

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 8633. A bill to authorize Hon. WAYNE L. HAYS, Hon. WALTER H. JUDD, Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY, and Hon. JOHN TABER, Members of the House of Representatives, to accept and wear the award of the Cross of Grand Commander of the Royal Order of the Phoenix, tendered by the Government of the Kingdom of Greece; considered and passed.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 8634. A bill for the relief of Dominico Orrino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. R. 8635. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Zoltan Goldstein and son, Harry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 8636. A bill for the relief of Maria Finfinis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H. R. 8637. A bill for the relief of Elba O. Selva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES:

H. R. 8638. A bill for the relief of Jozef Podlacki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 8639. A bill for the relief of Bianca Veronica Wolk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 8640. A bill for the relief of Wojtech Rothman and his wife, Julie Grunwald Rothman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 8641. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Francis E. Resta; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 8642. A bill for the relief of Gordon E. Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Hon. Homer E. Capehart, of Indiana, at Launching of the "Philip Sporn"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 10, 1957

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks I made on July 5 at the launching of the *Philip Sporn*, a new Ohio River boat produced by the Jeffersonville Boat & Machine Co. under the direction of Mr. Pat Calhoun, president of the Jeffersonville company and of the American Barge Lines.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAPEHART

The rise of inland water transportation has been one of the most astonishing and encouraging stories of the past two decades.

A little less than 100 years ago inland water transportation was a dead letter. The very mode of transportation which helped build cities like Jeffersonville and Louisville no longer was a factor in our transportation picture. But today, I am happy to say, that picture has changed. Funds voted by Congress have made possible the long-range program of the Corps of Engineers for the modernization of the Ohio River—its locks, dams, and levees.

I have always been a staunch supporter of this program and not long ago, on May 10, in a statement before the Senate Appropriations Committee, I strongly urged the support of various navigation projects on the river. I told the committee that:

"The Ohio River is a primary source of materials basic to the national security. I believe it is important rapidly to complete this program designed for modern conditions and volume of traffic which would be required for our national defense."

These navigation projects, for which Congress has appropriated funds, are to my mind examples of what Congress can do to enable private enterprise to serve the public better and cheaper.

A great deal of the credit for the growth of river transportation and the resultant solid industrial growth of cities and towns on the river is due to two gentlemen who are here today. I would like to pay tribute to them individually.

Mr. Pat Calhoun, president of the Jeffersonville Boat & Machine Co. and of the American Barge Lines, has been active in efforts to rebuild our river transportation system since World War I. Jeffboat has been building river steamers and ferryboats for over a hundred years. But what a far cry is this fine, modern new boat—the *Philip Sporn*—from the wooden paddlewheelers of the old days. To see this modern towboat, one might think it was always so in the industry. But this is not the case.

Mr. Calhoun and I have been around for quite a few years now and I think both of us remember the twenties when Pat started in the industry. It needed a lot of courage and foresight to enter the river transportation industry then, when few people had faith in its success and fewer yet enough vision to see its growth potential. But he persevered in his efforts to reestablish this once great form of transportation and I think when we look around us today we can see the measure of his courage and foresight. And I think he can also be proud of the role these yards played in serving our Nation during the war—when the need for inland water transportation was so great.

Just a few weeks ago I learned that Mr. Calhoun and his company made another contribution to our economy and the promotion of trade with our great neighbors to the south. This was the launching of the first piggyback barges to be sent to Venezuela. Here is another example of what Indiana has done to link the United States with South America in the network of inter-American trade relations.

Mr. Philip Sporn, for whom this fine boat is named, is also a citizen of whom the people of the Ohio River can be proud. Ever since 1920 when he joined the American Gas & Electric Co., of which he is now president, he has worked toward the improvement of the electric utility industry. He has led his company's pioneering efforts in several fields of electric power generation, transmission, and distribution. These efforts have not only improved the general efficiency and economy of operation of the producers of electricity but have also served to keep down the cost of electricity to the 5 million people in this great area of ours.

I am not going to take the time to record the many achievements in Mr. Sporn's career, though I would gladly like to, but I would like to point out two things which I feel are of major importance.

Mr. Sporn has devoted a great deal of time and effort to the study of nuclear energy and particularly to the possibilities of its application in the field of power generation. I understand he is at present a member of the Edison Electric Institute's technical task force in nuclear power. This group is now evaluating various reactor types for recommendation to institute members.

The second service of Mr. Sporn and his associates to which I would also like to call attention is the creation of the Ohio Valley

Electric Corp., of which he is also president. This \$400 million enterprise was organized by 15 private electric utility companies of the Ohio Valley region to supply the electric power requirements of the Atomic Energy Commission's new \$1½ billion diffusion plant in Pike County, Ohio.

To my mind these are two fine examples of what our utility industry is doing to insure that the utilities of our Nation rank second to none in service to national security and consumer benefit.

I would like also to point out that Mr. Calhoun, Mr. Sporn, and their associates have been successful in providing to the public, through their companies, efficiencies and economies of operation which have kept down costs during a period of constantly rising costs of virtually every phase of modern-day living. This is no mean achievement.

The value of inland water transportation is so far reaching that I imagine there are few people who can envision the tremendous contributions made by this mode of transportation to our country. Before I came down here, I refreshed my memory by looking at some of the statistics concerning this industry. I was again impressed—although I served for some time as ranking minority member of the Interstate Commerce Committee and was well acquainted with the subject—by the rapid strides made by this industry in so short a time. I think you might be interested in a few facts as to what the river—and its servant, the barge lines—is doing to serve the people of Indiana, Kentucky, and the 18 other States in our inland water empire.

Taking the valley as a whole, since 1950 more than \$11 billion has been invested in new and expanded industrial and atomic plants along the main stream of the Ohio River and its navigable tributaries. The communities along the banks of the Ohio have a population of 3.2 percent of the Nation's total—but during the period from 1950 through 1955 they have been the site of 6.7 percent of the Nation's new investment in manufacturing and public utility plants.

In a recent tax and investment study made by the tax foundation, Mr. Ben Fairless, of the steel corporation, is quoted as saying that the average capital investment required to provide a job for one man in our present economy is \$12,000. On this basis the industrial expansion of the Ohio Valley has provided almost 800,000 jobs. This is more employment than the combined number of jobs of Pittsburgh and Cincinnati.

This booming economy has also contributed a great tax flow into the Federal Treasury. Taking only the 6 States of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois—which actually lie within the Ohio Valley—corporation taxes paid in 1954 amounted to \$2½ billion. Social security and personal income taxes added another 4½ billion. This is more than \$7 billion.

And how much money has been spent for navigation development of the Ohio River during the past years? From 1824 to 1954, inclusive, the total expenditures amounted to only \$150 million—spread over 130 years. No investment of the Federal Government has ever benefited more people or provided a bigger return than this stake in the Ohio River navigation facilities.

Of particular note is the massive growth of electric utilities in the Ohio Valley. The increase in number and capacity of power stations and the increase in volume of electricity generated are looked upon as key measures of industrial progress. Along the main stream of the Ohio River the capacity of electric generating plants has grown more than twice as fast as in the United States as a whole. In 1941, it was 3 percent of the United States total and now is over 7 percent. Electricity generated along the main stream of the Ohio has shown an even more impressive growth. Plants along the Ohio generated 9 percent of the Nation's power in 1955 compared to 3.7 percent in 1939. When the navigable tributaries, other than the Tennessee and Cumberland, are included, the Ohio Valley now produces about 11 percent of the Nation's power.

The rollocc answered by new industries which have come to the Ohio Valley is much too long to list here. Along with the growth of heavy industry such as steel, oil, chemicals, and nonferrous metals have come a host of others such as rolling mills, fabricating plants, integrated chemical plants and many others.

It may be said of the Ohio—it is a river come alive.

What accounts for the rebirth of industry in the Ohio Valley, which for so long has been dormant? Certainly there are many factors which have contributed to this tremendous industrial growth. When we ask the companies who have been lured to the valley what factors attracted them, we get the same answer from them all. Directly or indirectly, most of them come back to the waterway itself. The most important of these are low-cost water transportation, a vast and growing concentration of electrical energy, an adequate supply of water, limitless coal deposits, and a sufficient and efficient supply of labor.

All of these companies and Ohio Valley industry in general are increasingly dependent on low-cost water transport. The vital relationship between the traffic on the river and the economic development of the region is demonstrated by the fact that while Ohio River traffic in ton-miles was increasing 582 percent from 1929 to 1950, per capita income in the Ohio Valley increased 221.8 percent as compared with an increase of 211.8 percent during the same period for the Nation as a whole.

The annual volume of barge traffic on the Ohio has grown phenomenally from 26 million tons in 1929 to a record of 72 million tons in 1955.

In ton-miles, traffic on the river increased more than 300 percent from 1946 through 1955; from 5 billion to 15 billion ton-miles. I have just received the latest figures in a report of July 1, which records still additional gains. These show that 76,376,633 tons of commercial traffic moved along the Ohio in 1956—nearly 5 million tons more than the previous year. Ton mileage increased to 15,999,404,994, a gain of over 5 billion from 1955.

The 1956 annual report of the TVA indicated that over 1½ billion ton-miles of commercial traffic moved on the Tennessee River during 1955, an increase of 24 percent over 1953, and almost 6 times as much as in 1945. The traffic for the first 6 months of 1956 was in tons, a 19-percent increase over the same period in 1955. The TVA report finally indicated that about three-quarters of the in-

terchange river tonnage in 1954 was accounted for by the Ohio Valley region.

When these factors are added up, there is no predicting what peaks of development this valley may reach, or what needs for river-related uses it may require. About 4 years ago a trade journal raised the question of whether we might not some day see a 100 million tons of freight a year moving on the Ohio. Now I think it not unreasonable to look forward to 150 million tons as early as 1965.

Of course, I know that one of the chief concerns of all of you is to see that this phenomenal growth continues. I know that many of you are concerned that the practical limits of the capacity of many of the present locks will be reached in a few years. It is your feeling and I know it is shared by many others in this area, that a vigorous prosecution of the long-range program on the Ohio River is necessary for the continued economic development of the valley. There are many organizations in the area who are doing splendid work toward this goal, including, I understand, a newly formed group called the Inland Waterways Common Carriers Association of which American Barge Line is a charter member.

These are times for economy; but, as I have stated previously, I believe that the benefits to be obtained from new locks and dams should not be measured merely in the conventional manner of savings in transportation costs. The true measure of benefit lies rather in the expanded productivity, the improved standard of living for millions of people living in the Ohio Valley, the protection against disastrous floods, vastly increased revenues to local State and Federal treasuries—far in excess of the governmental costs involved—and the strengthening of national security which will stem from providing an efficient modern water highway in the industrial heart of our Nation.

You gentlemen here today have dedicated many years of your lives to the cause of water-resources development in the valley. I know that you will continue to bring to the people of the valley and the Nation a deeper understanding of the vast potential of economic growth inherent in this great river and of the problems and programs involved in the development of that potential.

I think it fitting that, in closing, I quote the words of President Hoover on the occasion of the dedication of the Ohio River canalization in 1929:

"A nation makes no loss by devotion of some of its current income to the improvement of its estate. This is an obligation we owe to our children and our grandchildren. I do not measure the future of America in terms of our lifetime. God has truly blessed us with great resources. It is our duty to make them available to the people."

This Is the Right Place

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1957

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this is a very special day for Utah and for Utahans wherever they may be. One hundred and ten years ago, on July 24, 1847, the main body of the first party of Mormon pioneers—143 men, 3 women, and 2 children—emerged from a nearly impenetrable mountain fastness into the then-barren valley of Great Salt Lake.

What they, and the thousands who followed them, accomplished in that arid wilderness is too well known to need repetition here. By faith, energy, and determination they subdued the wilderness and made the desert bloom. I know of no epic to match it in American history.

Now, each July 24 is a Utah holiday during which Utahans of all faiths pause to celebrate this anniversary of pioneer settlement; to pay homage to these forebears of ours; to draw on accomplishments of the past for the inspiration for the future.

I invite my colleague to share with us the pride we feel in these Mormon pioneers who made such a contribution not only to their church but to their country. I am sure no one can ever visit that now-green valley without affirming the prophetic words of Brigham Young: "This is the right place."

Repealing a Misnamed Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1957

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today filed a bill to repeal the Sustained Yield Act of 1944, but I should like to point out that this is not only a misnomer but the act itself suffers considerable abuse and appears to favor a few major timber companies.

The Subcommittee on Public Works and Resources, in cooperation with a subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, held extensive field hearings in the fall of 1955 on Federal timber sales policies. These hearings revealed that there was considerable difference of opinion among the people in the lumber industry and in the Government agencies as to the effectiveness of a 1944 act of Congress which allowed the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to award timber to particular companies without the use of competitive bidding or with limitations on who could compete for the timber.

The committee found that in Oregon the Bureau of Land Management had created marketing areas under another act rather than through the use of this 1944 act. Communities were petitioning that these marketing restrictions either be eliminated or that they be changed so that certain areas that could not now bid for O & C timber would be permitted to do so. The committee also found that, in this same area where there is twice as much National Forest timber as there is O & C timber, the Forest Service had not set up any restrictions on who could bid for their timber.

Sustained yield, as such, is not only excellent planning but necessary. For 300 years, the people of America have gained an abundance of wood products, game, sports, and enjoyment from the

vast forests growing on this continent. Today, many of these forests still remain, carrying on their role as man's most versatile natural resource. It is important that they continue to serve the needs of present and future generations.

The principles of sustained yield forest management are well imbedded in the basic statutes which govern the operation of the various Federal forests.

Repeal of the act of March 29, 1944, will in no way jeopardize, influence, or affect the management of the National Forests or any other of the forest lands operated by the Government for sustained yield forestry purposes. The repeal of this act will remove the discretionary authority to grant Federal timber to individual companies or to companies in certain selected areas.

Political Chicanery Thwarts Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1957

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the deadline on payment of income taxes coming close on the heels of a \$71 billion budget shocked our people into a realization that (a) their taxes were too high, (b) the Federal Government was spending altogether too much money, (c) national financial disaster was just around the corner. The result was an insistent demand that Congress cut appropriations. That the Congress proceeded to do.

But then came pressure from many groups insisting upon new legislation; additional appropriations of billions for foreign aid, other billions for national defense, millions for Federal aid to education, to name but three.

On top of those three—and there were others—came the politician's dream. A bill to protect civil rights. One purpose was to secure the Negro vote in the 1958 and 1960 elections.

The bill was wholly unnecessary. We have a statute—Revised Statutes, section 2004 and following—which makes it a criminal offense to deny to any person his right to vote at any election because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. We have a crime-detecting organization, the FBI, unsurpassed. We have a Department of Justice with an Attorney General and United States district attorneys and district and appellate courts with authority and the means of enforcing that statute.

Nevertheless, though not needed, to curry favor with minority groups, along came this so-called civil-rights bill. It created a new Commission which was empowered to employ an Advisory Commission with authority to make investigations, subpoena witnesses, hold hearings, and make recommendations. A new snooping agency. This though the regular standing committees of the Congress have like authority, and upon these

standing committees is imposed the same duties delegated to the Commission.

The bill also authorized the appointment of a new Assistant Attorney General and provided authority to employ an unlimited number of assistants to the assistant. The Congress was given not even an estimate as to the cost which would be incurred by the Commission, its employees, the Assistant Attorney General and his assistants and employees, but the bill did contain a provision authorizing the appropriation of so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The foregoing is an illustration of the way the Congress, under the guise of a worthy purpose, in my judgment, needlessly authorizes the wasteful expenditure of your tax dollars. It is an example of how an economy drive is halted.

To further insult the intelligence of the average citizen, the bill, while purporting to protect civil rights, took from the citizen his established constitutional right to a trial by jury when charged with a criminal offense.

I did not vote for the bill because (a) there is now on the books ample legislation to protect the right to vote; (b) we have an FBI second to no agency in the wide, wide world capable of detecting criminal activities; and (c) we have a United States Attorney General backed by able, vigorous United States district attorneys, plus United States district and appellate courts capable of seeing that the present law protecting the right to vote is enforced.

And because, most important of all, the bill deprived a citizen of his basic, fundamental, constitutional right to trial by jury.

Incidentally, it calls for additional unnecessary Federal employees and the needless spending of additional tax dollars.

Report of Congressman John E. Fogarty, a Congressional Adviser of the United States Delegation, at the 10th World Health Assembly, Held May 7 to May 24, 1957, at Geneva, Switzerland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1957

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the 10th World Health Assembly met at the headquarters of the World Health Organization in Geneva last May, and I had the privilege of attending part of the sessions as a member of the United States delegation. What I saw at the assembly confirms my belief that WHO is an important international agency, and that we have a real stake in it. It is fitting that Congress has authorized the appropriation of funds to hold the 11th World Health Assembly next year in the United States. In 1958 the World Health Organization will have been in existence for 10 years. The constitution

of WHO was drawn up and signed in New York City. These considerations led to the action of Congress which made it possible for the United States to invite WHO to hold its next annual meeting in our country.

I was happy to have the opportunity to extend to WHO the invitation on behalf of the United States delegation, and to tell the Assembly that the United States Congress has shown by its actions its realization that improving world health conditions is a basic part of building a more peaceful and stable world. The World Health Assembly accepted the United States invitation. The 11th World Health Assembly will therefore be held in the United States next May, along with a 2-day 10th anniversary commemorative session to mark the special occasion.

The overwhelming vote—71 out of 75—by which the Assembly elected the United States to appoint a member of the WHO Executive Board dramatically indicates the general recognition of the contributions which the United States has made to WHO. These are contributions not only in financial terms, but also in leadership and technical knowledge. These contributions have repaid us several times over in good will and in better health for hundreds of millions of people.

There was considerable recognition at the Assembly also of the assistance which the International Cooperation Administration gives to health programs in many countries. Several delegations acknowledged in their Assembly speeches the great value of United States assistance. There was no feeling that ICA and WHO are in competition, but rather that they are working side by side constructively to help countries raise health levels.

This common objective of WHO and ICA was made even more clear by the United States delegation statements during the Assembly consideration of malaria eradication. These statements reviewed the contributions of ICA to malaria eradication and affirmed our confidence that with the leadership demonstrated by WHO a coordinated worldwide campaign against malaria will be successful. They referred also to the possibility of increased United States aid to eradicate malaria as proposed by the President. Malaria indirectly costs the American people hundreds of millions of dollars each year, and this campaign, therefore, has great significance for us in economic as well as other terms.

The United States delegation, in conversations with other delegations to the Assembly, found considerable mention of the value of medical research, especially in the United States. There is appreciation of the research work being done at the National Institutes of Health of the Public Health Service and at other centers. This applies both to research in tropical diseases, which still ravage many countries as well as indirectly burden the United States, and to research in chronic diseases, like heart diseases, poliomyelitis, and cancer.

The kind of massive scientific attack on disease which our NIH research represents is basic to our efforts in our

own country, and abroad through WHO and ICA, to help free man from disease.

The World Health Organization as an international agency with limited resources does not attempt large-scale research itself, but rightly limits its part to stimulating and promoting research, and correlating work and exchanging information between laboratories in various countries. The Director General of WHO reported to the Assembly that during 1956 the Organization maintained close collaboration with nearly 1,800 scientific institutions, particularly medical research laboratories all over the world. In line with this function of stimulating worldwide research attacks on major diseases, the Assembly unanimously adopted a resolution authorizing WHO and member countries to cooperate in a comparative study of the variations between cancer types in different countries and environments. This is expected to yield valuable clues to the origins of the disease.

In addition to reviewing and adopting a program and budget for WHO for the next year, the delegates to the World Health Assembly take the opportunity to engage in a specialized discussion of some important public health topic. This year the theme was The Role of the Hospital in the Public Health Program. The United States delegation was fortunate in having as a member the director of the American Hospital Association, who made a major contribution to the technical discussions and was one of the rapporteurs.

The delegation, in fact, was constituted so that it could capably represent American concepts of public health and medicine. In addition to a very able chairman, Dr. Leroy E. Burney, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, and officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Public Health Service, and the Department of State, some of whom have been closely associated with WHO matters for many years, the delegation included a trustee of the AMA, deans of schools of public health and of dentistry, a member from the Department of Defense, a public member who has distinguished herself in work in voluntary health agencies, and public health workers from State and Territorial health departments. From the Congress, Mr. Wolverton and I served as advisers to the delegation. It was a pleasure to be associated with this delegation which represented the United States in a business-like and effective way.

Attendance at the 10th World Health Assembly confirmed my belief, which I find that Mr. Wolverton shares, about the importance of the work of the World Health Organization. Its budget is small in comparison to the massive disease problems still facing the world, and the United States, yet who is spearheading strong international attacks on such problems. It has already helped to push back the ravages of diseases like malaria, yaws, and tuberculosis, and to lessen the appallingly high number of deaths among children in many areas, through whom, we and other nations are pooling resources so that they can be used most effectively to protect all of us against

disease. I am proud of the part which the United States plays in the work of the World Health Organization, and of the support which we give to this agency for health.

Report of Congressman Charles A. Wolverton, a Congressional Adviser of the United States Delegation, at the 10th World Health Assembly, Held May 7 to May 24, 1957, at Geneva, Switzerland

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1957**

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, recently I had a most rewarding and revealing experience—that of serving as a member of the United States delegation to the 10th World Health Assembly, which met in Geneva May 7 to 24, 1957. Attending the Assembly gave me an unparalleled opportunity to appraise the character and work of the World Health Organization.

I wish that every Member of Congress—indeed every citizen of the United States—could have the close view of this great organization that I have had. No one could come away from such an experience without a sense of deep satisfaction in what we Americans are doing through this organization to relieve misery and suffering among hundreds of millions of our fellow men. And one could not help being astounded at how much is being accomplished with so little money. Hundreds and hundreds of important health projects are being carried out even in the remotest corners of the world under the stimulus and technical guidance of this organization. I know of no money that is being spent with greater effect than the small resources of the WHO. Truly, it is changing the world for the better, building a strong and more resourceful human race.

I was delighted with the refreshing atmosphere of warm good will and friendship that I found among the delegates, many of whom were old and true friends of long standing. Many, indeed, are loyal alumni of our own schools of public health. Dr. Ernest Stebbins, the dean of the Johns Hopkins School of Public Health and Hygiene, who was a member of our delegation, held an impromptu Hopkins reunion that was attended by a goodly number of delegates from all over the world. He was busy the whole 3 weeks talking with his former students.

It was clear at the assembly that health is a common denominator which brings all people together. Seventy-nine of the eighty-eight member countries sent delegations, consisting chiefly of physicians. Despite highly varied national and political backgrounds, these delegates spoke the same language on health matters. They all shared a de-

termination to work through WHO to help all countries improve the health of their people, as human beings regardless of race, creed, color, or political belief.

The reason for this understanding became evident to me. Physicians and other health workers are traditionally dedicated to improving the lot of us all. They know instinctively that health is truly international, that disease knows no frontiers, and that for over half of all mankind poor health—sickness and suffering—is still the normal condition of everyday life. They know, too, that so long as major diseases exist anywhere they are a threat to people everywhere.

I am convinced after seeing the WHO at close range that it is of the greatest importance that the United States give vigorous and increasing support to WHO as it continues to grow in strength and influence. The organization provides a means through which the governments and people of nearly all countries work together on a constructive and friendly basis with the common aim of better health. The character of WHO is not nearly as well known as it should be, and in particular the fact that in this organization there is a degree of international understanding that, I believe, is unique. Over the years I am convinced that this aspect of WHO alone will make a major contribution to the building in all fields of the constructive and cooperative relations between countries which are essential for peace and even for survival.

The health programs of the World Health Organization also deserve to be much better known. They include worldwide services, such as rapid international reporting of disease outbreaks, promotion of uniform quarantine measures and of standards for drugs. Newsworthy of late has been the work of WHO in encouraging and coordinating international reporting and research into influenza epidemics, the viruses which cause them, and vaccines which may be effective against them. Its worldwide network of cooperating laboratories has been the world's watchdog as influenza has broken out in Asia and threatens to spread over the world.

WHO also provides a wide range of expert assistance and training to help countries build strong health programs of their own. It was brought out at the Assembly that in 1956 WHO assisted 700 projects in 120 countries and territories, and granted fellowships to 900 health workers for advanced training in the United States and other countries.

The 10th World Health Assembly looked into and discussed every aspect of the WHO programs, as carried out in 1956 and as projected for 1958. The examination of the work of WHO was not merely a formality, but gave real insight into the programs. This was due to the able reporting on the programs by the WHO Secretariat, and to the high caliber of the delegations from many of the countries.

The United States can be proud of the character and performance of our delegation at the World Health Assembly. The delegation was headed by Dr. Leroy

E. Burney, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, and was broadly representative of public health and medicine in the United States, including such leaders as Dr. James Reuling, one of the trustees of the American Medical Association, Mr. Edward Crosby, director of the American Hospital Association, Dr. Lester Burket, dean of the Dental School of the University of Pennsylvania, and, representing the public, a charming lady from Brookline, Mass., Mrs. Viola Pinanski, who has played a prominent part in many voluntary health activities in her own community and across the Nation. The States and Territories were represented by Dr. Franklin Yoder, the health officer of Wyoming who is the president of the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, Dr. Richard K. C. Lee, the president of the Board of Health of Hawaii, and by Mr. Blucher Poole, chief sanitary engineer of Indiana. The delegation included as well, experienced health officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Public Health Service, the Department of State, the International Cooperation Administration, and the Department of Defense. Mr. FOGARTY and I had the honor to serve on the delegation as Congressional advisers, and I felt proud, as I am sure Mr. FOGARTY did too, to be associated with such a group.

This delegation worked. It worked hard and effectively and was a credit to the United States in every way. Following a delegation meeting at 8:15 each morning, the delegation members participated actively not only in the formal sessions, but even more important, informally in establishing warm and friendly relationships with other delegates, and acquainting them with the United States positions on the various matters before the Assembly.

The esteem in which the United States is held in the World Health Assembly was shown when the 10th Assembly elected 6 states, each of which is entitled to designate 1 expert to fill a vacancy on the 18-man WHO Executive Board. The United States headed the list, with 71 votes out of 75 voting. I believe this vote of confidence in the United States is a tribute to the able farsighted men which the United States has placed on the annual Assembly delegations and on the Executive Board. As a result the United States has had a leading role in the sessions of the Assembly and Board.

Next year, 1958, marks the 10th anniversary of the coming into force of the constitution of the World Health Organization, which was originally drawn up and signed in New York City. The 10th World Health Assembly considered plans for the 10th anniversary, and approved the holding of a special commemorative session in conjunction with the 11th World Health Assembly, 1958. Last July the Congress declared by joint resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 183—that 1958 would be particularly appropriate for holding the World Health Assembly in the United States, and authorized an appropriation to pay the additional expenses of holding the 11th Assembly in our country. Speaking for the United States delegation, our colleague Representative

FOGARTY informed the Assembly of the action of Congress and the invitation that had been sent to the Director General to hold the 1958 assembly in the United States. He affirmed the wish of our country to make the occasion an auspicious and successful one. The Assembly decided, without dissent, to accept the United States invitation. We have therefore secured a unique opportunity to demonstrate the continuing support of the United States for WHO and international cooperation in health. This will also provide the people of the United States a splendid opportunity to see the World Health Organization at close range.

At the recent Assembly the U. S. S. R. and three other Soviet States—Albania, Bulgaria, and Poland—sent delegations for the first time in 8 years, during which period they declined to support or share in the work of WHO. While delegates welcomed the return of these states, the Assembly did not give the U. S. S. R. sufficient votes to enable that country to designate a member of the executive board at this time. The statements of these states in the Assembly were in general moderate and unexceptional. Eight countries, including the United States and the U. S. S. R., joined in co-sponsoring a resolution to promote worldwide cooperation through WHO in investigating the causes of cancer—an illustration of how common health interests may cut across ideological differences.

The World Health Assembly discussions made clear that malaria is still a major world problem. Each year malaria attacks over 200 million people—more than the population of the United States—and kills 2 million. Characteristic of the farsighted leadership which WHO exercises on health programs is its present drive to eradicate malaria from the world. Since mosquitoes and airplanes cross frontiers, malaria must be attacked on an international scale. WHO is able to provide technical guidance and the needed coordination of plans. In 2 years the voluntary special malaria eradication fund established in 1955 has received only \$70,000, and the Assembly therefore urged countries to make voluntary contributions to this fund. The discussion on malaria came on the day following President Eisenhower's message to Congress on foreign aid, and the delegation was able to read to the Assembly the passage in the President's message in which he proposed that the United States increase our contributions to the attack against the world's No. 1 health problem. I hope that this program will receive the support it deserves. Malaria eradication will redound to the benefit of the United States through the improvement it will bring about in the economy of the underdeveloped countries. And further, there is no better way for us to show our friendship for that huge segment of the world's population that is heavily burdened by preventable disease.

The contributions which American scientists have made over the years in advancing the fight against malaria were signaled in the Assembly by the award to Dr. Paul F. Russell, the distinguished

malariologist of the Rockefeller Foundation, of the Darling prize for outstanding achievements in malaria control. In accepting the prize, Dr. Russell described WHO as the "motivating mainspring in the global assault on malaria." Dr. Russell has been one of the architects of the President's malaria eradication proposals.

Of direct interest for all of us is the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. WHO has embarked on a constructive program to help countries develop the health and medical uses of radioisotopes and to promote protection against radiation hazards connected with the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The program includes exchange of information, training and seminars, and technical assistance. The Assembly with the strong support of the United States delegation endorsed the continuation and expansion of this program, in cooperation with the International Atomic Energy Agency when established. The United States delegation expressed gratification that WHO is recognizing its responsibilities in this field. A proposal by the delegation of India that the Assembly appeal for a ban on nuclear bomb tests was ruled out of order in committee, and the ruling upheld by committee vote. This was evidence of the determination of the WHO to proceed with its work without becoming involved in international political problems.

After considerable discussion, the Assembly adopted by vote of 50 to 10 a budget for 1958 of \$13,500,000. This is a very small amount in relation to the job to be done. In my judgment, no international organization is accomplishing more for the welfare of mankind in relation to the funds which it expends. Every dollar we contribute to WHO, whether to the regular budget or to the Special Malaria Fund, is a gilt-edged investment.

The activities of the World Health Organization are almost universal in scope and respond to a universal human need. In the constitution of WHO, we have joined with other nations to declare that all peoples have the right to the highest possible level of health. WHO is helping them to achieve this rightful condition, and in so doing is bringing mankind closer together. Thus, it is directly serving the interests of the United States and of peace. It was a great personal pleasure for me to find, at first hand, what a great contribution we, as Americans, are making to build a better world through our participation in this splendid organization.

The United States of America was fortunate in having as delegates a very representative group of individuals, each of whom are actively engaged in promoting health, both in the United States and throughout the world.

The following is a list of members of the United States delegation who attended and actively participated in the proceedings of the 10th World Health Assembly:

Chief delegate: Dr. L. E. Burney, Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Delegates: Dr. H. van Zile Hyde, Chief, Division of International Health, Bureau of State Services, United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Dr. J. R. Reuling, American Medical Association.

Alternates: Mr. H. B. Calderwood, Office of International Economic and Social Affairs, Department of State; Dr. A. C. McGuinness, Special Assistant for Health and Medical Affairs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Congressional advisers: Mr. J. E. FOGARTY, House of Representatives, United States Congress; Mr. C. A. WOLVERTON, House of Representatives, United States Congress.

Advisers: Dr. L. W. Burket, dean, Dental School, University of Pennsylvania; Col. R. L. Callison, Office of the Surgeon General, Department of the Army; Dr. E. P. Campbell, Deputy Chief, Public Health Division, International Cooperation Administration; Dr. E. L. Crosby, director, American Hospital Association; Dr. R. K. C. Lee, president, Board of Health, Honolulu, T. H.; Mrs. V. R. Pinanski, consultant to the National Advisory Neurological Diseases and Blindness Council, National Institutes of Health, United States Public Health Service; Mr. B. A. Poole, chief, Bureau of Environmental Sanitation, State Board of Health, Indianapolis, Ind.; Mr. D. H. Popper, acting United States representative to international organizations, United States resident delegation and Consulate General, Geneva; Dr. E. L. Stebbins, director, School of Hygiene and Public Health, the Johns Hopkins University; Mr. R. Olaf Waring, Office of International Administration, Department of State; Mr. L. Wyatt, Division of International Health, Bureau of State Services, United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Dr. F. D. Yoder, president, Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, Cheyenne, Wyo.

A National Cowboy Hall of Fame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1957

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for millions of Americans, the cowboy is a symbol of the development of the West. Certainly there was no figure on the American frontier any more colorful than the cowboy. Little wonder that every American boy has at one time or another played cowboy. Likewise, the cowboy is a prominent figure in our radio, television, and movie dramas. It is impossible to think about the frontier without recalling the dramatic role he has played.

The life of the cowboy was not always one of color and drama, however. His life consisted also of long hours of toil, drudgery, and hardship. He was called upon to serve in many ways that made

possible the opening and development of the West.

It is entirely fitting that the rich heritage of the American cowboy should be preserved. That is why I add my support to the movement to establish a National Cowboy Hall of Fame and Museum.

Some time ago individuals from 17 Western States, particularly interested in preserving the literary and cultural heritage of the cowboy, joined together to launch at Oklahoma City, Okla., just such a hall of fame and museum. Construction of this project is underway. I am happy to say that South Dakota, which figured prominently in the cowboy era, has furnished two trustees who are giving of their excellent abilities to make this project a great national shrine to the cowboy. Mr. Bert Hall, of Kennebec, S. Dak., a distinguished author and rancher, and Mr. Ernest B. Ham, of Viewfield, S. Dak., who comes from a long line of western cattlemen, are both active in this splendid cause.

I want to urge the Members of Congress, Mr. Speaker, to give whatever support is possible to the successful completion of this worthwhile venture. I think it deserves our attention and our encouragement.

Why Steel Prices Went Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1957

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, since United States Steel recently announced an increase of approximately \$6 per ton, and since steel is one of the basic products of our industrial economy, I think it is important that the Members of Congress, who have such a great responsibility to the people of the Nation, know the basic facts, or reasons, for such increase in the price of steel. I think it is well to review the facts which briefly are as follows:

On August 3, 1956, a year ago, after the steel companies had suffered a loss of millions of dollars as a result of a 34-day strike, the United States Steel Corp. signed a 3-year labor agreement contract effective July 1, 1956, which provided a total increase each year of about 24 cents per hour annually, including a cost-of-living adjustment of about four cents an hour plus other benefits.

Under that agreement, which became effective July 1, 1956, the steel company to meet the increase in labor costs for the first year increased its prices about 7 6/10 percent.

At the beginning of this, the second year of the 3-year contract with the United Steel Workers, the steel company gave the employees their second increase in wages and employee benefits, which will amount to about 21 cents per hour from July 1, 1957, to July 1, 1958, which includes a cost-of-living adjust-

ment of 4 cents per hour and various other benefits.

Mr. Hood, president of United States Steel, in announcing the signing of the second year contract, and in explaining its provisions, said:

The new pay adjustments will bring the corporation's average hourly employment cost for wage employees engaged in steel production to about \$3.52 per hour, a record high.

Mr. Hood called attention to the inflationary pressures on all other costs that have been accompanying wage increases in recent years. He made the statement that from 1940 through 1956 United States Steel's employment costs per employee-hour has risen 250 percent, which purchased goods and services, taxes, and other costs had risen 315 percent, or even more substantially. Thus United States Steel's total costs per employee-hour rose 284 percent over this period.

In contrast, the price of finished steel mill products, as measured by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, increased only 138 percent. The difference between this increase in total costs and the smaller increase in prices has been absorbed by United States Steel over the years through greater efficiency of operation, intensive cost reduction, the expenditure of billions of dollars on modernization and improvement of facilities, and partly by a decline in the profit rate.

In emerging from the depression, United States Steel made a profit in 1940 of 9 1/2 cents on each dollar of sales, a figure exceeded in numerous predepression years, but never equaled for any year since 1940, Mr. Hood pointed out. The nearest approach to that was in 1955, when the corporation earned 9 cents on each dollar of sales. Last year it earned 8.2 cents on each dollar of sales.

The pay increases that are taking effect in United States Steel under the terms of the 1956 labor contract, which terminates June 30, 1959, and which provides for further increases in 1958, are these:

1. A general wage increase of 7 cents per hour for all hourly rated employees, plus an increase of two-tenths of 1 cent in the present differential of 6.3 cents per hour between each of United States Steel's 32 job classifications for its production and maintenance employees.

OTHER BENEFITS

2. A cost-of-living increase of 4 cents per hour for all hourly rated employees. This brings to 7 cents an hour the total cost-of-living adjustments occurring under the 3-year labor agreement in the first year of its operation. The adjustments are governed by the consumer price index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

3. An increase to one and one-fifth times the regular rate of pay, from one and one-tenth times the regular rate, as the compensation for nonovertime work performed on Sunday.

4. An increase to double time and one-tenth, from double time, as the compensation for work performed on any of 7 specified holidays.

In addition to these increases in United States Steel's employment costs, other increases will result from similar and simultaneous adjustments in the pay of salaried employees who are cov-

ered by labor agreements signed last summer, as well as from appropriate increases to other salaried employees, Mr. Hood reported.

As of May 20, 1957, United States Steel Corp. for the first quarter announced a quarterly dividend of \$1.75 per share on the preferred stock, and 75 cents per share on the common stock. The common stock is listed at a value of approximately \$69 a share on today's market.

The following table shows earnings and some other costs of operating the steel business:

FOR THE YEAR 1956

Products and services sold...	\$4,228,900,000
Tax payments.....	427,000,000
Total net income after taxes...	348,100,000
Employment labor costs.....	1,681,000,000
Dividends paid.....	170,100,000
Other employee benefits.....	*225,352,981

*The \$225,352,981 in employee benefits which already exceeds dividends paid by over \$55,000,000 does not include fringed costs paid to employees, which amount to an additional 50 to 60 percent, or about \$120,000,000.

And may I say that under our tax system nearly all of these dividends the stockholders receive are subject to the regular income tax which greatly reduces the net amount.

A close look at the table above indicates that taxes paid by United States Steel are \$78,900,000 more than the net earnings of \$348,100,000 after taxes. Net earnings after taxes for 1956 were 8.2 percent.

The Need for Protecting FBI Files

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1957

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to discuss H. R. 8341, a measure of utmost importance to the preservation of our Government.

This measure deals with the FBI files, which were in effect declared sitting ducks in an open hunting season by the Supreme Court of the United States in the now-famous Jencks case. The Court in that ruling has created and compounded confusion, not only among the law enforcement officers of the executive branch, but among the jurists of the lower courts as well. The Court, I submit, was not clear in its definitions or terminology and left much of what it intended to convey in doubt. But one fact remains inescapable through this ruling. The Court, in effect, told every criminal and his lawyer that they have the right to examine the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation if they think that through such examination they can find documentary support for whatever nefarious position they choose to take. This, of course, to be accomplished before a presiding judge has a chance to examine the files to determine if the material is or is not pertinent to the case.

The Judiciary Committees of both the House and the other body have considered this bill and one like it with favor. In an appearance before one committee, the Attorney General, Mr. Herbert Brownell, Jr., pointed out some dangers inherent in the Court's decision. He noted that already persons accused in narcotics cases had been freed in Pennsylvania and Georgia and that convictions already won in the courts might be reversed in a kidnaping case in Rhode Island. In numerous other cases the criminals or their attorneys are now preparing to base appeals on this ruling.

I recognize, as every other Member of this House does, the need to protect the innocent and to provide the accused with every possible means of preparing his defense. This is the basic function of our legal system and one of the main differences between our own and totalitarian justice where the only defense is to throw yourself on the mercy of the court.

At the same time I recognize, as does every Member of this House, that one of the prime functions of Government is to protect itself and the citizens who depend on it for protection—protection not only against aggression from abroad and subversion from within, but also from those elements within our own society who prey on their fellow humans and who stalk the jungles of our underworld. To accomplish this protection, Government has at its disposal the Armed Forces to guard against aggression from without, and the FBI to guard society against those who would corrupt or communize it. The FBI, under the direction of that eminent public servant, J. Edgar Hoover, has done a remarkable job in this important field. Now the Court would have us destroy the efficiency of this organization and its ability to function not only as the discoverer of wrong-doing, but the protector of the innocent.

What are these mysterious FBI files?

They are simply the accumulation of a generation of evidence ferreted out by the agents themselves or brought to the attention of the FBI by private citizens. Much of the material is in the so-called raw files, that is, files which up to now have been open only to expert and experienced men to evaluate the evidence and to determine if it warranted further inquiry.

Much of the material in the files is unsubstantiated stuff which is better left locked up—material containing half true or completely false allegations. It would never, under the old procedure, have gone further. But under the new Court edict, this mass of material is open to the prying eyes of lawyers and outright criminals—men who could and would use it to their own advantage and without regard for those whom it might needlessly hurt.

Equally important, the files contain names of men, who through loyal service have uncovered the criminal plots against the Government, some of them paid counterintelligence agents. To open these files would be to expose these names and thus make them useless or, indeed, in some cases to make their very existence a hazard.

Also, the files contain clues as to which direction investigations may take, and to open them would be to announce to the world—and particularly to the shrewd and evil conspirators, where they should more carefully cover their tracks, where to go underground and what incriminating evidence to destroy.

In sum, the FBI files, if open to the wrong man or men, could do this Nation untold damage.

The purpose of H. R. 8341 and its companion bill in the other body, is to protect these files, while at the same time protecting the right of defendants to fair trial. It accomplishes this purpose by directing that such files or parts of files pertinent to the defense shall be open to the defendant—but only after examination by the trial judge. We are in this measure placing the responsibility on the shoulders of experienced and trained jurists and not at the discretion of possible Communists—or men who make their living at the beck and call of the criminal element.

The bill, I feel, accomplished the purpose of protecting the life of our Nation while at the same time guaranteeing every right to those accused of crimes, whatever those crimes may be.

Interview of Hon. Richard B. Russell, of Georgia, on CBS News and Public Affairs Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 10, 1957

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a transcript of the interview over the CBS News and Public Affairs Hour on Monday, July 8, the so-called Capitol Cloakroom broadcast, wherein I was interviewed by three of the news correspondents of the Columbia Broadcasting System.

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

CAPITOL CLOAKROOM

(Broadcast over the CBS Radio Network, July 8, 1957, 9:30 to 10 p. m.—guest: The Honorable Richard B. Russell, United States Senate, Democrat, of Georgia—CBS news correspondents: Griffing Bancroft, Bill Downs, Paul Niven—producer: Michael Marlow)

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator RUSSELL, will there be a real showdown on civil rights?

Mr. DOWNS. Senator, would this bill really punish the South?

Mr. NIVEN. Senator, would the South accept a compromise on civil rights?

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator RUSSELL, welcome to Capitol Cloakroom. One of the real veterans here, you have been in the United States Senate now for more than 24 years.

And right now you are the leader of the southern Senators in this current battle over civil rights. So let's start with that.

Do you think this time there will be a real showdown on civil rights?

Senator RUSSELL. Well, there is, of course, a very decided disposition to press this bill which is titled a civil-rights bill to a conclusion in this session of the Congress. Now we have a very attractive habit here of labeling bills, sometimes, when they don't always live up to their label.

But if you are referring to the bill that is now being discussed on the floor of the Senate, it is apparent that a very determined effort will be made to force a legislative conclusion on that measure.

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, we want to ask you what might happen on that, but first, you say whether this should properly be called a civil-rights bill.

If it is not a civil-rights bill, what is it?

Senator RUSSELL. Well, in some of its aspects it is more of a force bill aimed at the customs and laws of the South that were upheld for a hundred years than it is a civil-rights bill.

It has been presented to the public generally as being a bill to assure the right to vote. But as a matter of fact that is the mildest of all the provisions of the bill.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, Senator, there was a coalition of so-called liberal Republicans and liberal northern Democrats that got this bill to the floor in the first place.

What happens to the conservative coalition among southerners and conservative Republicans under these circumstances?

Senator RUSSELL. Well, I don't know just exactly what that term "coalition" implies. At times it seems to be used as a term of condemnation or derision.

In times past when some of the southern Democrats have voted with the Republicans not to move quite as fast in some areas as some of our Democratic Presidents would have had us to move, that's been called a coalition between southern Democrats—Mr. Reuther and his crowd always said Dixiecrats without regard to how loyal we had been to the Democratic Party—and the reactionary Republicans.

We do have a most unusual coalition this time in that the Republican leadership has joined hands with some of our very liberal friends, such as Senator DOUGLAS and Senator HUMPHREY and others to force this bill to a conclusion.

But, then, politics makes strange bedfellows. In this case we undoubtedly have a game where the South is a mere pawn on the political checkerboard. The minority groups have apparently convinced the leadership of both parties that the party that is willing to wage the furthest punitive expedition into the South will win the Presidency in 1960.

Mr. NIVEN. Senator, some Republicans have charged and northern Democrats have denied that there was a deal in the voting over the procedure of the civil-rights bill and the Hells Canyon bill.

Senator RUSSELL. Yes; I saw that in the press. If there is anything to that, I have no knowledge of it. I saw the article.

I happen to be one of the five Democrats who changed his vote on Hells Canyon. I did it because of the tax amortization feature which made it very apparent that the Federal Government was going to pay for the dam in any event. If we were going to pay for it, I thought we ought to have title to it.

Mr. NIVEN. But you did not offer and were not offered any kind of deal?

Senator RUSSELL. No; there was no deal in any sense I know of. I hope, however, such a thing as appreciation still exists even in the Senate of the United States where any Senator finds that he can out of his heart do so to vote to make this bill a tolerable bill or a reasonable bill and not a force bill, that they will vote for amendments.

I hope that the purpose of this charge was not to frighten the true liberals in the Senate who will support, for example, a jury-trial amendment.

We have a very anomalous situation when so-called liberals are trying to abolish the right of trial by jury, as is being done in this bill.

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, Senator RUSSELL, if there was a deal made, you apparently lost it anyway, because the bill went on the calendar over your objections.

Senator RUSSELL. Yes; and very frankly, when I saw the coalition that was there—that I called the Knowland-Douglas-Humphrey axis—I had very little hopes of getting a majority vote. I did make a fight because I believe in orderly procedure in the Senate, and I did not think that the procedure that was followed was orderly, and we are paying the penalty for it right now.

We put the bill on the calendar and it comes out later that there's been an error in the print of the bill that was sent over that they are undertaking to correct today.

When you get away from established precedents in the Senate, when you try to take shortcuts for temporary advantage, it nearly always brings a great deal of trouble.

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, now, coming back for just one moment to this bill, President Eisenhower, who claims that this is a moderate bill and who says at least his principle desire is to protect voting rights has expressed some surprise at your statement, I believe, about how far you think this bill could go.

And there was some talk that you might have a conference with the President to talk about this. Is there any conference now set for you at the White House?

Senator RUSSELL. Well, now you ought to go back to what you were talking about—

Mr. BANCROFT. All right.

Senator RUSSELL. Before you get down to that.

President Eisenhower also stated that he had gotten out the bill and tried to read it and had found some of its provisions very confusing.

Mr. BANCROFT. That is right.

Senator RUSSELL. And I may say that he has a great deal of company, because it is a very adroitly and cunningly drafted bill.

I have no comment to make on the other because I am of the old school, came up here at a time when Senators didn't go out and make an announcement they were trying to get down to the White House or were invited to the White House.

I would only say that I earnestly hope that I may have an opportunity to discuss this bill with President Eisenhower, either personally or with any legal adviser that he wants there, to show him that the right-to-vote provision in this bill is the least momentous of all its provisions.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, Senator, you said that in the case of jury trial, in demanding a jury trial in voting rights cases, for example, that this bill should contain that provision.

Senator RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. DOWNS. Isn't it true, sir, that in the South, and hasn't it been proved in the South, that when you have an all-white jury voting on the rights of a Negro voter, that he doesn't have much of a chance of winning?

Senator RUSSELL. Well, that's one of the common slanders that's been repeated against the South without a word of evidence to substantiate it. You have got any number of criminal statutes on your books now where it is made a violation of criminal law, punishable by imprisonment and fine, to interfere with the voting rights of any citizen.

Now the South is entitled to have at least some proof brought forward of this charge that is repeatedly banded that every southern white man is so irresponsible that he would forswear himself or perjure himself in a case involving a Negro citizen.

I practiced law for many years before I came into the Senate, and I did not find

that to be true. And we were at least entitled, before a whole great section of this country was indicted as everyone of us being perjurers, we were at least entitled to have the Attorney General come out and say, "Here, I tried to get an indictment in this case before a grand jury for a violation of a right to vote, and I didn't get an indictment," or if "I did get an indictment," that the jury "didn't do justice."

They haven't done that; they have just gone on this wave of public sentiment, this antisouthern feeling that has been built up by just such charges as that, that the whole white South would just forswear themselves.

As a matter of fact, there is no great problem about the Negro voting in the South today. In my own State, and that's the only one I have personal knowledge of, there's no limitation or prohibition on the right of qualified Negroes to vote. Why in the city of Atlanta they elected a Negro over one white man to one of the most responsible of all the city positions, a member of the board of trustees for the schools. He was reelected within the past few months by white votes. And the Negroes vote there, they vote generally over the State. And this is just part of this campaign to make it appear that throughout the entire South that Negroes are denied the right to vote. It is certainly not the truth.

Mr. NIVEN. Senator, isn't there a good deal of social and economic pressure against Negroes to restrain them from voting?

Senator RUSSELL. I have heard that that was true in some areas. I was giving you what I know of my own knowledge in my own State. And there may be, I don't say there aren't, isolated instances where Negroes are denied the right to vote—in every State of this Union you've got wards and communities and counties where you have got so-called courthouse gangs, and they deny some white people as well as some Negroes the right to vote if they don't belong to that gang.

But we have got criminal statutes to punish that, and why doesn't the Attorney General invoke them before coming in here and making a blanket indictment of the South, "The white man in the South is so venomous against the Negro that he won't do justice." For that is not true.

The relations between the races in the South have been gravely disturbed in the last 2 or 3 years; but until that time there had never been any place in all the history of human civilization where two races so equal in number had started out with the disparity that there was between them—one coming out of slavery—and had made the progress over the period of 80 years that has been made in the South.

The white South should be commended for what they have done. They have taxed themselves even in the desolation of destruction following the Civil War to create schools. And for a hundred years, under the protection of the law, they have paid taxes and bonded themselves to build separate but equal schools for the white and colored people.

And that's the purpose of this bill, to forcibly commingle the white and Negro children of the South in the schools. This voting business is all a smokescreen for that vicious provision of the bill—and not only in the schools, but in all our places of public entertainment.

Mr. NIVEN. Well, Senator, you and other southern Democratic Senators are now emphasizing the segregation—this integration threat in the bill.

The bill was debated for about a week in the House and the southerners there did not place great emphasis on this, they seemed to debate the bill on its open merits.

Senator RUSSELL. Well, I of course don't know what took place over there. They perhaps were taken in by this campaign that

it was just a voting bill. I haven't read the debate in the House. I did read the bill here. I spent the better part of 3 days with about 40 law books running down this cunningly contrived bill. And I leave it up to you and your personal attorneys, right now, to take the remarks that I made in the Senate last Tuesday on this bill and take this bill and if he doesn't come up and tell you that it can be used as a force bill to bring the whole might of the United States Government to bear to integrate the schools of the South, why you'd better get you another lawyer.

It's very clear, when you run it down.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator RUSSELL, it seems to me you go a little further than that. You say that not only can it do that, but that that was the intention of those who sponsored this bill.

Senator RUSSELL. Undoubtedly. This section, this part—

Mr. BANCROFT. Well then, whom do you—

Senator RUSSELL. I don't know who drafted this bill.

Mr. BANCROFT. Accuse of doing this? Do you think Attorney General Brownell—

Senator RUSSELL. I don't know whether—

Mr. BANCROFT. Deliberately brought in a bill that goes—

Senator RUSSELL. Mr. Brownell knew what was in this bill or not. I am confident he didn't draft it. But I would certainly like to meet the man who did draft it because it is a masterpiece of obscuring the purpose.

Mr. BANCROFT. If this is a deliberate plot, who do you think was—

Senator RUSSELL. I don't know who is responsible for it. But I assert unhesitatingly that this part 3 of this bill was drawn for the express purpose of obscuring a vast grant of power to destroy any system of separation of the races in the South.

And I will say that after the people of the South have known no other way of life, no other social order for a hundred years, this is a monstrous proposal to come in and to ask for any such grant of power as that over night.

This condition wasn't changed by an act of Congress, where it was debated, people had an opportunity to see what was said and discuss it themselves—it came through a decision of the Supreme Court, based on a book by the Swedish Socialist who said that our Constitution is a plot against the common people of the United States. And it came overnight—like that—with no preparation.

Mr. BANCROFT. This is the Supreme Court school segregation decision you are talking about?

Senator RUSSELL. Yes, this bill proposes to enforce judicial law, a law that has been written by the courts rather than legislative law, a law that's been written by the Congress, that's what it does.

Mr. DOWNS. Senator, you also expressed I think last week the fear or prediction that American troops could be used.

Senator RUSSELL. Why this bill is tied in with one of your old reconstruction statutes that was passed by Sumner and Stephens when they set out, as they said themselves, to put black heels on white necks in the South. The criminal counterpart of this civil statute was stricken down by the Supreme Court declaring that it was passed by an impassioned Congress at a time when the Southern States were being treated as conquered provinces.

And yet that is the law that it skillfully ties into without being apparent on its face. Why didn't they write out in this bill what they propose to do where we could read it, instead of saying "section 1895," and then having that section refer to section 1993, where it requires a lawyer who is a jigsaw puzzle expert to put it all together to see exactly what it does?

But you will see that the real lawyers of this Senate will not refute one iota of what

I said when they have studied this bill, and I care not which side of it there're on. They may say "We don't intend to do it," but they won't say it can't be done.

Mr. NIVEN. Senator, can you imagine Federal troops actually being sent into the South?

Senator RUSSELL. I certainly can. I certainly can. When they can make such a political pawn out of the South, as has been done now, and where they can—when men are seeking political preferment, they make all kinds of commitments, and I can very readily see that Federal troops could be sent into the South to enforce—why we have had troops and tanks at two school-houses in the South already, without this law.

Mr. DOWNS. That was National Guard troops.

Senator RUSSELL. Yes, that's true. But you're just as dead if you're shot by a tank bullet from a National Guard man as if you were shot by a regular or a marine.

Mr. DOWNS. Senator RUSSELL, in answer to my question you said that you do believe, then, that this bill is really designed to punish the South?

Senator RUSSELL. I have no question about it. Now I don't know why they take such an admonitory attitude toward the South, as if we were a group of wild and uncivilized people. Some of them feel that they are doing a very meritorious thing, to resort to any means to force the South to conform to what the rest of the Nation thinks is the proper social order for the South.

Well, this is a great Nation of ours—

Mr. NIVEN. Senator, I want—

Senator RUSSELL. If a man wants to move from one State to another, if the southern people want their children in integrated schools, it's mighty easy to move to a State where they have them; they are not more than 300 miles away from anywhere in the South. If any other person preferred for his child to go to school with children of his own race, why, he might move to the South. Then he'd be safe for the time being, until this bill passes and is enforced.

Mr. DOWNS. Don't you believe, sir, that the social order in the South has changed and is changing?

Senator RUSSELL. Oh, of course, it has, and is. But it has happened through a process of evolution, and this proposes to enforce a revolution on the South and to drive men. There's a great deal of difference between leading and in driving or letting people themselves lead and drive.

We have made great progress in the South. Why, in the voting, not in my time have there been any restrictions on Negroes in general elections in the South, but we did have a law for a long time that they couldn't vote in the Democratic primaries. Now that's all been done away with, and they do vote; there's no longer a white primary. We have moved forward very rapidly when you consider the full impact of it.

It's all well and good for a man that lives in a State where it is 98 percent white and 2 percent Negro to say, "Why, where is this problem? There's nothing to it." Let him go to a State where they are nearly equal in numbers, where the races in communities are about equal in numbers, and then undertake to enforce overnight such a bill as this.

Mr. NIVEN. Senator, the colored leaders reply that, despite this evolution and this progress, large numbers of them are still denied a right which they have been guaranteed by the Constitution for 90 years.

Senator RUSSELL. You mean the right to be in integrated schools?

Mr. NIVEN. The right to vote.

Senator RUSSELL. Well, the Supreme Court said that for 90 years they had been denied the right that they were entitled to be in

integrated schools. The Constitution hadn't changed; the complexion of the Court has changed.

And I deny that statement as to voting. At least, as far as the greater portion of the South is concerned, there is no real limitation or restriction on the right of qualified Negroes to vote.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, the qualifications, sir—

Senator RUSSELL. You can come to my State when they are having an election and see them; they are lined up there for blocks to go and vote, and their votes are counted just like anyone else.

Mr. NIVEN. Well, Senator, would you concede that qualification has been interpreted differently for white and colored persons?

Senator RUSSELL. I have heard that, but I don't concede it—no; I don't concede it, generally, in my State; no. There may be areas where it has been, small communities, it is probably true.

Mr. NIVEN. Well, why don't Negroes vote in larger numbers, then?

Senator RUSSELL. Well, they vote in—we have practically 225,000 registered in Georgia, and they vote. Perhaps in some of the elections they have a higher percentage voting than white people.

Oh, you pillory the South by giving the figures voting in a general election and saying only 45 percent of the people voted. But as a matter of fact we have had the one-party system in the South, and our people vote in the primaries. And you compare the vote in the primaries, when we really settle our election, and it's not too much behind the rest of the country. But we don't vote in the general election because everything has been settled in the primary.

But that's the figures they always give you, just 45 percent here in the general election.

Mr. NIVEN. But the percentage of Negro voting is not anywhere near as high as the percentage of whites voting; is it?

Senator RUSSELL. No; because there are a great many more white people in my State than there are Negroes. We have about 2,300,000 white people and about 1,200,000 Negroes.

Mr. NIVEN. Isn't that a proportionate basis?

Senator RUSSELL. Well, that may be slightly true. I concede that, because they haven't been voting long. They haven't been voting too long. We only abolished the poll tax in Georgia about 10, 11 years ago.

But where can the Attorney General come in and say, "In Georgia they violated the criminal law by denying this man, Bill Jones, the right to vote"? And he should do it and prove, "I tried to indict and I tried to convict before a jury," before you come in and indict the whole State of Georgia and say we have deprived the Negro of his right to vote illegally.

Mr. NIVEN. Sir, is it your case that until recently there were impediments in the way of the Negro voting?

Senator RUSSELL. Of course there were in voting in the primary. I explained that a while ago. They could vote in the general election, but it didn't mean anything because the man who was nominated in the primary was going to win the general election. That may be a mistake, we may have—should have been a two-party State. I sometimes think that we would have fared much better if we had been.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator RUSSELL, I wonder if I could explore a moment what's apt to happen here on the floor of the Senate.

You are leading this strategy. And the motion made today, of course, is a motion to take up the bill.

Senator RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. BANCROFT. Which, if it prevails, would of course be followed by the discussion and the motion to pass or to act on the bill and amendments. There has been some talk

that you might not filibuster or unduly prolong and defeat a vote on the motion to take up. How about that?

Senator RUSSELL. Well, Mr. Bancroft, I intend to act as each circumstance presents itself and as this matter unfolds in such a way that I think will cause us to be able to get our maximum strength for the amendments to this bill that will see that it is a right-to-vote bill instead of a punitive bill against the South.

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, now, on that, Senator RUSSELL, an amendment cannot be offered or acted upon—

Senator RUSSELL. Oh, no.

Mr. BANCROFT. Until after this motion to take up the bill acted on.

Senator RUSSELL. We are now debating this bill strictly on its merits. There is no part of this discussion that consists of reading long papers, the ordinary earmark of a filibuster.

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, I'm trying to find out if and when—

Senator RUSSELL. I'm not prepared to say just when we'll let the bill be made the unfinished business. We want to discuss it. We have found that there are a number of Senators who have been busy with other matters and didn't really understand the full impact of this bill.

I want the situation in the Senate to jell a little where we can see just where we are going with these different amendments.

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, then, after it has jelled a little, then presumably you will allow a vote to take place on the motion to take up?

Senator RUSSELL. Oh, I think the Senate will vote on amendments to this bill.

Mr. BANCROFT. On the motion to take up, first? And—

Senator RUSSELL. I think the Senate will vote on amendments to this bill.

Mr. BANCROFT. Then to vote on amendments?

Senator RUSSELL. Well, I'm not prepared to say just when, but I'm very confident that it will.

Mr. Downs. Senator, you indicated strongly that this is a political measure—

Senator RUSSELL. Yes; I feel that strongly.

Mr. Downs. Being presented by a coalition of Democrats and Republicans, and then—

Senator RUSSELL. I feel this—

Mr. Downs. Also you said perhaps it would be a good thing if the South did have a two-party system.

Do you think that your opposition to the bill, Democratic opposition to the bill might strengthen the Republican Party in the South?

Senator RUSSELL. No; not when the Republican Party is furnishing more votes for this particular bill than the Democratic Party is in the Senate. I don't think that it would. I was talking about we would have been in a better bargaining position if we had not all been tied up in what's called the Southern Democratic Group.

As it is now, the minority groups outside the South, though they are relatively small in numbers compared to the voting strength of the white South, they can go to the political leaders there and convince them that these elections depend on their action in these doubtful States.

And by having had strictly a one-party political system in the South, I think we have denied ourselves a similar bargaining power.

But the Republicans, of course, are going at it in a very poor way to improve their position by putting more votes behind this force bill than the Democratic side of the aisle, here in the Senate.

Mr. Downs. Well, what do you think the general outcome, say, in next year's elections will be as a result of this debate?

Senator RUSSELL. Well, I couldn't say—my crystal ball is not that good. I can't pass on what it will do.

I don't believe that the great mass of the American people favor extreme measures—we are all in favor of civil rights, everybody is in favor of civil rights.

The question is, Where do my rights end and where do yours intervene? That's the question that's involved here, wholly aside from this voting proposition and this separation of the races. And they put a tag on it and call it civil rights.

But if this bill were explained to the American people, there is no doubt in my mind that an appeal from the politicians to the people would be sustained and that the American people would vote down this bill in a referendum, because it is a very unfair piece of legislation.

Mr. NIVEN. Senator, can you project any kind of compromise on this bill that would be acceptable to you?

Senator RUSSELL. Well, I would have to see it. I would have to see it. I am perfectly willing to entertain any ideas that any responsible leader of those that are pressing this bill might care to discuss. I do resent this whole theory of the bill that the South needs a guardian in the person of the Attorney General.

Now if there is any one State where the Negro is denied the right to vote, you have got clauses in the Constitution guaranteeing a republican form of government. Apply that without coming in here and abolishing the right of jury trial and tying it into the force bills of reconstruction so you will have the power to bring the Armed Forces of the United States to bear on the southern people.

We—the country as a whole doesn't realize what we have gone through with in this whole period. We have been a very poor people. It was from 1940, 80 years after 1860, until the tax values of my State got back to where they were, prior to the great fratricidal war.

And we have taxed ourselves, taxed our poverty heavier proportionately than any other section of the country to try to carry on this separate but equal system of education. And you can get your statistics and you will see that the tax according to wealth has been heavier in the Southern States than anywhere else for education.

We don't like to be threatened with this kind of force legislation.

Mr. NIVEN. You may recall that a national poll a couple of years ago found that 55 percent of Southern whites expected that integration in public schools would eventually take place. Would you agree with that?

Senator RUSSELL. I didn't see it, but I am not in a position to challenge your statement because I don't know. I didn't understand your question.

Mr. NIVEN. Apart from your preferences in the matter, do you feel that school integration is inevitable in the long run?

Senator RUSSELL. Well, forever is a long time. In the foreseeable future I don't see any integration of the schools in my State, particularly with this force legislation, because you can badger and arrest and bait people until they get in a frame of mind to close down the schools before they will do it.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator RUSSELL, you said that amendments, in your opinion, amendments to this bill would be voted on, and I—

Senator RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. BANCROFT. Presume you think some would be accepted?

Senator RUSSELL. Well, I would certainly devoutly hope so. If it is not amended it will be the worst piece of legislation ever considered.

Mr. BANCROFT. Now I presume one would be the jury trial amendment, for example, the one that was defeated in the House?

Senator RUSSELL. Yes, and the one to strike part 3 of this bill, the force provision. It is not related to the right to vote.

Mr. BANCROFT. In other words, Senator, that would leave in it simply the provision for a civil-rights commission and a new division in the Department of Justice?

Senator RUSSELL. Yes. Of course, that's a rather unusual provision.

Mr. BANCROFT. Would you accept that much of the bill?

Senator RUSSELL. No; I wouldn't be prepared to vote for a bill that was such a reflection on the people of Georgia as I deem this one.

Mr. BANCROFT. In other words, no matter how many amendments are adopted you still won't vote for this bill?

Senator RUSSELL. Oh, I didn't say that, now. You just narrowed it down. You just narrowed it down to—in the first place, this bill is wrong in policy. Here you have got a proposal that you are going to establish an entirely new division in the Department of Justice to take up all these cases, whether a man wants it done or not, and do it at Government expense.

Now the National Colored People Association and their kindred organizations have had no difficulty at all in getting up money to bring all these lawsuits.

You are starting a new system there, and the next thing you are going to do is to have some system where labor will be able to have a division in the Department of Justice to enforce their rights on employers at the expense of the Government, or vice versa, and in other fields. I don't approve of that.

I could not support such a measure. I think it is wrong in policy where a man is able to hire a lawyer, to say because it is a certain kind of case that the Attorney General can proceed at the taxpayers' expense whether the man involved wants him to or not. I don't approve of that general philosophy.

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, I'm afraid that's all the time we have, and Senator RUSSELL, we want to thank you very, very much for being with us on Capitol Cloakroom, and we will watch with interest to see what happens down there on the floor of the Senate.

Thank you, sir.

Return of Seized Alien Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 10, 1957

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "It Is Not Ours To Keep," which appeared in the Easley Progress of Tuesday, July 2, 1957, in Easley, S. C., and a statement by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], concerning the Trading With the Enemy Act and proposals for the return of vested assets.

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

[From the Easley (S. C.) Progress of July 2, 1957]

IT IS NOT OURS TO KEEP

From time to time we have noted in the press veiled suggestions of improper motive in legislation introduced by Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON to restore the property of German nationals seized during the war. The criticism has all along seemed unfair. In the first place Senator JOHNSTON risked his life as an

active participant in the first war against Germany as an enlisted man. In the second place, being upon the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, he would not be so foolish as to introduce improper legislation in his official capacity. He would have no cause to do it in a private capacity. Because of the continued charges of persons unfriendly to him the Senator has released a full statement on the question of the return of enemy aliens' property, which we have found most interesting and clarifying. A little thought on the part of the citizen would bring him to the same conclusion that the long report leads to. The seized property held so long by the United States is not German Government property but that of citizens of Germany who happened to have it in the United States when the war began. We are of course entitled to keep spoils of war taken from the enemy government; but it is not our character and viewpoint to keep the property of individuals longer than our own safety requires. Many of these aliens were friendly to the United States. One who died in a Hitler concentration camp by his will left a large sum of money to our Rockefeller Foundation. But even though the alien was hostile, a peace treaty removes that barrier and if we keep his private property we are doing wrong. Some self-styled superpatriots can't see through that conclusion of commonsense, justice, and decency. They are the only ones who have been unfair to Senator JOHNSTON in introducing his Judiciary Committee bill to complete the adjustment of seized alien properties.

STATEMENT OF OLIN D. JOHNSTON, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM SOUTH CAROLINA, CONCERNING THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT AND PROPOSALS FOR THE RETURN OF VESTED ASSETS

Because of a widespread misunderstanding of the responsibilities and functions of the subcommittee on the Trading With the Enemy Act of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and pending bills affecting alien property, a statement may help to dissipate much of the confusion in the public mind with respect to such bills which provide for the return of the privately owned properties of our former German and Japanese enemies seized under the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

The Trading With the Enemy Act was enacted on October 6, 1917. Its principal purpose was (a) to immobilize the properties of enemy nationals in World War I; (b) to prevent commercial transactions between the merchants of the United States and Germany and her allies; and (c) to hold the properties in trusteeship for the ultimate disposition of such assets by the Congress. Confiscation of such properties was never in the mind of the Congress when the original statute was enacted.

In 1923, the Congress authorized by the Winslow Act the returning up to \$10,000 in value of the vested properties seized during World War I. In the War Claims Settlement Act of 1928, Congress returned 80 percent in value of the seized properties; the remaining 20 percent was retained as security for the payment of American war-damage claims, costs of administration, etc. In 1934, because of the worldwide depression and the defaults of the Hitler Government, further returns of the balance of 20 percent were prohibited by the Harrison Act.

Shortly after the commencement of World War II, the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act were reactivated, enlarged by executive orders under the War Powers Act. Provision for the appointment of a Custodian of Alien Property was made.

In 1948 the War Claims Act was passed to provide payment of claims for the detention and ill-treatment of prisoners of war and on behalf of certain religious groups

for property losses sustained by them as the result of the military action of the Japanese and German forces. As a ready and available source of funds necessitating no direct congressional appropriations, the Congress provided that no returns of the private properties be made and that the proceeds thereof be applied to the payment of those minor war claims. Two hundred and twenty-five million dollars of the estimated \$612 millions in value of the seized properties have thus far been expended in the payments of that category of war claims. Since 1942 Congress has appropriated from the liquid assets about \$52 million to the Custodian's office for his administrative expenses. That office has had an average of over 300 persons employed annually since 1942 with an annual payroll for them in excess of \$3 million. That expense does not include the costs of administering the going concerns operated by the Office of Alien Property.

The properties of Japanese nationals were seized and vested up to the time of the Japanese Treaty on April 28, 1952. The President, by informal order on April 17, 1953, directed that no further seizures be made of the privately owned German properties. Thus it is apparent that much of the property was seized long after hostilities ceased and the necessity for seizures no longer existed.

The estimated values of the properties at the time of their seizures amounted to \$390,808,000. The appreciation in values of the vested properties, the net income from them and other properties received through agreements with foreign governments have swelled the original total to a present estimated total of \$629,701,000 as of June 30, 1956. As of that date the net value of all assets then being administered by the Department of Justice amounted to \$271,879,000.

The estimated percentages of the values by countries of the vested assets are German—76.2 percent, Japanese 16.7 percent; the balance consists of properties of Italian, Hungarian, Rumanian, Bulgarian, and others.

As a result of the peace treaties with Italy, Hungary, and the others, provisions have been made for a return of the values of the properties of the nationals of those countries.

Only the properties of German and Japanese individuals and concerns controlled by them require the attention of the Congress. No governmental property of the former governments of Hitler or Tojo is included in any proposal now pending before the Congress. No return of any property will be made to any war criminal of either country.

Congress by several amendments to the Trading With the Enemy Act provided relief for American creditors against their German and Japanese debtors. Complaints arose with respect to the conduct of the business affairs of many of the properties, involving political favoritism, etc., inefficient procedures for the payment of and adjudication of conflicting title and debt claims, and also regarding the failure to make available to everyone the advances and discoveries in scientific and technical uses of a considerable part of the seized properties. As a result of these and other complaints, the Senate by resolution in 1952 created the Subcommittee on Trading With the Enemy Act to examine and review for it the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act by the Office of Alien Property of the Department of Justice. Each succeeding Congress has extended the subcommittee.

The late Senator Willis Smith, of North Carolina, became the first chairman of this Judiciary Subcommittee. In the Republican-controlled 83d Congress, Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN was designated chairman. Since March 18, 1955, after the Democrats succeeded to the control of the Senate, I have served as chairman along with Senators McClellan, of Arkansas; Price Daniel, of Texas; O'Mahoney, of Wyoming; Dirksen, of Illinois;

and Langer, of North Dakota, as subcommittee members.

Continuing studies, investigations, and reports have been issued as required by the Senate resolution creating and continuing the subcommittee. Extensive public hearings have been held on many bills which have been introduced affecting the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act. Recently, the subcommittee concluded its 25th day of public hearings. Over the years, over 3,300 pages—much in fine print—of evidence was presented to the subcommittee. Briefs, arguments, and written testimony were submitted, a preponderance of which contended that the private properties of our former enemies should not be confiscated, but should be returned either in kind or their reasonable value to their former owners. There was a considerable number who for varying reasons contended that no return should be made but that the private properties of some 40,000, more or less, German and Japanese owners should be held in lieu of reparations, due as from the Governments of Germany and Japan.

After most exhaustive and painstaking hearings and thorough consideration of the many factors involved, Senator DIRKSEN introduced S. 3423 on May 7, 1954. In brief, this bill provided for a full return, with certain exceptions, of all the privately owned properties of the former owners who were German and Japanese. The justification for such a return met with the approval of the Senate Judiciary Committee and the bill was favorably reported to the Senate. Congress adjourned in 1954 before S. 3423 had been considered.

The administration did not look with favor upon Senator DIRKSEN's bill. Among other reasons it was urged that no provision was made in it for the payment of American war damage claims.

As a result of the continued study and further public hearings, the subcommittee recommended and the full committee unanimously reported out favorably to the Senate my bill in the 84th Congress, known as S. 4205. This measure provided for a full return in kind or value of all privately owned properties which had been seized under the Trading With the Enemy Act and a full payment of all American war damage claims. These returns and payments were to be made progressively. Procedures and methods were adopted which permitted such a result without the necessity of any additional direct appropriations. Like S. 3423, S. 4205 failed of passage in 1956 by reason of the adjournment of Congress.

A modified version of S. 4205 was introduced by me on January 14, 1957, and is known as S. 600. This bill likewise directs a full return of all vested assets or their values and a full payment in installments of all American war damage claims not otherwise provided for by law. The bill contains provisions preventing a return of properties to war criminals of Germany or Japan, governmental properties, and properties to those residing in the Soviet-dominated countries.

There has been considerable criticism of these return bills and of me personally for authoring two of them. Much of that criticism may be traced to a lack of understanding of the reasons which prompted my action. I have long felt that a wider knowledge of the complex problems, the traditional American concepts of the human and property rights involved, and a fuller appreciation of our own national interests would dispel most, if not all, of the objections which reasonable persons could possibly entertain.

What are the reasons back of these full return bills? Why has OLIN D. JOHNSTON supported one and been the author of two others? What are some of the problems involved and the questions presented? How can it be in the interest of the people of the

United States to divest themselves of title to over \$629 million worth of property?

So far as I am concerned, the answers are clear. My duty is plain. My responsibility with respect to the problems is not difficult to assume. What has been the American way of handling such problems?

Before our Constitution was adopted, John Adams said:

"The moment the idea is admitted into society, that property is not as sacred as the laws of God, and that there is not a force of law and public justice to protect it, anarchy and tyranny commence. If 'thou shalt not covet' and 'thou shalt not steal' were not commandments of Heaven, they must be made inviolable precepts in every society before it can be civilized or made free." (In Works of John Adams, by Charles Francis Adams, Boston, 1951, vol. 6, p. 9.)

There would have been no United States Constitution had the Bill of Rights (first 10 amendments) not been forthcoming as an integral part of it. While the fifth amendment provides protection for one against testifying against himself, it also contains very salient provisions which protect our property rights. Those provisions are:

"No person shall be * * * deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation."

The foundation of property rights originating in Holy Writ is inscribed as part of our basic constitutional rights. Our history and tradition as a free people are built upon them. The concept of our free society is founded upon them. The principle is clearly stated by a United States Senator in his testimony before the subcommittee recently when he said:

"The unpaid American war-damage claims should be paid. Private property or its reasonable value should be returned. Now, at all times, we who set the moral standards for the peoples and governments of the world must of all things adhere to them or be willing to pay in lives and our material fortune the unthinkable price involved in the savage doctrine of confiscation.

"Confiscation is the attribute of communism. Private ownership, the integrity of property rights, and contractual obligations, on the other hand, are the distinguishing characteristics and handmaidens of the free world. The issues involved are just that simple."

It is an historical fact that the United States has never practiced confiscation of its former enemies' properties. During the Revolutionary War several of the Colonies confiscated the property of the English Tories. This was compensated for in our first treaty—the Jay Treaty—with England in 1794. The formula set out in that treaty has been the uniform pattern for all of our subsequent treaties of commerce, friendship, and navigation with other foreign governments.

The language of the present Speaker of our House of Representatives which he used in 1923 in support of a full return of German properties after World War I has vital force today. He said in one of his official reports:

"From the days of Hamilton and Jefferson and Marshall down to now every man who had a reputation that extended beyond the community in which he lived * * * has looked upon the question of confiscating private property for the satisfaction of a public obligation with obloquy. That has been our policy. * * * the most savage doctrine ever announced by any people anywhere was that private property should be taken for the satisfaction of a public obligation."

Every Secretary of State of the United States without exception from Thomas Jefferson—our first Secretary—through Mr. Dulles, has opposed confiscation. Each has

sought to maintain the doctrine of the inviolability of contractual rights and the sanctity of private property in time of war or national emergency.

World conditions have changed greatly since the Jay Treaty of 1794. In fact there exist today many more reasons than existed following World War I, why it is in our own national self-interest to return private property seized in time of war. A consideration of a few of those facts constitutes a compelling reason why privately owned properties should be returned and why as a Nation we should avoid the stigma of confiscation.

A most important fact to remember is that the United States today is the leading creditor Nation in the world. While no exact figures are available, we do know that Americans have private investments abroad in excess of \$55 billion. As taxpayers, every American citizen has a direct interest and an investment at an initial cost of over \$4 billion in over 900 of our defense installations scattered throughout the free world. As taxpayers, every American citizen has a direct interest and an investment now exceeding \$4 billion in the loans made through our Export-Import Bank to private concerns and their governments abroad. These latter interests concern you and me directly because our money paid in the form of Federal taxes supports and maintains them.

Almost half of our high Federal tax burden is necessary each year for the support of our national-defense programs. We have spent over \$35 billion annually for national defense since 1945. Our national-defense program is large because we seek by it to maintain our free way of life. The cornerstone of our free way of life is our right of ownership of private property. When property rights are destroyed, freedom and free government are lost. This truth is undeniable.

In addition to the direct interest so many Americans have in private investments abroad and the very large investments all Americans have in foreign countries, we have engaged in other programs since 1947 which have resulted in our people having to continue to pay heavy taxes. I refer to our foreign-aid programs. Every justification for any foreign-aid expenditure falls of its own weight when stripped of the reason that we spend this money abroad to support our free way of life and to preserve and extend American principles. Thus, it is argued that foreign-aid expenditures aggregating now almost \$60 billion have been in our national self-interest. While I have not agreed with such contentions, others have agreed and they have prevailed. I do know I am taxed heavily for the support of that program.

Add these figures up and you can see a stupendous investment: \$55 billion in private investments, \$8 billion directly invested by all of us together with the \$60 billion spent in foreign aid and the more than \$35 billion each year for national defense. As the leader among the free nations of the world setting, as we must, the tone of morals in business and private conduct, for the world, can we afford the penalty of inflicting upon others any principle involving confiscation? Look at what is happening in the Middle East today. The Congress has just passed a \$200 million special foreign-aid program (Eisenhower doctrine) for the ostensible purpose of keeping some of the countries in the Middle East as our allies in the struggle against communism. If, as a permanent policy, we are to confiscate these alien properties, as Egypt is confiscating the properties of the English, French, Israel, and others, it requires little imagination to conclude that we stand to lose far more than all the rest of the world combined. Why? Because we have more at stake. It is a sad commentary on our laws that Egypt boasts in her press that she is following the provisions of the American Trading With the Enemy Act in what Nasser

is now doing. Those news articles assert that if it is proper for the United States to confiscate the private property of its former enemies—the German and Japanese—then Egypt has every right to nationalize or confiscate British and other alien property in that country.

Not all of the properties whose original value at the time of vesting amounting to \$390,808,000 belonged to our former enemies. Over 20 percent of that amount, namely \$87,801,000 was American property. It originated in the United States. It helped our war effort through the taxes paid on it and by its owners. It is known as "estate and trust properties." Let me illustrate—an American citizen dies leaving an estate of \$25,000 to his five relatives in Germany or Japan. These relatives have been denied their legacies because the Attorney General has vested these estates. Another illustration will help. An American veteran of German or Japanese origin, honorably discharged from service in the American Army dies. His social security and death benefits are seized and confiscated by the Department of Justice. His relatives are denied the right to inherit these benefits earned under American laws by American nationals. Another illustration proves how unseemly our vesting program has been constructed and administered. A young German student studying at Harvard University under the Fulbright scholarship program at your and my expense testified before the subcommittee. He was the legatee under a will of an American and entitled under that will to \$2,500. This legacy has been confiscated. Think of one Department of the American Government educating this boy at the expense of all of us on one hand and another branch of our Government seizing and confiscating his private property earned and produced here on the other hand. Or, consider the case of a lady who testified before us. She married an American officer overseas. She is now an American citizen living here and rearing a family of three children. The Russians seized and confiscated her estate in East Germany. The United States seized and confiscated a substantial inheritance here in America which was left to her by an American relative. Our existing law needs to be changed to prevent these obvious injustices. These illustrations could be multiplied by the hundreds. They all go to show how wholly unnecessary and wrong it has been to so administer the Trading With the Enemy Act—a necessary war measure—but not needed in time of peace. They all go to show how essential it is for the Congress to pass corrective legislation as it did following World War I.

There is another consideration which has influenced my views respecting the necessity for the return of these private properties. It did not take us long after the close of the war to learn the bitter lesson that our real enemy is Russia and Russian communism. That country has no respect for the right of private property. We learned soon that if we could enlist the Germans in West Germany and the Japanese in the cause for free democratic representative governments, they would eventually become our staunchest and strongest allies. That effort of ours is an accomplished fact today. Thoughtful Americans realize that both Germany and Japan are our most reliable and trustworthy friends among the free nations of the world. It cost us many billions of dollars to achieve this result. We loaned and gave West Germany, consisting of about 60 million persons, over \$3¼ billions. We did the same for 80 million Japanese at a cost of well over \$2 billions. We made an outright gift of \$2¼ billions in our settlement of post-war loans to these 60 million Germans. We are prepared to scale down the Japanese debts to its 80 million inhabitants in the same percentage of reductions. Who is there to say

that it is fair to make a gift of about \$4 billions to a 140 million Germans and Japanese and retain and penalize from some 30 or 40 thousand of the same persons for the private property they either invested here or to which they are entitled by their inheritance? Such properties amounted to less than a half-billion dollars when it was first seized. If Germany and Japan owe the United States anything by way of war reparations that obligation should rest equally upon all Germans and Japanese alike. That burden should fall on all the millions of people in these countries, not on the few thousands who may benefit from small amount of properties in America.

Those Japanese and Germans who invested their properties here did so because they felt those properties were safe and secure under our constitutional protections. They felt their properties would be protected under our laws. Is it the right to deny to them the equal protection of our laws? Certainly, there can be little justification in law or morals to deny our German and Japanese friends the benefits of trust, estate, and guardianship properties originating here in the United States.

Now with respect to the payment of American war-damage claims, every sense of moral justice dictates an early payment of them. Every nation, except the United States, which engaged in World War II, has already made some provision to indemnify its nationals. We have done much, sometimes too much, for others and nothing for our own. Many civilian lives were lost, many suffered personal injuries, and there have been millions of dollars in losses in property damage. Except for the small prisoner-of-war claims and a few religious organizations operating chiefly in the Pacific area, no comprehensive war-damage claims act has been passed by the American Congress. I agree with many that this is a shameful neglect of our own. S. 600, which I introduced, makes ample provision for the payment of all proper American war-damage claims.

Notwithstanding the use of over \$275 million of the vested assets by our own Government, the State Department opened an avenue for the payment of American war-damage claims and the return in value of all the vested assets. The payments may be financed through the remittances made to us by Germany and Japan in the settlement of our postwar loans and grants to those countries. This is advantageous to us for two reasons, namely, (a) it makes additional appropriations with a resulting increase in our tax burden unnecessary; and, (b) it will fix the exact amount of our total war damages so that when a peace treaty settlement is made with Germany, our negotiators will then know precisely how much in war damages is chargeable against Germany.

Such a method of payment of war claims and return of vested assets was initiated by the State and Justice Departments in presenting draft bill S. 2227, though payments in that bill were in each instance limited to \$10,000. The concept employed by S. 2227 was extended in the provisions of S. 600 to provide for full return and to make full payments so that no fresh appropriations will be required.

To summarize a few of the important reasons why the United States should make a full return in kind or its reasonable value of all assets vested in wartime and subsequent vestings and also make full payment of American war-damage claims, I believe:

1. That our foreign-aid programs since the close of World War II will have been useless should we adopt a policy of confiscation which becomes a negation of the principles of the free world;

2. That our enormous national defense spending which bids fair to continue indefinitely at such an enormous rate with its crushing tax burden upon us all will have

been useless unless basic and fundamental concepts of the free nations are continued unimpaired;

3. That our tremendous private and governmental investments abroad should not be subjected to or imperiled by our adoption of a policy of confiscation; hence it is essential in our own national self-interest to effectuate returns without delay;

4. That no reason in morals or justice exists why we should not finance the payments now of all legitimate American war-damage claims. No reason exists why the United States should provide funds for others and other nations so they may provide for their own, and we continue to neglect the rightful demands of our own nationals.

In conclusion the question can be asked, Why we have done all these things since the close of World War II? We have done them in the interest of a free way of life. We have done them in an effort to extend the principles of freedom, representative democracy, and the blessings of liberty to other nations and peoples. Confiscation is a barbaric relic of the Dark Ages. If we would have others do right by us, we must do right by them. Why, then, should we turn back the pages of history and embark now, at such peril to our own interests, upon a vicious program of confiscation? To me, enduring and fundamental principles are at stake.

My actions shall be charted to the only course I know to preserve those principles which have made us the greatest Nation on earth today. To do otherwise, I would betray the past, endanger the present, and imperil the future of my country. To do otherwise, I would "covet my neighbor's property," and history would convict me of violating the cherished commandment of "thou shalt not steal."

Seventy-fifth Anniversary of Dan River Mills, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1957

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on July 2, 3, and 4, 1957, the Dan River Mills, Inc., of Danville, Va., observed its 75th anniversary. On Thursday, July 4, a celebration and party was held at the Danville fairgrounds which was attended by more than 30,000 people and was sponsored by Dan River Mills, of which Mr. W. J. Erwin is president.

The Dan River Mills is one of the largest textile organizations in the world and is the second largest employer in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Mr. Erwin and other officials of the mills are men of outstanding character and ability and they have surrounded themselves with employees of solid and dependable character. The relationship between officers and employees is wholesome and has stimulated a spirit of cooperation and fellowship in southside Virginia.

I do not believe we have any business organization which has contributed more to the enhancement of the cultural, educational, and economic development of southside Virginia than has Dan River Mills. We are all proud of their accomplishments and of what that

organization has done to improve living conditions in our section.

At the celebration referred to above on July 4, Mr. W. J. Erwin, the able president of Dan River Mills, extended greetings to those attending the party, and the distinguished senior United States Senator from Virginia, the Honorable HARRY FLOOD BYRD, delivered a very timely and able and worthwhile address. Under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am glad to include the addresses of President W. J. Erwin, of the Dan River Mills, and Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia. They are as follows:

REMARKS BY W. J. ERWIN AT JULY 4 EMPLOYEES' PARTY

Senator BYRD, Congressman TUCK, fellow employees, and distinguished guests, we extend to you and your families a very warm and sincere welcome to this birthday party, which commemorates the 75th anniversary of the founding of Dan River Mills.

In planning for this anniversary year, it has always been our intention that this party for you and the members of your family would be a climax of the activities undertaken to commemorate the 75th anniversary. This party is an expression of appreciation to you for what you have done to make this company a success. We are proud of your performance and proud of what you have done for Dan River over the years.

At the same time we want to pay tribute to the many men and women who have preceded us and who contributed so much to the growth and welfare of our company.

On behalf of our entire management, I extend to all of you our thanks, our best wishes, and our hope that this will be a day you will remember pleasantly for a long, long time.

SPEECH BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, DAN RIVER MILLS, INC., DANVILLE, VA., JULY 4, 1957

The Fourth of July is an anniversary of deep significance to all Americans, and it is an especial pleasure for me to observe it with the fine people of the Danville area in this year of 1957.

Here, in Virginia, we are now observing the 350th anniversary of the founding of the first permanent English settlement in Virginia, at Jamestown; the 181st anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, written by a Virginian, the great Thomas Jefferson, of Monticello; and the 75th anniversary of your great industrial institution, the Dan River Mills, which may properly be regarded as one of the finer fruits of the freedom for which the country was settled, our independence was won, and the sound progress for which Virginia has always stood.

It has been my privilege over the last few months to participate in several observances of the founding of Virginia at Jamestown, and on this day in Danville, I think it is fitting to recall that occasion, for when that small band of founders came ashore from their 3 little ships 350 years ago they set in motion a chain of events without comparison in human history.

With their faith in the future they marked one of the great moments in history. It was a moment of greatness because those men and their staunch followers began to build with such soundness and vision that a new world slowly but surely began to form. It was indeed a case of the infinitely small being infinitely great. These first settlers were great men in whom God and nature succeeded.

There at Jamestown respect for individual rights and responsibilities was established.

There the dignity of man was acknowledged.

There the rights of free enterprise and initiative were encouraged.

There, truth to God, and truth to self were practiced.

On this foundation was built the first representative government in the New World—the Virginia House of Burgesses, the predecessor of our State legislatures and the National Congress.

Material results are but the tardy sign of invisible activity. The courage to hope, and live, and build for a better world was the great legacy the founders bequeathed their descendants.

And from this later came the fortitude to fight for liberty when it was threatened, and to win the independence of a great nation.

Who among us does not have indelibly stamped in his heart and soul the great words of Jefferson as he penned them in the Declaration of Independence—the unanimous declaration of the Thirteen United States of America in the Congress, July 4, 1776, 181 years ago today.

And you remember the closing words—immortal and will live as long as the language exists:

"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 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."

Mark those last words, "We mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor", and remember that our immortal Declaration of Independence was not written in a moment of victory. It was, itself, a record of uncertainty and peril—an oath taken in the most dangerous hour this country has ever known. George, the Third, regarded it as an act of treason, and the hangman's noose cast its shadow over those responsible.

Yet, Thomas Jefferson penned it, and John Hancock wrote his signature at twice its normal size so, he said, "John Bull could see it without his spectacles and double the price to be put on my head."

That great document, adopted by Congress 181 years ago today, is carefully preserved in Washington now for all to see. If you haven't seen it, please do not miss an opportunity. It is a source of great inspiration. It is the living evidence of men's hopes and courage. It expresses the fervent hope that the future may draw faith from its deep meaning.

This and the other American achievements leading to our revolution and independence were the immediate inspiration for the spread of democratic freedom in an ever-widening sphere. Today the United States stands as the beacon of hope in the world.

It is well for us today to recall these great historical developments, because they were wrought by great men with great minds, and great vision for sound progressive future. They made possible the greatness of our Nation today. They were building a great nation for us thought by thought, and deed by deed. Our institutions are the lengthened shadows of the men who conceived them and that applies to Dan River Mills.

It is on the firm foundation built by our forebears that Virginia has made its own environment; it is from them that we inherited our abiding belief in States rights, and sound principles. And it is upon these that we have built our State and local governments, and institutions.

Development comes with use, and use of our principles in Virginia has brought us out of the dark days of reconstruction into the light of sound progress.

Virginia today stands as a symbol for States rights, for the democratic principle of separate coordinate branches of government, and for unmortgaged future.

The people of our Commonwealth have been generous to me, and to them I shall always be grateful. It has been my unwavering purpose to serve them to the utmost of my ability in each of the positions of honor they have entrusted with me. I believe in the people of Virginia, and I trust in their judgment, and I stand firmly on Virginia traditions and Virginia principles.

In Virginia we regard experience as a guidepost—not a hitching post. Perhaps in these days of spiraling inflation it is still possible to get a few things for nothing—but experience is not one of them.

Our progress in Virginia is based on 350 years of experience. It is our purpose to be guided by that experience. Like the Dan River Mills long experience has served Virginia well. And as one citizen of Virginia I am proud of our record.

Virginia has its critics and I well know that no government is perfect, but governments are comparative and I want now to give you just a few instances of our modern-day progress.

First of all, Virginia is 1 of the 3 States completely free of State debt. And this is of significance when the Federal Government and nearly all the States have recklessly plunged themselves into indebtedness, the interest on which I predict will exceed many times the principals of the loans.

Virginia escapes this terrible burden of the annual and perhaps permanent interest charges.

Here are a few figures showing how Virginia is going ahead of other States.

In the past 25 years in population of 49 percent as compared to an increase of 33 percent in the country as a whole. Per capita income payments increased in Virginia by 253 percent as compared to the general increase of 163 percent.

Value of products manufactured in Virginia increased 328 percent as compared to general average of 282 percent.

Payroll in Virginia manufacturing increased 416 percent as compared to general average of 341 percent.

Retail sales in Virginia increased 426 percent and the general increase was 251 percent.

Deposits in Virginia banks increased 425 percent. The national average increased 269 percent.

Number of telephones in Virginia increased 360 percent. Average, 178 percent. Motor-vehicle registrations increased 226 percent. Average 133 percent.

It is tommyrot to say Virginia is lagging behind.

We are making great progress all down the line.

We are doing this without debt and with sound governmental policies.

The Dan River Mills symbolize our sound progress in Virginia, and it is fitting that on Independence Day, 350 years after our founding at Jamestown, and 181 years after our Declaration of Independence we congratulate the institution on the occasion of its diamond anniversary.

Danville, the Danville area, and the southside of Virginia also is to be congratulated for its support of this great corporation which for 75 years has contributed so much

to the community, the State and the better living of people at home and abroad.

Virginia is proud of this great leader of the textile industry. When this company was originated by the three brothers, Robert A., John H., and James H. Schoolfield, along with Thomas B. Fitzgerald, Benjamin F. Jefferson, and Dr. H. W. Cole, the country was only about 100 years old. Thomas Jefferson had been dead little more than 50 years. Virginia was still trying to rise from the ashes of the War Between the States, the last of the military governors had been gone only 12 years.

With Virginia the Dan River Mills has grown in sound progress. Today it ranks among the great textile manufacturers of the world. In number of spindles it is a leader in the South. It ranks with the leaders in Virginia in the employment of our people. I am certain that its policy is to deliver the most value for the least cost. That means productive progress. Production is the source of wages. This is the American competitive system. This is the enemy of crippling inflation, and the source of higher living standards.

Under the sound and enlightened leadership of such men as W. J. Erwin, president, and Basil D. Browder, executive vice president, and Dan Daniels, Dan River Mills now is a corporation of more than 800,000 spindles, and more than 18,000 looms, owned by more than 9,500 stockholders, and operated by 18,000 employees, turning out useful products which sell for more than \$120 million yearly.

This is truly the Virginia brand of progress represented in a great corporation operating for the profit of its owners and employees, and for the good of mankind who need and are able to use its products.

I take it that when a Member of Congress is among you, he is expected to say something about what goes on in Washington. If that is true I might say this:

The Washington Government is a place of vast and complex pressures. So many of them seem to be so foreign to the traditional concept of our form of government, under which this Nation has grown great, it is all too easy to regard them with an apathetic attitude in the belief that such things can't happen here—to my country, my State, my town—to me. But they do.

For instance, the Federal Government has been in the red for 20 of the last 25 years, yet since World War II we have given away nearly \$60 billion in foreign aid spread around the globe. Millions of that money has gone to subsidize the textile industry abroad where they use cheap labor in competition with your own Dan River Mills.

You have in your midst a fine and patriotic citizen who has properly been honored by the American Legion, as their national leader. He is, of course, as you know, Dan Daniel. He is doing excellent and effective work with reference to foreign aid. Dan Daniel is a great American. He is going throughout the breadth of the land speaking against giveaway programs to foreign countries and for sound policies at home.

Sometimes as I listen to all the talk in Washington about aid for the underdeveloped areas, I wonder if the greatest underdeveloped area of all isn't under the hats of those who propose it.

Practically all of this foreign aid has been charged into our Federal debt, the interest on which, at this moment, is costing American taxpayers more than \$7 billion a year. That is a full 10 percent of all Federal taxes collected. In other words, if it were not for this Federal debt, the Federal taxes you and I pay could be cut 10 percent across the board.

But this is not the only aspect of the debt. It is difficult to comprehend, but you know that all the debt in this country totals \$800 billion. That is nearly \$1 trillion. More

than \$325 billion of it is in public debt which generally speaking is not productive debt. It is this tremendous debt—resulting from our unprecedented free-wheeling spending spree, largely encouraged by the Federal Government—that is causing the terrible inflation which even today is driving up the cost of living still more.

Yet, even in the face of renewed inflation, the President in January submitted to Congress the largest peacetime budget in history. It actually called for \$8 billion more in expenditures by Federal spending agencies than they passed out just 2 years ago. Most of the increase was in domestic civilian programs, having nothing to do with military preparedness.

Think of this in terms of what you pay in taxes. All taxes collected this year in this country will total \$110 billion.

That is the equivalent of nearly one-third of our national income.

It is no wonder that the people of the Nation have risen up this year in the greatest demand for reduction in Federal expenditures in all our history. But the spending is too entrenched, and the opposition of the administration was too great. Congress has done the best it could to reduce appropriations. But the result is not nearly enough.

I sincerely hope the people of the country will not be discouraged. They must keep up the demand next year, and for all the years necessary until we can get these expenditures under control, and reduce them to a point where we can reduce debt, stop inflation, and reduce taxes.

In Federal taxes alone, the Government is taking 20 percent of the workingman's salary at the lowest rate. In some cases, individuals are paying Federal taxes of more than 90 percent of what they make. Corporations are paying more than 50 percent before they begin to show a profit and put money aside to replace their machinery, and expand their plants. The average American is working one-third of his time to pay his taxes.

We need to cut taxes at all levels, at the lower levels, in the middle-income brackets where people are taking the worst tax licking, and even in the higher brackets. We need to reduce taxes for small business, and for larger businesses. In short, taxes are too high. They are virtually at a point of diminishing returns. They are killing incentive in both individuals and business.

Please believe me when I say the Members of Congress need your constant and continuing help in trying to get expenditures down so we can get the debt down, stop the inflation and get the taxes down.

This gigantic Federal spending serves to centralize Government, and that means more and more bureaucrats in Washington tell you in Danville, and me in Winchester what to do, when to do it, and how to do it, and how much to spend for it.

This is the greatest democracy in the history of the world. It has grown to this position in the brief span of 180 years, and with only 6 percent of the world's population. This could not have been achieved without the form of government bequeathed us as a sacred heritage by our forefathers.

Strike down the power of States to control their own affairs, and concentrate all power in Washington, and you strike at the heart of what makes this Nation great.

To me the decision of the Supreme Court abolishing segregation and compelling integration in States and local public school systems was a vicious and destructive invasion of States rights.

It set aside all previous decisions by the Supreme Court on the subject, including the 1928 decision by Chief Justice Taft, a great and learned man and a former President of the United States, who held segregation was

constitutional if separate equal facilities were provided.

Bad enough before, when centralization was developing through Federal expenditures, but in more recent years Federal courts have gotten into the act. I mention just a few examples. In the recent Girard case it held that a man's money could not be spent after his death in accordance with his will.

In another case, just a couple weeks ago, it put down the police powers of State and local governments.

Time and time again it has usurped legislative powers, which, under the Constitution, are clearly segregated to the Congress as 1 of the 3 separate coordinated branches of Government.

More recently the Federal Court has even divested the Federal executive branch from its means of bringing Communists—enemies of democracy—to justice.

These are the things that the people at home must understand—understand what is happening to you. In this Nation you are the supreme voice of the land—not the Supreme Court, not the President, not the Congress—it is you.

I say these things to you on this Independence Day in the sincere hope that you, with all the citizens of this land, will rise up in massive resistance to Federal usurpation of individual and States rights, and assert your independence with an overwhelming demand for the return to the fundamental for which this Nation was founded and for which our independence was won and upon which we have built the greatest nation on earth.

Who Signed the Declaration of Independence?—Who Signed the Constitution of the United States?—A Short Biographical Sketch of Each Prepared by the Library of Congress for Congressman Clyde Doyle, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1957

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the following historical and biographical data regarding each of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. It seemed to me entirely appropriate that at this particular season of patriotic expression toward our beloved Nation's independence it would be appropriate for you and each of my distinguished colleagues to have before you this data compiled for me at my request by the Library of Congress. You will note therefrom that it was prepared for me on April 25, 1957, and I anticipated submitting it to your attention prior to July 4; but, Mr. Speaker, the information herein contained is always appropriate, informative, and inspiring.

And also, Mr. Speaker, at my request the Library of Congress prepared for me short biographical sketches of each of the signers of the United States Constitution. They would also seem especially appropriate for us to have before us at

this time. Hence, I am pleased to also include the text thereof as furnished me by the Library of Congress:

THE SIGNERS OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE—SOME SALIENT FACTS

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Josiah Bartlett: He was born in Amesbury, Mass., on November 21, 1729, and died at Kingston, N. H., on May 19, 1795. At the age of 16, Bartlett began the study of medicine in the office of a practicing physician, and 5 years later began his own practice in his newly adopted home at Kingston. He was 47 years old when he signed the Declaration of Independence, and he has the distinction of being the first to give his vote in favor of the adoption of the Declaration. Although a layman, Bartlett, in 1779, was appointed chief justice of the New Hampshire court of common pleas. In 1782 he was elevated to the superior court, and in 1788 was appointed chief justice of that court. He served from 1790 as chief executive of his State with the title of president; and after June 1793, under the amended Constitution, he was elected the first governor of New Hampshire. While serving in the Continental Congress, he served on the important standing committees, and played an important part in shaping legislation. While serving on the bench in New Hampshire, he was a member and temporary chairman of the State convention called to ratify the proposed Constitution of the United States; and he contributed in no small way to the dissipation of the opposition of some of the smaller towns in the State to ratification of the Nation's premier charter. Bartlett is buried in the first cemetery at Kingston.

William Whipple: He was born in Kittery, Maine, on January 14, 1730, and died in Portsmouth, N. H., on November 28, 1785. Whipple was educated in the common schools. At an early age he went to sea, and, while in his early twenties, became master of a vessel. About 1760 he formed a partnership with his brother, Joseph, in the mercantile business in Portsmouth, continuing in this pursuit until 1775, when he gave up his share of the business to enter public affairs and work for independence. He was elected to the Continental Congress in 1775, and served until 1779. He was 47 years old when he affixed his signature to the Declaration. His service in Congress was interrupted for short periods, when he was participating in military campaigns during the war. He was commissioned brigadier general in 1777, and served in several battles, including the Saratoga and Rhode Island campaigns. He served in the State Assembly from 1780-84, and in 1782 was appointed an associate justice of the Superior Court of New Hampshire, a position which he held until his sudden death. Whipple is buried in the north cemetery at Portsmouth.

Matthew Thornton: He was born in Ireland in 1714, and died on June 24, 1803, at Newburyport, Mass., while visiting his daughter. Thornton came to America with his parents in 1718, settling first in Maine and then in Massachusetts. He received his early education in Massachusetts, and went on to study medicine, completing his program in 1740. He began his practice in Londonderry, N. H., where, at the same time, he became very active in public affairs. He served as under surgeon with the New Hampshire troops in the Louisbourg Expedition of 1745, and for some time held the rank of colonel in the State militia. He served as a member of the New Hampshire Assembly in 1758, 1760, and 1761. He was a delegate to the First Provincial Congress in 1775, and was elected president of that body; he also served as chairman of the committee of safety. In 1776, he was elected to the Continental Congress, and although he did not

arrive until November, he had the opportunity of affixing his signature to the Declaration of Independence. He was 62 years old when he signed that document. Thornton was appointed associate justice of the New Hampshire Superior Court and served until 1782. He served in the newly organized State senate from 1784 to 1786. His latter years were spent on his farm in Merrimack, N. H., where he devoted his time to writing. He is buried in Thornton's Ferry Cemetery, at Merrimack.

MASSACHUSETTS

John Hancock: He was born in Quincy, Norfolk County, Mass., on January 23, 1737, and died at Quincy, Mass., on October 8, 1793. When Hancock was a young boy, he was adopted by his uncle, Thomas Hancock, who was the richest merchant in Boston. He attended Harvard College and graduated in 1754. After completing his education, he entered his uncle's mercantile office; in 1763 he became a partner of Thomas Hancock & Company. When his uncle died in 1754, Hancock, a youth of twenty-seven, became the head of the leading mercantile house in Boston, and the heir to a large fortune. He was a member of the provincial legislature from 1766 to 1772, and served as president of the Provincial Congress in 1774. He was elected as a member to the Continental Congress in 1775, and served for several terms. From May 24, 1775 to October 29, 1777, he served as President of the Congress. He was the first to sign the Declaration and was 39 years of age at the time. He served as senior major general of the Massachusetts Militia during the war, and participated in the Rhode Island campaign. Hancock was elected the first governor of the State of Massachusetts in September 1780, and served until 1785, when he resigned because of ill health. In 1787 he was again elected governor and he died while serving in his ninth term. Hancock is buried in the Old Granary Burying Ground, at Boston.

Samuel Adams: He was born in Boston, Mass., on Sept. 27, 1722, and died at Boston on Oct. 2, 1803. No one had done more and perhaps no one else had done so much in behalf of American rights and liberties as Samuel Adams. He attended Harvard College and graduated in 1740. He found employment in the counting-house of Thomas Cushing, but stayed only a few months for he wished to establish his own business. After failing in his first business venture, he joined his father who operated a brewery. Not having a keen eye for business affairs, he soon dissipated his share of the family estate, and then entered the field of politics and public affairs, which was more to his liking. In the dispute with the mother country, Adams was at his best in firing the people for the cause of independence for the American colonies. He was chosen to draft the instructions of the town of Boston to its newly elected representatives concerning Lord Grenville's proposed stamp act in 1764. From 1765 to 1774 Adams served as a member of the Massachusetts General Court, and from 1774 to 1782 he served in the Continental Congress. He was 54 when he attached his signature to the Declaration. Adams served as a member of the State Constitutional Convention in 1779, and as president of the State senate in 1781. He served as Governor of Massachusetts from 1794 to 1797. He is buried in the Old Granary Burying Ground at Boston.

John Adams: He was born in Braintree (now Quincy), Mass., on October 19, 1735, and died at Quincy, on July 4, 1826, a few hours after Thomas Jefferson. After graduating from Harvard College in 1755, he taught school at Worcester for a short period, and later decided to take up law. He studied under James Putnam, and was admitted to the bar at Boston, on November 6, 1758. His law practice grew slowly, but he soon occupied a leading place at the bar.

Although opposed to mob demonstrations, Adams' name was early connected with the patriotic cause by his efforts in defending the colonies on legal grounds. He was elected to serve as a delegate to the Continental Congress in 1774, and served until 1778. During the debates in Congress on the Declaration, Adams was dubbed the Atlas of American Independence. He was 41 years old when he signed the document. It was John Adams who proposed the name of George Washington, to serve as head of the American Army during the Revolution. Adams was appointed Commissioner, with Benjamin Franklin and Arthur Lee to the Court of France. He later served as Minister to Holland in 1782, and was appointed to serve as the first Minister to England, serving from 1785 to 1788. In 1788, he was elected to serve as the first Vice President of the United States, and was reelected in 1792, serving from April 30, 1789, to March 3, 1797. He was elected President of the United States and served from March 4, 1797, to March 3, 1801. Adams is buried under the Old Congregational Church, at Quincy, Mass.

Robert Treat Paine: He was born in Boston on March 11, 1731, and died in the same city on May 12, 1814. He attended Harvard College and was graduated in 1749. He taught for a while and then turned to the study of theology. After a brief career in the ministry, he studied law and was admitted to the bar in 1757. Paine served as the associate prosecuting attorney in the Boston Massacre trial and thus became connected with the patriotic cause. He served several terms in the provincial assembly, and was elected to the Continental Congress, serving from 1774-78. He was 45 years old when he signed the Declaration. In 1777 Paine was elected the first attorney general of the State of Massachusetts, and served until 1790. In 1790 he was appointed to the State supreme court by John Hancock, and served until 1804. In 1780 he became a founder of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He is buried in the Old Granary Burying Ground at Boston.

Elbridge Gerry: He was born in Marblehead, Mass., on July 17, 1744, and died in Washington, D. C., on November 23, 1814. After graduating from Harvard College in 1762, Gerry entered his father's mercantile business. In May 1772 he was elected to the Massachusetts General Court, where he met Samuel Adams and became keenly interested in the cause for independence. In 1776, he was elected to the Continental Congress and served from 1776 to 1781, and from 1782 to 1785. He was 32 years old when he signed the Declaration. Gerry served in the first and second Congresses, from 1789 to 1793. In 1797 he was sent on a mission to France with Marshall and Pinckney (X. Y. Z. Affair). Gerry was elected Governor of the State of Massachusetts in 1810 and 1811. He was defeated for this office in 1801 and 1812. He was elected Vice President of the United States as a Democrat, and served from March 4, 1813, until his death. Gerry's name has been perpetuated in the term "gerrymander", which refers to the splitting up of election districts. He is buried in the Congressional Cemetery, at Washington, D. C.

RHODE ISLAND

Stephen Hopkins: He was born in what is now Providence, R. I., on March 7, 1707, and died there on July 13, 1785. After attending the public schools, he entered the mercantile business; at the same time he became a practical surveyor. From the age of 25 Hopkins served in public office. He was a member of the General Assembly from 1732 to 1752, and from 1770 to 1775; he served as Speaker of that body from 1738 to 1744, and also in 1749. He served as chief justice of the Rhode Island superior court from 1751 to 1754. Hopkins was elected to the Continental Congress in 1774, and he was 69 years

old when he attached his signature to the Declaration. He served as Governor of Rhode Island in 1755, 1756, 1758 to 1761, 1763, 1764, and 1767. Despite his lack of formal education, Hopkins became the first chancellor of Rhode Island College. He is buried in the North Burial Ground, at Providence.

William Ellery: He was born in Newport, R. I., on December 22, 1727, and died there on February 15, 1820. After graduating from Harvard College in 1747, Ellery engaged in various undertakings. He was a merchant, served as a naval officer of the colony, served as clerk of the General Assembly, and after being out of college for 23 years, began the study of law, being admitted to the bar in 1770. He was elected to the Continental Congress in 1776 and served until 1781. He was 49 years old when he signed the Declaration. He served again in the Continental Congress from 1783 to 1785, and in 1785 was appointed Chief Justice of the Rhode Island Superior Court. In 1786 he was appointed by the Continental Congress to serve as Commissioner of the Continental Loan Office. He served as collector of the port of Newport from 1790 until his death. Because of his activities in the cause for independence, the British burned Ellery's property when they occupied Newport. With the exception of Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, Ellery was the longest lived of the signers of the Declaration. He is buried in the Old Cemetery, at Newport.

CONNECTICUT

Roger Sherman: He was born in Newton, Mass., on April 19, 1721, and died in New Haven, Conn., on July 23, 1793. Born under humble circumstances, Sherman attended the public schools, learned the cobbler's trade, and moved to New Milford. He studied law, and was admitted to the bar in 1754. Sherman served several terms in the State assembly, and served in the Connecticut State Senate from 1766 to 1785. He served as a member of the Connecticut Superior Court in 1766, 1767, and 1773 to 1788. Sherman is noted for the various public offices he held concurrently. While holding certain of the above offices, he also served in the Continental Congress from 1774 to 1781, and in 1783 and 1784. He was 55 years old when he signed the Declaration. He was a member of the committee appointed to draft the document, and was the only Member of the Continental Congress to sign all four great American State papers—the Declaration of 1774; the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, and the Constitution of the United States. He served in the First Congress from 1789 to 1791, and served in the United States Senate from 1791 until his death. He is buried in the Grove Street Cemetery, at New Haven.

Oliver Wolcott: He was born in Windsor, Conn., on December 1, 1726, and died at Litchfield, Conn., on December 1, 1797. Graduating from Yale College, at the head of his class, in 1747, he was commissioned a captain by the Governor of New York. After the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, Wolcott returned to Litchfield and studied medicine, but did not practice. He was elected sheriff of Litchfield County in 1751, and from 1774 to 1786 served as a member of the State council. He was elected to the Continental Congress in 1775, and served up to 1784, dividing his time between serving in the Army and serving in Congress. Wolcott was 50 years old when he signed the Declaration. He served as a major general in the militia, and commanded a brigade which took part in the defeat of General Burgoyne in 1777. Wolcott served as Lieutenant Governor of Connecticut from 1786 to 1796, and was elected Governor of the State, serving from 1796 until his death. He is buried in East Cemetery, at Litchfield.

William Williams: He was born in Lebanon, Conn., on April 28, 1731, and died there on

August 2, 1811. Williams graduated from Harvard College in 1751, studied theology for a short time, and then entered the mercantile business. He served in the State assembly for several years, serving as Speaker of that body in 1775 and again from 1781 to 1783. Williams served in the Continental Congress from 1776 to 1778, and in 1783 and 1784. He was 45 years old when he signed the Declaration. He served as judge of the county court of Windham from 1776 to 1804, and served as judge of probate for the Windham district from 1776 to 1808. He was a member of the Connecticut convention that ratified the Constitution of the United States in 1787. He is buried in the Old Cemetery, at Lebanon.

Samuel Huntington: He was born in Windham, Conn., on July 3, 1731, and died at Norwich, Conn., on January 5, 1796. He attended the common schools, served his apprenticeship in the cooper trade, later studied law, and was admitted to the bar in 1758. He was appointed crown attorney in 1765, and served as justice of the superior court from 1774 to 1784; he served as chief justice of the court in 1784. He was a Member of the Continental Congress from 1776 to 1784, and served as President of the Congress from 1779 to 1781. He was 45 years old when he signed the Declaration. Huntington served as Lieutenant Governor of Connecticut in 1785; and from 1786 until his death he served as governor. He is buried in Norwichtown Cemetery, at Norwich.

NEW YORK

Francis Lewis: He was born in Llandaff, Wales, in March 1713, and died in New York City, on December 30, 1803. He attended Westminster School in London, and then entered the countinghouse of a London merchant. He came to the United States in 1735, and established merchantile houses in New York and Philadelphia. Lewis served in the French and Indian War as an aide to General Mercer, was captured in Oswego, N. Y., and taken to France. He was a delegate to the Stamp Act Congress of 1765 which met in New York. He served in the Continental Congress from 1774 to 1889, and was 63 years old when he affixed his signature to the Declaration. He served as Commissioner of the Board of Admiralty in 1779. Lewis is the only signer of the Declaration buried in Manhattan, in an unidentified grave in Trinity Churchyard at Wall Street and Broadway.

Philip Livingston: He was born in Albany, N. Y., on January 15, 1716, and died at York, Pa., on June 12, 1778, while attending the sixth session of the Continental Congress. Livingston attended Yale College and graduated in 1737. He entered the mercantile business in New York City and took part in public affairs. He served on the board of aldermen from 1754 to 1762, was a member of the provincial house of representatives from 1763 to 1769, and served as Speaker in 1768. He was a delegate to the Stamp Act Congress in 1765. Livingston was a Member of the Continental Congress from 1774 to 1778, and he was 60 years old when he attached his signature to the Declaration. Livingston was one of the earliest advocates of the establishment of King's College, now Columbia University. He also aided in the organization of the New York Society Library. He is buried in Prospect Hill Cemetery, at York, Pa.

Lewis Morris: He was born in Morrisania, now a part of New York City, on April 8, 1726, and died there on January 22, 1798. He was graduated from Yale College in 1746, and engaged in agricultural pursuits. Although a country gentleman, and heir to a large estate, Morris associated himself with the patriotic cause. He was elected to the Colonial Assembly of New York in 1769, but did not qualify because of nonresidence. Morris served in the Continental Congress

from 1775 to 1777, and was 50 years old when he signed the Declaration. He served in the State Senate from 1777 to 1781, and from 1784 to 1788. He was a delegate to the New York convention which adopted the Constitution of the United States. He served as a member of the first board of regents of the University of New York, in 1784, and served on the board until his death. He is buried in St. Anne's Episcopal Churchyard, in the Bronx, N. Y.

William Floyd: He was born in Brookhaven, N. Y., on December 17, 1734, and died in Westerville, N. Y., on August 4, 1821. Although coming from a wealthy family, Floyd achieved only a limited academic education. When only 18, he inherited his father's large estate. Floyd served as major general in the State Militia; and when the British made their first landing on Long Island, Floyd led a body of troops which drove them off. He served in the Continental Congress from 1774 to 1777, and from 1778 to 1783. He was 42 when he signed the Declaration. He served in the State senate in 1777 and 1778. He was elected to the first Congress and served from 1789 to 1791. He returned to the State senate, serving from 1784 to 1788, and again in 1808. He was a presidential elector in 1792, 1800, 1804, and 1820. He was a delegate to the State Constitutional Convention in 1801. He is buried in the Presbyterian Church Cemetery, at Westerville.

NEW JERSEY

John Hart: He was born in Stonington, Conn., about 1707, and died at Hopewell, N. J., on May 11, 1779. He received limited schooling, and then engaged in agriculture. He became an efficient farmer and soon acquired considerable property. He served in the New Jersey assembly from 1761 to 1771, and as judge of the Hunterdon County courts from 1768 to 1775. He served in Continental Congress from June 22 to August 30, 1776, and was about 69 years old when he signed the Declaration. He was elected to the first State general assembly under the State constitution in 1776, and reelected in 1777 and 1778. He served as speaker of that body from 1776 to 1778. His estate was devastated by the British troops when they landed in New Jersey. He is buried in the First Baptist Church Cemetery, at Hopewell, N. J.

John Witherspoon: He was born in Gifford, Haddingtonshire, Scotland, on February 5, 1723, and died on his farm, near Princeton, N. J., on November 15, 1794. Witherspoon was graduated from Edinburgh University in 1739, studied theology at the university, and was ordained minister of the parish of Beith in 1745. He at first declined the presidency of the College of New Jersey (now Princeton University), in 1766, but accepted the second invitation of that institution, and was inaugurated as president on August 17, 1768. He became a leader of the Presbyterians in America. He served in the Continental Congress in the years 1776 to 1779, 1780 to 1781, and again in 1782. He was the only clergyman in Congress, and was 54 when he attached his signature to the Declaration. After the War for Independence ended, Witherspoon returned to Princeton and continued his duties as president of the University. He is buried in the Witherspoon Street Graveyard, at Princeton.

Richard Stockton: He was born in Princeton, N. J., on October 1, 1730, and died there on February 28, 1781. Stockton graduated in the first class from Princeton College in 1748, studied law, and was admitted to the bar in 1754. He served as associate justice of the State supreme court, from 1774 to 1776. In June 1776, Stockton was elected to the Continental Congress, and was reelected in November of the same year, but declined the office. He was 46 years old when he signed the Declaration. Stockton served as

chairman of a committee of Congress which inspected the northern army at Ticonderoga, and on November 30, 1776, he was captured by the Tories and held prisoner in New York City until December 29, 1776. He was elected chief justice of the State Supreme Court in August 1776, but declined this office in order to remain in Congress. Stockton was a successful lawyer, and as a trustee of Princeton College contributed much to that college and higher education in general in America by his successful mission to Scotland which resulted in John Witherspoon's coming to America to head Princeton College. He is buried in Quaker Cemetery, at Princeton.

Abraham Clark: He was born near Elizabeth, N. J., on February 15, 1726, and died at Rahway, N. J., on September 15, 1794. After attending private schools, he studied law but did not practice. He was a member of the New Jersey Provincial Congress from 1775 to 1776, and from October 9, 1775, served as assistant secretary of that body. Clark served in the Continental Congress from 1776 to 1778 and was reelected in 1779, but declined the office. He was 50 years old when he attached his signature to the Declaration. He served in the State Assembly in 1776, and from 1783 to 1785. He again served in the Continental Congress from 1779 to 1783 and from 1787 to 1789. He was elected to the 2d and 3d Congresses, serving from March 4, 1791, until his death. He is buried in the Rahway Cemetery, at Rahway.

Francis Hopkinson: He was born in Philadelphia, Pa., on September 21, 1737, and died there on May 9, 1791. Although Hopkinson served as a delegate from New Jersey, he is usually associated with Philadelphia, where he studied and practiced law. He was the first graduate of the College of Philadelphia, receiving his degree in 1757. He served as Collector of Customs of the Port of Salem, N. J., in 1763, and was a member of the Provincial Council of New Jersey from 1774 to 1776. He was admitted to practice law before the New Jersey State Supreme Court in 1775. He was elected an associate justice of the State supreme court in 1776, but did not accept the office. Hopkinson served in the Continental Congress in 1776, and was 39 at the time he signed the Declaration. From 1789 to 1791, he served as judge of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. He is said to have designed the American flag, in 1777, and his son Joseph wrote the anthem Hail Columbia. Hopkinson is buried in the Christ Church Burial Ground, at Philadelphia.

PENNSYLVANIA

Benjamin Franklin: He was born in Boston, Mass., on January 17, 1706, and died in Philadelphia, on April 17, 1790. Franklin was self-educated, acquiring most of his education while working in a printing shop. By the time Franklin was 42 years old, he was able to give up the management of his printing business and devote his time to public affairs and other interests. He had already established the Pennsylvania Gazette (1728), and had begun the publication of Poor Richard's Almanac (1732). Franklin served as deputy postmaster general of the British North American Colonies, from 1753 to 1774. He served as the agent for Pennsylvania in London from 1757 to 1762, and again 1764 to 1775. He served in the Continental Congress in 1775 and 1776, and was the oldest signer of the Declaration, being 70 years old at the time. Franklin served as diplomatic commissioner in France, and from 1776 to 1785 he served as Minister to France. He was a delegate to the Constitutional Convention in 1787. Franklin played an important role in the establishment of the first circulating library in America, and in founding the American Philosophical Society for the Promotion of Useful Knowledge. He is buried in Christ Church Burial Ground, at Philadelphia.

James Wilson: He was born in Carskerdo, near St. Andrews, Scotland, on September 14, 1742, and died in Edenton, N. C., on August 28, 1798. He came to America in 1765, lived in New York City, and later moved to Philadelphia. He studied law and was admitted to the bar in 1767. He served in the Continental Congress in 1775, 1776, and for scattered years up to 1787. He was the second youngest Pennsylvania signer of the declaration, being only 34 years old at the time. He served as associate justice of the United States Supreme Court from 1789 to 1798; and in 1790 he became the first professor of law in the College of Philadelphia. He was buried in the Johnston Burial Ground on the Hayes Plantation near Edenton, N. C., but his remains were reinterred in Christ Churchyard, at Philadelphia, in 1906.

Robert Morris: He was born in Liverpool, England, on January 20, 1734, and died in Philadelphia, Pa., on May 8, 1806. Morris came to America in 1747, and entered the mercantile business in Philadelphia in 1748. He served in the State Assembly from 1778 to 1780, and served as superintendent of finance from 1781 to 1784. At a very early age, Morris became a partner in the firm of Willing, Morris & Co. He served in the Continental Congress from 1776 to 1778, and was 42 years old when he signed the Declaration. He was a delegate to the Constitutional Convention in 1787; and from 1789 to 1795 he served in the United States Senate. President George Washington offered Morris the position of Secretary of the Treasury, but he declined the office. Because of his mastery of financial affairs, Morris was dubbed the "financier of the Revolution." In his later years, he lost his vast fortune in unsuccessful land speculation. He is buried in the family vault of William White in the Churchyard of Christ Church, in Philadelphia.

George Taylor: He was born in Ireland, in 1716, and died in Easton, Pa., on February 23, 1781. He came to America in 1736, and engaged in the manufacture of iron in Pennsylvania. He lived in Durham, Pa., in 1755, and served as justice of the peace there for 3 years. He was a member of the provincial assembly from 1764 to 1769, and served as judge of the Northampton County Court in 1770. He served as a colonel of the Pennsylvania Militia in 1775. He was elected to the Continental Congress in 1776 and 1777. He was 60 years old when he signed the Declaration. He served as a member of the First Supreme Executive Council in 1777. He was buried in St. John's Lutheran Church Cemetery, but his remains were reinterred in the Easton Cemetery, in Easton, Pa.

James Smith: He was born in Ireland in 1713, and came to America and settled in Pennsylvania in 1727. He attended Philadelphia Academy (University of Pennsylvania), studied law, and was admitted to the bar in 1745. He moved to York, and engaged in the iron business for a short time, but without success. In 1776 he organized the Pennsylvania Militia and the two regiments of the Flying Camp in Perth Amboy, N. J. He served as brigadier general of the State Militia. From 1776 to 1778 he was a member of the Continental Congress, and was 63 years old when he signed the Declaration. In 1780 he served in the State house of representatives; and from 1780 to 1781 he served as judge of the Pennsylvania High Court of Errors and Appeals. He was elected to Congress again in 1785, but he declined the office because of his age. From 1781 to 1801 he was chiefly engaged in the practice of law in York. He is buried in the First Presbyterian Churchyard, in York, Pa.

George Ross: He was born in New Castle, Del., on May 10, 1730, and died near Philadelphia, on July 14, 1779. He studied law and was admitted to the bar in 1750. He served as a member of the Colonial As-

sembly from 1768 to 1776, and was a delegate to the State convention in 1774. He served in the Continental Congress from 1774 to 1777, and was 46 years old when he signed the Declaration. He was noted for his wit and good humor, and his personal popularity was demonstrated by the fact that only Benjamin Franklin received a larger vote in the election for the Pennsylvania delegates to the Congress. He was appointed judge of the Court of Admiralty for Pennsylvania in April 1779, and served in that position until his death. He is buried in Christ Churchyard, in Philadelphia.

George Clymer: He was born in Philadelphia, Pa., on March 16, 1739, and died in Morrisville, Pa., on January 23, 1813. He was orphaned at a tender age, and was brought up by a prosperous merchant uncle, William Coleman. Clymer entered the mercantile business and became a partner in the firm of Merediths and Clymer. He served in the Continental Congress from 1776 to 1778, and from 1780 to 1783. He was 37 years old when he signed the Declaration. He was a member of the State house of representatives from 1785 to 1788, was a delegate to the Constitutional Convention, and was a signer of the Constitution. He served in the first Congress, from 1789 to 1791, and in the latter year was appointed by President Washington as collector of excise duties for Pennsylvania, but resigned after the Whisky Rebellion. His last public service was rendered as commissioner to the Cherokee and Creek Indians in Georgia, when he participated in negotiating a treaty with those Indians. Clymer is buried in Friends Graveyard, at Trenton, N. J.

Benjamin Rush: He was born near Philadelphia, Pa., on December 24, 1745, and died there on April 19, 1813. Rush graduated from Princeton College in 1760, and studied medicine in Philadelphia and abroad. He began practicing in 1769, and became the most famous American physician and medical teacher of his generation. He founded Pennsylvania Hospital in Philadelphia, and served as president of the Philadelphia Medical Society. He was one of the founders of the Philadelphia Bible Society, and was also a founder of Dickinson College in Carlisle, Pa. He received several awards from foreign rulers for his contributions to medical science. He served in the Continental Congress in 1776 and 1777, and was only 31 at the time he signed the Declaration. He served in the Army with the rank of physician general in 1777. He served as treasurer of the United States mint in Philadelphia from 1799 until his death. He is buried in Christ Church Cemetery, at Philadelphia.

John Morton: He was born in Ridley Township, Delaware County, Pa., in 1724, and died in Ridley Park, Pa., in April 1777. He attended the common schools for a very short time, but he was well educated at home by his stepfather. He became a land surveyor, and served as justice of the peace in 1757. He had served in the Colonial General Assembly since his early thirties, and from 1771 to 1755 he served as speaker of that body. In April 1774 Morton was appointed an associate justice of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court of Appeals. He served in the Continental Congress from 1774 to 1777. He was 52 years old when he signed the Declaration. He cast the deciding vote to swing the Pennsylvania delegation over for the adoption of the Declaration of Independence. He was the first of the signers to die. He is buried in St. Paul's Churchyard, in Chester, Pa.

DELAWARE

Caesar Rodney: He was born in Dover, Del., on October 7, 1728, and died there on June 29, 1784. He obtained most of his educational training at home, and then engaged in agricultural pursuits. He served in several public offices, including those of superintendent of the printing of Delaware

currency in 1759, member of the State assembly from 1762 to 1769, and associate justice of the Delaware Supreme Court from 1769 to 1777. He served in the Continental Congress from 1774 to 1776, and rode from his home, through the night and rain, to cast his vote for independence. He was 48 years old when he signed the Declaration. He was elected president of Delaware, and served from 1778 to 1782. He was buried on his farm, Byfield, but a century later his remains were reinterred in the Christ Episcopal Churchyard in Dover.

George Read: He was born in Cecil County, Md., on September 18, 1733, and died in New Castle, Del., on September 21, 1798. Read studied law, and was admitted to the bar in Delaware in 1752. He served as attorney general for lower Delaware in 1763. He was a Member of the Continental Congress from 1774 to 1777. He was 43 years old when he signed the Declaration. He served as president of the State constitutional convention in 1776, and was a delegate to the Federal Constitutional Convention. He served in the State assembly, and was elected to the United States Senate, serving from 1789 to 1793. In this latter year Read was appointed chief justice of the State of Delaware, and served until his death. He is buried in Immanuel Churchyard, in New Castle, Del.

Thomas McKean: He was born in New London, Pa., on March 19, 1734, and died in Philadelphia, Pa., on June 24, 1817. He studied law, was admitted to the bar, and began practicing in New Castle, Del., in 1755. He was appointed deputy attorney general for Sussex County, and served from 1756 to 1758. He served in the Delaware assembly from 1762 to 1775. He served as a Member of the Continental Congress from 1774 to 1783, and in 1781 he served as president of Congress. He was 42 years old in the summer of 1776, but it is unknown when he actually signed the Declaration. He served as president of the State of Delaware in 1777, was appointed chief justice of Pennsylvania in 1777 and served in that capacity until 1799. He was elected Governor of the State of Pennsylvania in 1799 and served until 1808, when he retired from public life. He is buried in Laurel Hill Cemetery, in Philadelphia.

MARYLAND

Charles Carroll of Carrollton: He was born in Annapolis, Md., on September 19, 1737, and died in Baltimore, Md., on November 14, 1832. He attended the Jesuits' College of Bohemia at Hermans Manor, Md., and studied civil and common law in England and France, returning to Maryland in 1765. Carroll, a landed gentleman, was one of the richest men in America. He served as a delegate to the revolutionary convention of Maryland in 1775, and was a member of the board of war from 1776 to 1777. He served in the Continental Congress in 1776 and again in 1777 and 1778. He was 39 years old when he signed the Declaration. Carroll served in the Maryland State senate from 1777 to 1800, and served in the United States Senate from 1789 until 1792, when he resigned, preferring to remain in the State senate. Carroll was the last surviving signer of the Declaration of Independence. He is buried in the chapel of Doughoregan Manor, near Ellicott City, Md.

William Paca: He was born near Abingdon, Md., on October 31, 1740, and died there on October 23, 1799. He graduated from Philadelphia College in 1759, studied law in Annapolis and in London, and was admitted to the bar in 1764. He served in the Provincial Assembly from 1771 to 1774, and served in the Continental Congress from 1774 to 1779. He was 36 years old when he signed the Declaration. He served in the State senate from 1777 to 1779, and was appointed chief judge of the Superior Court of Maryland in 1778, and served until 1780. He was elected governor of the State of Maryland,

and served 3 terms from 1782 to 1786. He was appointed by Washington to serve as judge of the United States Court for Maryland, and served from 1789 until his death. He is buried in the family burial ground in Queen Anne County, Md.

Samuel Chase: He was born in Princess Anne, in Somerset County, Md., on April 17, 1741, and died in Washington, D. C., on June 19, 1811. He was tutored in the classics by his father, an Anglican clergyman. He studied law and was admitted to the bar in 1761. He served in the State assembly from 1764 to 1784, and served in the Continental Congress from 1774 to 1778, and again in 1784 and 1785. He was 35 years old when he signed the Declaration. He was the most violent of the Maryland delegation, and because of his "fery complexion" was given the name "Bacon face" in the Maryland court. He was appointed judge of the general court of Maryland in 1791, and in 1796 President Washington appointed him Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court. Chase was impeached for malfeasance in office, tried by the Senate of the United States in 1805, but was acquitted of all charges. At the end of the trial he resumed his seat on the bench, and served until his death. He is buried in Old St. Paul's Cemetery, Baltimore, Md.

Thomas Stone: He was born in Charles County, Md., in 1743, and died in Alexandria, Va., on October 5, 1787. He studied law and was admitted to the bar in 1764. He served in the Maryland State Senate from 1779 to 1783. He served in the Continental Congress in 1775, and again in 1779, 1784, and 1785. He was 33 years old when he signed the Declaration. He declined to serve as a delegate to the Federal Constitutional Convention because of the illness of his wife. Stone died at the age of 44 while waiting for a ship to take him to England. He is buried in the Garden Cemetery, Havre de Venture, in Charles County, Md.

VIRGINIA

Richard Henry Lee: He was born at Stratford, in Westmoreland County, Va., on January 20, 1732, and died at his home Chantilly, in Westmoreland County, on June 19, 1794. After some private instruction, Lee attended Wakefield Academy in England, returning to this country in 1751. Lee served in the Virginia House of Burgesses from 1758 to 1775, and served in the Continental Congress from 1774 to 1780. He introduced the famous resolutions declaring "that these united Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States * * *" and which led to the Declaration of Independence. He was 45 years old at the time. He served in the Continental Congress again, from 1784 to 1787, and was the author of the first national Thanksgiving Day proclamation issued by Congress, October 31, 1777. He was elected to the United States Senate, and served from 1789 until he resigned in 1792. He is buried in the family burying ground, Mount Pleasant, near Hague, Westmoreland County, Va.

Thomas Jefferson: He was born in Old Shadwell, Va., on April 13, 1743, and died at Monticello, in Albemarle County, Va., on July 4, 1826, a few hours before John Adams. Jefferson graduated from William and Mary College in 1762, studied law, and was admitted to the bar in 1767. Jefferson served in the Virginia House of Burgesses from 1769 to 1774, and served in the Continental Congress in 1775 and 1776. He served as chairman of the committee appointed to prepare the Declaration of Independence and was the author of that document. He was 33 years old at the time. Jefferson served as Governor of Virginia from 1779 to 1781, and later resumed his service in the Continental Congress. He served as Minister to France for more than 3 years. In 1789 he was appointed the first Secretary of State of the United States under the Constitution, and served until 1793. Jefferson was elected

Vice President of the United States, serving from 1797 to 1801. He was elected President of the United States for two terms, serving from 1801 to 1809. Jefferson took an active part in founding the University of Virginia. He is buried at Monticello.

Benjamin Harrison: He was born in Berkeley, Charles City County, Va., on April 5, 1726, and died in City Point, Prince George County, Va., on April 24, 1791. He attended William and Mary College. At an early age he was elected to the Virginia House of Burgesses, serving from 1749 to 1775. He served in the Continental Congress from 1774 to 1778; and as chairman of the Committee of the Whole House reported the resolution introduced by Richard Henry Lee declaring independence. He was 50 years old when he signed the Declaration. He served several terms in the State house of representatives after leaving the Continental Congress, serving as Speaker of that body in the years 1778 to 1782, 1785, and 1786. He served as Governor of Virginia from 1782 to 1784. One of Harrison's children, William Henry Harrison, became President of the United States. He is probably buried in Old Westover Church Cemetery, near famous Westover estate, on the James River, in Virginia.

George Wythe: He was born in Elizabeth City County, Va., in 1726, and died at Richmond, Va., on June 8, 1806. He attended William and Mary College, studied law, and was admitted to the bar in 1746. He served in the Virginia House of Burgesses from 1758 to 1768, and served as Clerk of the same body from 1768 to 1775. Wythe served as a member in the Continental Congress from 1775 to 1777. He was 50 years old when he signed the Declaration. He served as Judge of the Virginia Chancery Court in 1777; in 1778 he was appointed sole Chancellor of Virginia. He was professor of law at William and Mary College from 1779 until 1791, when he resigned. Afterward he established a private school in Richmond; and Thomas Jefferson, John Marshall, and Henry Clay, among others, studied under him. He was a member of the Federal Constitutional Convention in 1787. He is buried in St. John's Churchyard, at Richmond, Va.

Francis Lightfoot Lee: He was born at Stratford, in Westmoreland County, Va., on October 14, 1734, and died at his home, Menoken, in Richmond County, Va., on January 11, 1797. Lee pursued his studies under private tutoring, and became a member of the Virginia House of Burgesses at the age of 24, serving from 1758 to 1775. He signed the Westmoreland declaration against the Stamp Act. He served in the Continental Congress from 1775 to 1780. He was 42 years old when he signed the Declaration. He was the younger brother of Richard Henry Lee, who introduced the famous resolutions calling for independence. He served in the Virginia State senate from 1778 to 1782. He is buried in the family burying ground at Mount Airy, Richmond County, Va.

Carter Braxton: He was born at Newington, near King and Queen Court House, Virginia, on September 10, 1736, and died at Richmond, Va., on October 10, 1797. He graduated from William and Mary College in 1755, and then spent 3 years abroad, in England. He was elected to the Virginia House of Burgesses in 1761 and served until 1771, and again in 1775. He was elected to the Continental Congress in 1775 on the death of Peyton Randolph, and served until 1776. He was 40 years old at the time of the signing of the Declaration. In 1777 he was again elected to the Continental Congress, and served until 1783, and again in 1785. He was a member of the Virginia Council of State from 1786 to 1791, and again from 1794 until his death. He is buried on his estate, Chericoke, in King County, Va.

Thomas Nelson, Jr.: He was born in Yorktown, Va., on December 26, 1738, and died at his son's estate, Mont Air, in Hanover

County, Va., on January 4, 1789. Nelson attended private schools, and in 1761 he was graduated from Trinity College in Cambridge, England. Although English-educated, Nelson was a staunch patriot, and never leaned toward loyalism. He was elected to the Virginia House of Burgesses in 1774, while en route home from England. He was a member of the Continental Congress from 1775 to 1777. He was 37 years old when he signed the Declaration. It was Nelson who carried the Virginia convention resolutions to Philadelphia, which in turn precipitated the action of Richard Henry Lee. Nelson served as the commander of the Virginia State forces from 1777 until 1781. Ill health brought about by his service in the field in the campaign against Cornwallis forced his retirement in 1781. He received the public thanks of General Washington and of the Congress for his services. He served as Governor of Virginia in 1781, and then retired from public service. He is buried in the Nelson Cemetery, at Yorktown, Va.

NORTH CAROLINA

Joseph Hewes: He was born in Kingston, N. J., on January 23, 1730, and died in Philadelphia, Pa., on November 10, 1779. He attended Princeton College, then entered business in Philadelphia. In 1756 he moved to North Carolina. He served in the North Carolina State house of commons from 1766 to 1775, and was a member of the committee of correspondence in 1773. He served in the Continental Congress from 1774 to 1777, and while in the Congress served as chairman of the Marine Committee. He was a friend of John Paul Jones, and was instrumental in acquiring a ship for the latter. He was 46 years old when he signed the Declaration. He served in the State house of commons again in 1778 and 1779, and in the latter year was again elected to the Continental Congress. He died while serving in the Congress. He is buried in Christ Churchyard, in Philadelphia, Pa.

John Penn: He was born near Port Royal, in Caroline County, Va., on May 17, 1741, and died near Williamsboro, N. C., on September 14, 1788. Penn was privately educated, studied law, and was admitted to the bar in 1762. He was a leader in the patriotic cause, served in the Provincial Congress in 1775, and in the same year was elected to the Continental Congress, serving until 1780. He was 35 years old at the time he signed the Declaration. He served as a member of the board of war in North Carolina in 1780, and in 1784 was receiver of taxes for that State. Afterward he returned to the practice of law, but was almost in complete retirement because of poor health. He was buried on his estate in Granville County, N. C., but his remains were reinterred in the Guilford Battle Grounds, near Greensboro, N. C.

William Hooper: He was born in Boston, Mass., on June 17, 1742, and died in Hillsboro, N. C., in October 1790. Hooper attended Harvard College, graduated in 1760, was admitted to the bar, and in 1767 moved to Wilmington, N. C. He served in the North Carolina colonial assembly from 1773 to 1776, and during this period penned a series of articles against the Crown which awakened the people to the issues. As a result, Hooper was disbarred for 1 year. He served in the Continental Congress from 1774 to 1777. He was 34 years old when he signed the Declaration. Hooper was a member of the boundary commission appointed to settle the dispute between Massachusetts and New York in 1786. He was buried in Hillsboro, but was reinterred in the Guilford Battle Grounds, near Greensboro, N. C.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Arthur Middleton: He was born at Middleton Place, near Charleston, S. C., on June 26, 1742, and died at The Oaks, near Charleston, on January 1, 1787. He attended St.

John's College, Cambridge University, and studied law at the Middle Temple in London. Middleton returned to South Carolina in 1763, and assisted his father in the management of his plantations. At the age of 23, Middleton served in the provincial house of commons, serving from 1765 to 1768. He went to Europe, traveled extensively, and returned to this country in 1771, and again served in the provincial house of commons until 1775. He served in the Continental Congress from 1776 to 1778, and from 1781 to 1783. He was 34 years old when he signed the Declaration. Middleton served as an officer in the State militia during the war, and along with his fellow signers, Rutledge and Heyward, was captured and held prisoner by the British after the fall of Charleston. Middleton was elected Governor of South Carolina in 1778, but declined the office. He served in the State senate in 1781 and 1782. He was a member of the board of trustees of Charleston College. He is buried in the family mausoleum, at Middleton Place.

Thomas Heyward, Jr.: He was born on his father's plantation, in St. Helena's Parish (now St. Luke's), in South Carolina, on July 28, 1746, and died at White Hall, in St. Luke's Parish, S. C., on March 6, 1809. He studied law in the Middle Temple in London, returned to South Carolina in 1771, and was admitted to the bar. He was a member of the Council of Safety in 1775 and 1776, and served in the Continental Congress from 1776 to 1778. He was 30 years old when he signed the Declaration. Heyward served several terms in the State house of representatives, was an officer in the militia during the war, and was captured by the British at the fall of Charleston, in May 1780, and was imprisoned for a year. He served as judge of the circuit court from 1779 to 1789. He was a member of the State constitutional convention in 1790. He was the founder and served, in 1785, as the first president of the Agricultural Society of South Carolina. He is buried in the family burial ground, on his father's plantation, Old House, in St. Luke's Parish.

Edward Rutledge: He was born in Christ Church Parish, South Carolina, on November 23, 1749, and died in Charleston, on January 23, 1800. Like the other signers from South Carolina, he studied law at the Middle Temple in London. He returned to this country, and was admitted to the bar in South Carolina in 1773. Rutledge served in the Continental Congress from 1774 to 1777, and was the youngest signer of the Declaration, being only 26 years old at the time. He was the brother of John Rutledge, who signed the Constitution and later served as Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. Like Middleton and Heyward, Edward served as an officer in the Army, and was captured and imprisoned by the British in May 1780. He served for several years in the State house of representatives, and in 1791 authored the act abolishing the law of primogeniture. In 1794, President Washington tendered him the appointment of Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, but he declined the office. He was elected Governor of South Carolina, and served from December 6, 1798, until his death. He married the sister of Arthur Middleton, a fellow signer of the Declaration. He is buried in St. Philip's Churchyard, at Charleston.

Thomas Lynch, Jr.: He was born in Prince George's Parish, Winyah, S. C., on August 5, 1749, and was lost at sea with his wife, sometime in 1779. Lynch, a member of a landed family, was educated at Eton and Cambridge and studied law at the Middle Temple like the other members of his delegation. He returned to America in 1772. Owing to his dislike for law, he did not practice long, preferring to be a planter. Lynch began his service in the Provincial Congress when he was just 25 years old, serving from 1774 to

1776. It was by accident that Lynch became a signer of the Declaration. His father, Thomas Lynch, Sr., was serving as a delegate, and became ill. Thomas Junior was elected to care for, and if necessary to substitute, for, his father, in 1776. The father was too sick to sign the document, and thus Thomas Lynch, Jr., attached his signature to the Declaration. He was 27 years old at the time, just a few months older than Rutledge, who was the youngest signer. Lynch served as an officer in the State militia in 1776. No other signer had so short a life or so sad a story as Thomas Lynch, Jr. Seeking to regain his own health, Lynch and his wife embarked on a sea voyage in 1779, expecting to land in southern France. They both were lost at sea in that year.

GEORGIA

Lyman Hall: He was born in Wallingford, Conn., on April 12, 1724, and died in Burke County, Ga., on October 19, 1790. Hall graduated from Yale College in 1749, studied theology, and preached for a short period of time. He studied medicine, moved to Liberty County, Ga., sometime after 1752, and continued the practice of medicine which he had begun earlier. He was sympathetic to the patriotic cause and was a moving spirit for independence in his State. He served in the Continental Congress from 1775 to 1780. He was 52 years old when he signed the Declaration. With the fall of Savannah, and the destruction of his property, he in 1778 moved his family north, where they lived until 1782. He served as Governor of the State of Georgia in 1783. He was buried on his plantation near Shell Bluff, in Burke County, but in 1848 was reinterred beneath a monument on Greene Street, in front of the courthouse, in Augusta, Ga.

Button Gwinnett: He was born in Down Hatherly, Gloucestershire, England, in 1732, and died near Savannah, Ga., on May 19, 1777. Gwinnett engaged in the mercantile business in Bristol, England, and later immigrated to this country, settling in Charleston, S. C. In 1765 he moved to Savannah, Ga., and continued in the mercantile business. A few years later he moved to St. Catherine's Island, Ga., where he engaged in planting. He served in the Continental Congress in 1776 and 1777. He was 44 years old at the time he affixed his signature to the Declaration. From February to March 1777, Gwinnett served as Acting President and Commander in Chief of the State of Georgia. While serving as chief executive of Georgia, he was drawn into a controversy with the military authorities, particularly with Brigadier General Lachlan McIntosh. As a result, a duel ensued between the two men, and both were wounded on May 16, 1777. Gwinnett died a few days later from his wounds. He is buried probably in the Old Colonial Cemetery (now called Colonial Park), in Savannah, Ga.

George Walton: He was born near Farmville, Va., in 1741, and died near Augusta, Ga., on February 2, 1804. Walton attended the common schools, studied law, and was admitted to the bar in 1774. In 1775 he served as secretary of the Provincial Congress, and at the same time served as a member of the Provincial Congress, and at the same time served as a member of the council of safety. Walton served in the Continental Congress from 1776 to 1781. He was 35 years old when he signed the Declaration. Walton also has the distinction of signing the Articles of Confederation. He served as an officer in the First Georgia Battalion, was wounded, captured, and later released by exchange. He served as Governor of Georgia in 1779, and became Chief Justice of that State in 1783, serving until 1786. He served as Governor again in 1789, and Chief Justice in 1793. He was appointed to the United States Senate in 1795, and served until February 1796. In 1799 he was appointed judge of the middle circuit of

Georgia, and served in that position until his death. He was buried in Rosney Cemetery, but in 1848 his remains were reburied with those of Lyman Hall, his fellow signer, beneath a monument in front of the court house on Greene Street, in Augusta, Ga.

Sources: Dictionary of American biography. Malone, Dumas. The story of the Declaration of Independence. New York: Oxford University Press, 1954, 282 pp. United States Congress. Biographical directory of the American Congress, 1774-1949. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1950.

THE SIGNERS OF THE CONSTITUTION

George Washington, 1732-99, Virginia: Planter, soldier, statesman; colonial officer in French and Indian War; Virginia Legislature; Continental Congress, 1774-75; Commander in Chief of Continental Army; Deputy to Constitutional Convention, President of it; President of the United States, 1789-97; Commander in Chief of United States Provisional Army.

John Langdon, 1741-1819, New Hampshire: Merchant; militia service during Revolution; Continental Congress, 1775-76; New Hampshire Legislature, speaker; Continental Navy agent; President of New Hampshire; Deputy to Constitutional Convention; Governor; United States Senator, 1789-1801.

Nicholas Gilman, 1755-1814, New Hampshire: Statesman; officer in Continental Army; Continental Congress, 1787-88; Deputy to Constitutional Convention; Congressman, 1789-97; New Hampshire senate; United States Senator, 1805-14.

Nathaniel Gorham, 1738-96, Massachusetts: Merchant, landowner; Massachusetts Legislature, speaker; Massachusetts Board of War and constitutional convention; Continental Congress, 1782-83, 1786-87; judge; Delegate to Constitutional Convention, Chairman of Committee of the Whole; Massachusetts Council.

Rufus King, 1755-1827, Massachusetts: Lawyer; Massachusetts Legislature; Continental Congress, 1784-87; Delegate to Constitutional Convention; United States Senator from New York, 1789-96, 1813-25; Minister to Great Britain; Federalist candidate for Vice President and President.

William Samuel Johnson, 1727-1819, Connecticut: Lawyer, Stamp Act Congress; Connecticut agent in England; Connecticut Council; judge; Continental Congress, 1784-87; delegate to Constitutional Convention; United States Senator, 1789-91; president of Columbia College.

Roger Sherman, 1721-93, Connecticut: Shoemaker, lawyer; Connecticut Legislature and Council of Safety; Continental Congress, 1774-81, 1784; signer of Declaration of Independence and Articles of Confederation; delegate to Constitutional Convention; mayor of New Haven; Congressman, 1789-91; United States Senator, 1791-93.

Alexander Hamilton, 1757-1804, New York: Lawyer; aide to Washington and line colonel in Continental Army; Continental Congress, 1782-83, 1788; New York Legislature; Annapolis Convention; delegate to Constitutional Convention; part author of Federalist; Secretary of the Treasury, 1789-95; inspector general in United States Provisional Army.

William Livingston, 1723-90, New Jersey: Lawyer; New York Legislature; local New Jersey Committee of Correspondence; Continental Congress, 1774-76; commander of New Jersey Revolutionary militia; Governor of New Jersey; Commissioner to Constitutional Convention.

David Brearley, 1745-90, New Jersey: Lawyer; officer in Continental Army; New Jersey Constitutional Convention; chief justice of New Jersey; Commissioner to Constitutional Convention; United States district judge.

William Paterson, 1745-1806, New Jersey: Lawyer; New Jersey Provincial Congress, Constitutional Convention, Attorney General, and Council; Commissioner to Constitutional Convention; United States Senator, 1789-90; Governor; Chancellor; Associate Justice of Supreme Court, 1793-1806.

Jonathan Dayton, 1760-1824, New Jersey: Landowner; officer in Continental Army; New Jersey Legislature, speaker; Commissioner to Constitutional Convention; Continental Congress, 1788; New Jersey Council; Congressman, 1791-99, Speaker; United States Senator, 1799-1805.

Benjamin Franklin, 1706-90, Pennsylvania: Printer, statesman, scientist, philosopher; Pennsylvania Legislature; Deputy Postmaster General of Colonies; Albany Congress; Colonial agent in England; Continental Congress, 1775-76, signer of Declaration of Independence; Commissioner and Minister to France; President of Pennsylvania; Deputy to Constitutional Convention.

Thomas Mifflin, 1744-1800, Pennsylvania: Merchant, politician; Pennsylvania Legislature, Speaker; Continental Congress, 1774-75, 1782-84, President of it, 1783-84; aide to Washington, major general and quartermaster general in Continental Army; Continental Board of War; Deputy to Constitutional Convention; President of Pennsylvania and Governor; Pennsylvania Constitutional Convention.

Robert Morris, 1734-1806, Pennsylvania: Merchant, financier; Continental Congress, 1775-78; signer of Declaration of Independence and Articles of Confederation; Pennsylvania Legislature and Council of Safety; Superintendent of Finance, 1781-84; established Bank of North America; Deputy to Constitutional Convention; United States Senator, 1789-95.

George Clymer, 1739-1813, Pennsylvania: Merchant; Pennsylvania Council of Safety; Continental Congress, 1776-77, 1780-82, signer of Declaration of Independence; Pennsylvania Legislature; Deputy to Constitutional Convention; Congressman, 1789-91.

Thomas Fitzsimons, 1741-1811, Pennsylvania: Merchant, militia officer in Revolution; Pennsylvania Council of Safety and Navy Board; Continental Congress, 1782-83; Pennsylvania Legislature and Board of Censors; Bank of North America; Deputy to Constitutional Convention; Congressman, 1789-95.

Jared Ingersoll, 1749-1822, Pennsylvania: Lawyer; Continental Congress, 1780; Pennsylvania Attorney General; Deputy to Constitutional Convention; United States District Attorney; municipal officer in Philadelphia; judge of Pennsylvania District Court; Federalist candidate for Vice President.

James Wilson, 1742-1798, Pennsylvania: Lawyer; Pennsylvania Provincial Convention; Continental Congress, 1775-77, 1783, 1785, 1786, signer of Declaration of Independence; Continental Board of War; Advocate General for France in America; Deputy to Constitutional Convention; Associate Justice of Supreme Court of the United States, 1789-98.

Gouverneur Morris, 1752-1816, Pennsylvania: Lawyer; New York Provincial Congress and Constitutional Convention; Continental Congress from New York, 1778-79, signer of Articles of Confederation; Assistant Superintendent of Finance; Deputy to Constitutional Convention; special mission to England; Minister to France; United States Senator from New York, 1800-03.

George Read, 1733-98, Delaware: Lawyer; Delaware attorney general and Legislature; Continental Congress, 1774-77, signer of Declaration of Independence; Delaware Constitutional Convention and Council; Continental Court of Appeals; Annapolis Convention; Deputy to Constitutional Convention; United States Senator, 1789-93; Chief Justice of Delaware.

Gunning Bedford, Jr., 1747-1812, Delaware: Lawyer; Delaware Legislature and

Council; Continental Congress, 1783-85; Delaware attorney general; Annapolis Convention; Deputy to Constitutional Convention; United States district judge.

Jacob Broom, 1752-1810, Delaware: Surveyor, businessman, manufacturer; Deputy to Constitutional Convention; borough officer in Wilmington; Delaware Legislature; postmaster at Wilmington; bank director.

Richard Bassett, 1745-1815, Delaware: Lawyer; militia service in Revolution; Delaware Council of Safety, Legislature, and Constitutional Convention; Annapolis Convention; Deputy to Constitutional Convention; United States Senator, 1789-93; judge of Delaware Court of Common Pleas; Governor; United States circuit judge, but office soon abolished.

John Dickinson, 1732-1808, Delaware: Lawyer; Delaware and Pennsylvania Legislatures, speaker in Delaware; Stamp Act Congress; Continental Congress, 1774-76, 1779, signer of Articles of Confederation; president of Delaware; president of Pennsylvania; Annapolis Convention; Deputy from Delaware to Constitutional Convention. (Though not present at the signing, his signature was added, at his request, by George Read of Delaware.)

James McHenry, 1753-1816, Maryland: Physician; surgeon in Continental Army, military secretary to Washington, aide to Lafayette; Maryland Legislature; Continental Congress, 1783-85; Deputy to Constitutional Convention; Secretary of War, 1796-1800.

Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer, 1723-90, Maryland: Planter; agent and receiver general for lord proprietary of Maryland; Maryland Legislature, Council, council of safety, and president of senate; Continental Congress, 1779-81; Maryland-Virginia Conference of 1785; Deputy to Constitutional Convention.

Daniel Carroll, 1730-96, Maryland: Planter; Continental Congress, 1781-83, signer of Articles of Confederation; Deputy to Constitutional Convention; Congressman, 1789-91; Commissioner for District of Columbia.

John Blair, 1732-1800, Virginia: Lawyer; Virginia Legislature, Provincial Convention, and Council; judge of General Court and Chancery of Virginia; deputy to Constitutional Convention; Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, 1789-96.

James Madison, 1751-1836, Virginia: Lawyer, statesman; Virginia Convention, Legislature, and Council; Continental Congress, 1780-83, 1787-88; Virginia-Maryland Conference of 1785; Annapolis Convention; deputy to Constitutional Convention; part author of Federalist; Congressman, 1789-97; Secretary of State, 1801-09; President of the United States, 1809-17; Virginia Constitutional Convention; rector of University of Virginia.

William Blount, 1749-1800, North Carolina: Landowner; paymaster in Continental Army; North Carolina Legislature, Speaker; Continental Congress, 1728-83, 1786-87; deputy to Constitutional Convention; Governor of Territory South of the Ohio River and Superintendent of Indian Affairs; Tennessee Constitutional Convention; United States Senator from Tennessee, 1796-97; Tennessee senate.

Richard Dobbs Spaight, 1758-1802, North Carolina: Planter; North Carolina Legislature; Continental Congress, 1783-85; deputy to Constitutional Convention; Governor of North Carolina; Congressman, 1798-1801; North Carolina Senate.

Hugh Williamson, 1735-1819, North Carolina: Merchant, physician; surgeon general of North Carolina militia; North Carolina Legislature; Continental Congress, 1782-85, 1787-88; deputy to Constitutional Convention; Congressman, 1789-93.

John Rutledge, 1739-1800, South Carolina: Lawyer; South Carolina Legislature; Stamp Act Congress; Continental Congress, 1774-75, 1782-83; South Carolina Council of Safety, Constitutional Convention, President, and Governor; judge of Chancery Court; deputy to Constitutional Convention; Associate Justice of Supreme Court of United States, 1789-91; Chief Justice of South Carolina.

Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, 1746-1825, South Carolina: Lawyer, soldier; South Carolina Provincial Congress, Council of Safety, Legislature, and President of Senate; colonel in Continental Army; deputy to Constitutional Convention; declined Cabinet positions; Minister to France; major general in United States Provisional Army; candidate for President.

Charles Pinckney, 1757-1824, South Carolina: Lawyer; militia service in Revolution; South Carolina Legislature; Continental Congress, 1784-87; deputy to Constitutional Convention; South Carolina Council, Governor, and Constitutional Convention; United States Senator, 1799-1801; Minister to Spain; Congressman, 1819-21.

Pierce Butler, 1744-1822, South Carolina: Planter; officer in British Army before the Revolution; South Carolina Legislature; Continental Congress, 1787; deputy to Constitutional Convention; United States Senator, 1789-96, 1803-04.

William Few, 1748-1828, Georgia: Lawyer; Georgia Constitutional Convention, Legislature, and Council; militia service in Revolution; judge of Georgia County and Circuit Courts; Continental Congress, 1780-82, 1786-88; deputy to Constitutional Convention; United States Senator, 1789-93; New York Legislature and prison inspector; bank director; New York City Alderman.

Abraham Baldwin, 1754-1807, Georgia: Clergyman, lawyer; tutor at Yale; chaplain in Continental Army; Georgia Legislature; author of charter and president of University of Georgia; Continental Congress, 1785, 1788; deputy to Constitutional Convention; Congressman, 1789-99; United States Senator, 1799-1807.

Source: The Story of the Constitution, Sol Bloom, 1937, pages 54-64.

FPC Should Say "No" on the Canadian Gas Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1957

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, the State of Kentucky has a very important stake in the Canadian gas hearings now being held by the Federal Power Commission. Only West Virginia and Pennsylvania produce more coal than Kentucky, but our State's comparative position will become even further enhanced because neither of those States has the coal reserve strength of Kentucky. Beneath the soil within the boundaries of Kentucky are almost 60 billion tons of recoverable coal reserves—enough to last for approximately 900 years at the present rate of production.

Our mines have a working force of perhaps 40,000 men, and the wages which go into their paychecks have a very decided impact upon the business establishments within the 3 counties in eastern Kentucky and the 12 in western

Kentucky where bituminous coal is produced. Next to agriculture, coal has the highest value in products and is the highest employer in the entire State. Kentucky cannot enjoy complete economic progress without a vigorous coal industry.

When a foreign product enters fuel markets of the Middle West or of the eastern portion of the United States, Kentucky's economy is injured. The millions of barrels of residual oil that have flowed onto the Atlantic seaboard from foreign refineries over the past decade have had a most injurious effect upon the Kentucky coal industry. That oil has also been responsible for loss of revenues and wages in the railroad industry of our State, and it has ultimately affected all wage earners—from boot-black to service station operator, from haberdasher to washing machine salesman. The losses extend into our State, county, and local exchequers, into our churches, and into our charitable organizations.

Attempts to bring Canadian gas into the markets now being served by coal constitute another intended raid upon an industry that has already sustained more than its share of hardships through unwise import policies. The ambitious programs, of which the gas import plan is the latest venture, projected by world fuel merchants are astounding in their absolute disdain for domestic industry and labor. Save for the substantial profits that are to be realized by the pipeline people, what other gains would be forthcoming?

To exhaust a limited fuel resource such as natural gas while billions of tons of lignite and bituminous coal are within easy reach of consuming areas would be an extravagant use of a scarce source of energy regardless of where in nature's storehouse it may occur. At first glance into the Canadian gas proposals, a United States citizen might be inclined to say: "Let Canada send her natural gas into this country so that we can preserve our own resources." Even without concern for the American workers who would lose their jobs as a conse-

quence, this simple conclusion is loaded with question marks.

What assurance have customers in the Midwest of a firm supply of a foreign product? Canadian statesmen have said time and again that the Dominion's newly discovered natural-gas supply should be reserved for use in Canadian homes and industries. If, after a few short years, those who advocate this policy succeed in having their views prevail, what would happen to those customers who meanwhile come to depend on Canadian gas?

Price of natural gas is a subject that has occupied considerable time on Capitol Hill and in the executive department for several years. It certainly cannot be arbitrarily dismissed in the Federal Power Commission hearings on the Canadian gas cases.

Who is to say that the controlling pipeline interests—or any segment thereof, whether it be producer or distributor—would not burden American customers with exorbitant price increases once this market had been seized and consolidated? The proposed pipeline to the Middle West from the Canadian line would bear the same public-utility status enjoyed by other lines throughout America, thus creating a fuel monopoly as soon as coal and competing oil products were displaced. When competition is out of the way, how high the price of imported gas would go is a matter over which no Federal, State, or local government body in the United States would have control.

Another question pertains to possible high export taxes that are quite likely to be imposed by the Canadian Government at some time in the future. How to get enough revenue to meet government spending is a perennial problem practically the world over. To levy a substantial tax upon a foreign consumer is a legal and accepted device that is naturally to be anticipated.

Let me make it clear that I am not challenging the integrity of the Government of Canada or its party in power. There has already been so much talk about the fantastic profits made by American investors in the pipeline that

putting the squeeze on a United States consumer beholden to a fuel produced in the Dominion would seem the logical approach to bringing some of the dollars back across the border.

Until an assortment of global-minded officials in the State Department began to assume a progressively greater degree of power in the making of foreign-trade treaties two decades or so ago, equitable foreign-trade agreements were the recognized instrumentalities of international commerce. Since the so-called liberal element in Washington began to make fantastic concessions at the expense of our own industries and working forces, it has admittedly become very difficult to erect any semblance of protection against the onrush of foreign goods.

Perhaps the recent statement of Canada's new Prime Minister will bolster our chances of ruling out this new threat to the American coal industry. The Wall Street Journal for July 8 reported from Ottawa:

Canada's new conservative government hopes to switch 15 percent of the nation's imports from the United States to Great Britain in a move that could slice more than \$600 million a year from American exports now flowing into Canada at upward of \$4 billion annually. Canada's newly elected Prime Minister John Diefenbaker told a press conference the switch from United States to United Kingdom wares is the foundation of his proposal for a British Commonwealth conference he wants to hold here.

In the light of this declaration, it would seem a sensible and easy matter for the Federal Power Commission to refuse extension of the Canadian pipeline into American markets. If an explanation is needed, the FPC need only point out that the decision is in the interest of the general welfare of the United States.

On the assumption that the Commission will follow this patriotic course, let me say that thousands of coal miners and railroad workers in Kentucky and neighboring States will be highly appreciative of this wise and considerate decision.