports submitted to it by the Tariff Commission, but that surely does not excuse the executive department from not recapitulating in detail the data of these annual reports and presenting additional pertinent data at the formal public hearing where the general subject of foreign trade is up for review.

Furthermore, the failure of the executive witnesses to be prepared to discuss in detail the procedures established and followed in entering trade agreements under GATT and, indeed, their affirmative presentation of the preposterous idea that the Congress could intelligently approve the United States entering into OTC without studying GATT, further negatives their case.

The failure of the majority of the members of the committee to attend or follow the hearings on this matter, coupled with the poor presentation referred to, convince me of one basic thing. The conditioning of the public mind on this subject has been so well done that an objective study into the problem of foreign trade by the Congress was neither desired nor intended by the State Department personnel who are essentially responsible for this presentation. The theory seems to be the more ignorance there is the more certain the blind approval.

I am not convinced, as some persons are, that there is anything sinister in the attitude of the State Department bureaucracy who have taken charge of the regulation of foreign trade. (I have been impressed by the comprehensive data the State Department officials have presented to this committee for the record, when asked. However, I again point out that without this data being available to the public and made the subject of examination and questioning by our committee its value is greatly limited.) Rather, I am convinced that the attitude of the State Department personnel is one of basic loyalty to the overall welfare of our country, and I am further convinced that the individual persons occupying this particular drawer of the Federal Bureau are very able, hardworking and conscientious citizens. However, I do find an attitude of certainty that they know best what is in the welfare of the United States and that the Congress and the special economic interests that seek to influence and, on occasions, can influence the Congress, do not. Indeed, they feel that it is their duty to protect the overall welfare of the United States against what they regard as the shortsighted and selfish interests of all special economic groups.

This, of course, is benevolent dictatorship. Perhaps they do know best but I doubt it. I still feel that the collective wisdom existing in our citizenry is the best wisdom our society can obtain, not the wisdom of any small group, even though they be the wisest men in the society. It behooves us to follow procedures which best will enable this collective wisdom to be brought to bear upon the problems that face us. The institution of the Congress is no more than a set of procedures whereby the wisdom of our people may be gathered together and brought to bear upon the problems of our day. When Congress delegates its authority to the Executive, as it should, in various areas including the areas of foreign trade, it should do so in a fashion that this basic feature is preserved. This, in my opinion, is not the situation in respect to the regulation of our foreign trade today.

An Army doctor whose job it was to interview the Korean war prisoners in order to try to learn the techniques of Red Chinese brain washing made a significant statement in an interview which was published in the February 24, 1956, U. S. News & World Report: "Question. Did the Communists feed prisoners propaganda?"

"Answer. They certainly did.

"Question. What was the aim of this propaganda?"

"Answer. To lower their opinions of America.

"Question. How?"

"Answer. They began gently, capitalizing upon a sure-fire theme: the unpopularity of the Korean war. This was a subject dear to the heart of many a soldier."

The Constitution provides that only Congress may declare war, for the specific reasons that the writers of that great document felt, and rightly so, that any war in which our

society is engaged must have the support of the people. One of my friends in the State Department said to me at the time of the Korean war, "but if it had been referred to the Congress, Congress might not have done the right thing and it was necessary for our national welfare under the circumstances to move into Korea at once."

Yes, similarly it is true if the GATT in all its ramifications were referred to the Congress it might not be approved, but I suggest following the course we are still following bears with it even greater dangers than any momentary setback. Personally, I believe that Congress would have approved the Korean war if the problems were forthrightly presented to it just as Congress would approve the GATT if it was presented forthrightly to it and there were proper procedures established for preserving the basic rights of our citizens in promoting their proper economic interests.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, JULY 6, 1956

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

Eternal God, spirit of light and truth, of beauty and freedom, bestow upon us, we pray Thee, Thy sustaining grace that our strength fail not nor the vision splendid fade in the heat and burden of the day. In this moment, closing the door against all clamorous voices, we bring our stained lives to the holiness that shames our uncleanness, to the love that forgives our iniquities, to the truth that reveals our falseness, to the patience that outlasts our fickleness.

Make us patient and thoughtful one with another in the fret and jar of these difficult days, remembering that each comrade by our side fights a hard fight and walks a lonely way. Teach us a gentler tone, a sweeter charity of words, and a more healing touch for all the smart of this wounded world. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 5, 1956, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On July 2, 1956:

S. 1614. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids," title 21, United States Code, section 321c;

S. 2016. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Lawrence F. Kramer;

S. 2771. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and

Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the Fourth National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes;

S. 3295. An act to amend the act of April 28, 1953, relating to daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia; and

S. 3663. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Columbia Historical Society in the District of Columbia.

On July 3, 1956:

S. 1275. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to designate employees of the District to protect life and property in and on the buildings and grounds of any institution located upon property outside of the District of Columbia acquired by the United States for District sanitariums, hospitals, training schools, and other institutions;

S. 2512. An act to amend the act of August 27, 1954, so as to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of certain members of the Armed Forces who died or were killed while serving in such forces; and

S. 3076. An act to provide for a continuing survey and special studies of sickness and disability in the United States, and for periodic reports of the results thereof, and for other purposes.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5731. An act to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, with dependents, to occupy inadequate quarters on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters; and

H. R. 11766. An act to provide for the establishment of the Horseshoe Bend National Military Park, in the State of Alabama.

### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 220. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court for the District of New Mexico, to hear, determine, and render

judgment upon certain claims arising as a result of the construction by the United States of Elephant Butte Dam on the Rio Grande;

S. 449. An act for the relief of George Pantelas;

S. 584. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, relating to the Customs Court;

S. 977. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to duties of judges of the United States Court of Claims;

S. 997. An act to provide punishment for certain confidence game swindles;

S. 1178. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Simonson;

S. 1245. An act for the relief of Agnes V. Walsh, the estate of Margaret T. Denehy, and David Walsh;

S. 1542. An act to authorize an allowance for civilian officers and employees of the Government who are notaries public;

S. 1616. An act for the relief of Sumiko Ariumi Bilson;

S. 1638. An act to amend the Federal Seed Act;

S. 1739. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix rates of compensation of members of certain examining and licensing boards and commissions, and for other purposes;

S. 1798. An act for the relief of Mrs. Charles C. Phillips;

S. 1961. An act to provide for the conveyance of part of Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Colchester, Vt., to the State of Vermont, and for other purposes;

S. 2008. An act for the relief of Winifred A. Hunter;

S. 2091. An act authorizing the reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of the bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island, Ill.;

S. 2169. An act for the relief of M. B. Huggins, Jr.;

S. 2210. An act to modify the project for the Saint Marys River, South Canal, in order to repeal the authorization for the alternation of the International Bridge as part of such project, and to authorize the Secretary of the Army to accomplish such alteration;

S. 2240. An act for the relief of James Richard Hogan;

S. 2244. An act for the relief of Maria Novak;

S. 2352. An act for the relief of Maj. Luther C. Cox;

S. 2690. An act for the relief of William G. Jackson;

S. 2712. An act to authorize the charging of tolls for transit over the Manette Bridge in Bremerton, Wash.;

S. 2913. An act to extend for 2 years the Advisory Committee on Weather Control;