

of the textile industry of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 541. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation and study of the textile industry of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MCINTIRE:

H. Res. 542. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation and study of the textile industry of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. Res. 543. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation and study of the textile industry of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. Res. 544. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation and study of the textile industry of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. Res. 545. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation and study of the textile industry of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the completion of the Corning Canal, and construction of the Red Bluff Diversion Dam; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the construction of a salt water conversion demonstration plant; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H. R. 12102. A bill for the relief of J. Paul Adams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 12103. A bill for the relief of Milunika Stevanovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 12104. A bill for the relief of Ivana Buek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 12105. A bill for the relief of Theodore A. Sames; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 12106. A bill for the relief of Samuel Abraham, John A. Carroll, Forrest E. Robinson, Thomas J. Sawyers, Jack Silmon, and David N. Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 12107. A bill for the relief of Martin Kirchner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 12108. A bill for the relief of Hannah Jane Jackson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H. R. 12109. A bill for the relief of Agnes Lorraine Pank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 12110. A bill for the relief of Miss Lillian Dunn (formerly Miss Lillian Oh); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 12111. A bill for the relief of Francesco Grisanzio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

583. By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Resolution of Orange County, N. Y., Board of Supervisors,

interceding with the Department of the Army in an effort to prevent a proposed reduction in the National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

584. By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York: Petition of Mrs. Lulu E. Nash, Oneida, N. Y., who submitted petitions from the many signers in the 34th Congressional District of New York State, favoring passage of S. 582 and H. R. 4835, bills to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages on the radio and TV; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

585. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Herbert C. Holdridge, Washington, D. C., relative to Frank Bednarz and others countersigning the petition of Herbert C. Holdridge, similar to others submitted as Nos. 500 and 545, and appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 26 and April 14, 1958, relating to being "for criminal action against the agents of the private corporation of the Federal Reserve bank and its collaborators"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

586. Also, petition of the president, Alaska National Guard Officers' Association, Anchorage, Alaska, relative to the Alaska National Guard expressing alarm and concern over the taking of salmon by Japanese nationals between 175° west and 170° east longitude; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

587. Also, petition of William Rapoport and others, Detroit, Mich., requesting passage of the bills H. R. 1008, H. R. 4523, and H. R. 4677, pertaining to the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

588. Also, petition of Alexander Meiklejohn, Berkeley, Calif., relative to Helen Lindgren and others endorsing the petition of Alexander Meiklejohn of Berkeley, Calif., relating to a redress of grievance pertaining to the House Committee on Un-American Activities, similar to one submitted as petition No. 351, dated January 7, 1958; to the Committee on Rules.

589. Also, petition of the chief clerk, Philadelphia City Council, Philadelphia, Pa., requesting Congress to override the veto by the President of the omnibus rivers, harbors, and flood control authorization bill; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Business Failures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COYA KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, there is an article in the April 18, 1958, issue of U. S. News & World Report which should cause widespread interest and concern. It begins on page 83. Its title is "Recession's Toll: 45 to 50 Firms a Day."

The part that immediately struck my eye was this:

Failures in States around the Great Lakes held close to 1957 levels in the first 2 months of 1958, but now, on the basis of weekly reports, have risen sharply over a year ago.

In speaking of the rising rates of failures, the U. S. News article asserts:

Failures among retail clothing stores are running about 15 percent higher than a year ago. Liabilities involved in these failures are about double the volume of a year ago.

There is a considerable increase in the number of eating and drinking places going broke, indicating that people are eating out less often, taking more meals at home.

Failures are nearly half again as high among stores selling hardware and building materials.

While casualties among furniture stores are running about the same as in 1957, there is a considerable increase in the liabilities of the firms that are failing.

Overall, failures among retailers are up more than 13 percent over a year ago and there is an even bigger increase—34 percent—in liabilities involved.

Failures are higher than a year ago among wholesalers of food and farm products, apparel, dry goods, lumber, building materials, and hardware.

In manufacturing, failures are up for lumber, paper, leather and leather products, coal mining, and iron and steel products.

Now to go back to the lead paragraphs of this U. S. News article:

On an average day in this recession period, 45 to 50 American firms close their doors and go out of business.

If the present rate continues through the year, more than 14,000 businesses will go to the wall in 1958. This will be the highest annual total in nearly 20 years.

So far in 1958, business failures are running 12 percent higher than in 1957 and 27 percent higher than in 1956.

In addition to the businesses going broke, others in growing numbers are closing down voluntarily, getting out while they are still solvent. Many others, hard pressed, are merging with competitors, hoping to make a go of it.

The increase in business failures, in general, is greatest among retailers.

Older firms, in business 10 years or longer, account for a growing share of failures.

Mr. Speaker, this trend in business failures is nothing new. A like situation prevailed in the late twenties and early thirties. In those days, as it is now, statistics had a way of hiding the grim facts. The U. S. News says that from 45 to 50 businesses a week are closing up shop in this recession. This amounts to one firm per State. On the surface, it does not sound like a catastrophe.

But let us go into it.

For instance, Peterson's Paper Mill—the main industry of a Minnesota county-seat town—closes its doors. The entire population of the town is around 3,000 people. The paper mill employs about 150 men. These 150, plus their

wives, plus their children, make up one-fifth of all the inhabitants. The usual customers stay away from Schultz's Hardware Store. The regulars do not show up at Red's Cafe. Schultz closes up. So does Red. Their customers begin to look worried every time they pass the First National Bank. That makes the officers of the bank look worried, too.

What has been a recession takes on the identifiable earmarks of a depression. A depression, as we well know, is a chain reaction of closed business places, bankrupt banks, and empty wallets.

It cannot be cured by having the owner of a family farm be a part-time farmer and a part-time town jobholder. Only part-time economists go for that.

It can be cured by doing everything humanly possible to stabilize the security of the family farm. If—and when—this is done, community and State and Nation can, once more, be brought back to prosperity.

Results of a Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I have recently concluded a poll among residents of the 39th Congressional District of New York, asking their opinions on 20 of the most important issues before the Nation. More than 7,000 persons replied to the questionnaire.

There has been great interest in the poll, among both the people whom I am privileged to represent and among many persons and groups outside my district. So that my colleagues and all these other interested persons and groups may have the benefit of the results of the poll, I include in the RECORD the results of the poll:

	Percentages		
	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Do you favor a greater Federal responsibility to increase science education?.....	67.6	28.5	3.9
2. Should Congress enact a Presidential disability law?.....	76.0	17.4	6.6
If such a law were passed, whom do you think should decide whether a President is disabled: (a) the Vice President (3.9); (b) the President's Cabinet (29.6); (c) a commission of executive and legislative officials (49.9); Undecided (16.6).			
3. Would you favor a system of pay television?.....	8.3	87.7	4.0
4. Do you favor extending statehood to—			
(a) Hawaii?.....	81.7	12.5	5.8
(b) Alaska?.....	85.3	9.0	5.7
5. Do you favor an increase in postal rates to reduce the annual postal service deficit?.....	70.1	26.3	3.6
6. Do you favor a pay increase for—			
(a) Postal workers?.....	58.7	32.1	9.2
(b) Other Federal Government employees?.....	34.4	49.6	16.0
7. Should Congress enact legislation to provide Federal regulation of welfare and pension funds now under—			
(a) Union control?.....	66.2	24.1	9.7
(b) Employer control?.....	50.5	36.4	13.1
8. Should the Federal minimum-wage law be amended to—			
(a) Raise the present \$1 hourly rate?.....	46.8	46.8	6.4
(b) Extend coverage to more workers?.....	72.1	17.7	10.2
9. Should the social-security law be amended to—			
(a) Abolish the present annual \$1,200 ceiling on earnings?.....	47.8	35.5	16.7
(b) Raise the \$1,200 ceiling?.....	60.1	22.5	17.4
10. Do you favor increasing the present \$4,200 social-security tax base, and the tax contributions, if benefits also are raised?.....	53.1	38.4	8.5
11. Do you favor reducing nonmilitary Federal spending to permit a tax cut?.....	62.1	30.8	7.1
12. Do you favor a wider farm price support formula of 60 to 90 percent of parity and an increase in acreage allotments, instead of the present 75 to 90 percent of parity?.....	27.6	52.1	20.3
13. Should these provisions of the agricultural Soil Bank program be continued:			
(a) The conservation reserve?.....	41.6	34.1	24.3
(b) The acreage reserve?.....	25.2	48.1	26.7
14. Should atomic energy for peaceful purposes be developed by (a) the Federal Government (11.1); (b) private enterprise (27.3); (c) a partnership of both (57.3); Undecided (4.3).			
15. Do you favor the proposed multibillion dollar program for construction of civil defense shelters?.....	26.3	64.9	8.8
16. Should we continue our foreign aid programs of—			
(a) Military assistance?.....	56.3	33.1	10.6
(b) Economic assistance?.....	60.6	30.3	9.1
17. Should the United States exchange atomic-weapons information with our allies?.....	58.2	32.1	9.7
18. Do you favor closer cooperation with NATO countries in political, economic, and cultural fields, in addition to our military alliance?.....	80.1	13.8	6.1
19. Do you favor increased cultural and commercial relations with Russia?.....	52.6	39.1	8.3
20. Do you believe the United States should seek new negotiations now with Russia on disarmament and world political problems?.....	57.9	34.2	7.9

Israel's Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, on May 14, 1948, when the courageous and farsighted Zionist leaders in Palestine proclaimed the birth of the State of Israel, they took the destinies of the

Jewish nation into their own hands. At the time this seemed a daring and somewhat dangerous act. Today, 10 years after that momentous and epoch-making event, it is abundantly clear that their courage paid off. In a single decade Israel has moved from a struggling newborn state to a powerful political and cultural force in the Middle East. Israel is not only a safe haven for refugee Jews, but also a model democratic state in a sea of ancient feudal countries.

Our friendship and respect for Israel continued as we have seen the desert blossom and a democratic society spring

up in a part of the world that knows mostly feudal and autocratic governments. It is widely recognized that Israel has used American foreign aid to better advantage than any other state in the Middle East. A well-educated, industrious people they have set forth with the enthusiasm and vision that only pioneers can muster to their cause. They have worked hard and have built a thriving modern nation where formerly there was little but desert, poverty, and disease.

But there is also a close friendship between our two countries because of the compatibility between our deepest national interests. We share a common interest, the development and preservation of international conditions that make it possible for democratic societies to grow and to survive.

On the anniversary celebration of Israel's Independence Day, I wish them more power and full success in their efforts to make the desert bloom and to provide security for their people.

States Rights—The Law of the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, Charles J. Bloch, of the Georgia bar, has written a timely, significant, and moving book entitled "States Rights—The Law of the Land," which is worthy of notice by every student of constitutional history and law. A review of this book, written by me, appeared in the Winston-Salem (N. C.) Journal and Sentinel on April 20, 1958. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the review be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the review was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MEANING OF STATES RIGHTS

(By SAM J. ERVIN, JR., United States Senator)

Charles J. Bloch, of the Georgia bar, is deeply versed in history and law. He loves and understands the Constitution of the United States. He knows it was designed to establish an indissoluble union composed of indestructible States.

While attending a Congressional committee hearing a year ago, Mr. Bloch was amazed to hear a Congressman voice the astounding statement that the doctrine of States rights "is the very warp and woof of the philosophy underlying the Communist system." He concluded on the spot that it was high time * * * someone tried to tell the American people the facts of history upon which the doctrine of States rights is based.

The American people are, indeed, fortunate that Mr. Bloch did not leave this task to others. He devoted to its performance his enlightened mind, his understanding heart, his vast learning, and a tremendous research in historical and legal fields.

The result is the recently published *States Rights—The Law of the Land*, a compact volume of 381 pages (The Harrison Co.,

\$10) whose lucid and luminous language is readily understandable to lawyers and laymen alike.

SIGNIFICANT VOLUME

The book is timely, significant, and moving. It merits a place in the library of every American who believes that the destiny of this Nation ought not to be dictated by non-elected Supreme Court judges who forsake their proper sphere of action to usurp and exercise constitutional powers belonging to other departments of the Federal Government and the States.

The able and eloquent author analyzes with commendable clarity and conciseness historical facts, the Constitution of the United States, and relevant decisions of the Supreme Court to document and establish these fundamental propositions:

1. The States do not look to the Federal Government as the source of their powers. The reverse is true. The Thirteen Original States became self-governing Commonwealths 13 years before George Washington's first inauguration as President. These sovereign States created the Federal Government. They did this by a Constitution, which delegated to the Federal Government the specific powers necessary to enable it to discharge its limited functions as a central government, and reserved to the States the general powers necessary to enable them to regulate their internal affairs. To make the retention by the States of their reserved powers doubly sure, the First Congress and the States inserted in the Constitution the 10th amendment, which declares in words of utmost simplicity that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

SOVEREIGNTY ESSENTIAL

The preservation of the sovereignty of the States, within the limits of their constitutional powers, is essential to the preservation of our system of Government. To preserve the sovereignty of the States, the Constitution and the great decisions of the Supreme Court of former days established three cardinal rules to govern the judges of the Supreme Court in judging State action or State legislation. The first rule is that the Supreme Court is not concerned with the desirability or wisdom of State action or State legislation. These are matters exclusively for State determination. The second rule is that in passing on the constitutionality of State action or State legislation, the only question for the Supreme Court to decide is whether such action or legislation is within the scope of the reserved powers of the State. The third rule is that the Supreme Court is not to hold State action or State legislation unconstitutional unless the conclusion to that effect is unavoidable.

3. During the past 20 years a majority of the Judges of the Supreme Court have been men who had no judicial experience whatever and little actual experience as general practitioners of law before their respective appointments to the Supreme Court. Instead of adhering to the sound rules designed to preserve the sovereignty of the States, these judges have been instrumental in handing down decision after decision invalidating as unconstitutional State action and State legislation simply because they deemed such action and legislation undesirable or unwise.

GROWING THREAT SEEN

4. Our system of Government will survive only if affirmative action is taken to prevent further inroads by the majority of the Supreme Court on the constitutional powers of the States. This action ought to be twofold in nature. The Senate should reject all future appointees to the Supreme Court save those whose past judicial or legal experiences makes it certain that they will carry

with them to that high bench the qualifications and temperaments indispensable to the proper discharge of judicial duties; and the Congress should enact legislation restricting the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and inferior Federal courts and revitalizing the 10th amendment.

When the reader lays down this book, he instinctively joins in the prayer implicit in the author's dedication: "To my grandsons, for them and those of their age, my hope is that constitutional government may survive."

Fiftieth Anniversary of Discovery of the North Pole, April 21, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call attention to the following statement prepared by Mr. Robert Holder, of Snyder, N. Y. April 21, 1958, is the 50th anniversary of that date when Dr. Frederick A. Cook, a resident of New York State, discovered the North Pole and claimed it for the United States.

Dr. Frederick Albert Cook gave out the first descriptions of the North Pole which were published in the New York Herald of September 2, 1909.

Five days later, on September 6, 1909, Robert Peary announced that he had reached the North Pole on April 6, 1909. It is important to note this second conquest of the pole a year later.

If there is ever any dispute concerning the ownership of the North Pole, we can claim the top of the Arctic by the right of discovery by two brave Americans. The strategic importance of the Arctic is known to every schoolboy today; 50 years ago it was an almost useless mystery.

Arctic interest has been stimulated by the scientists during this International Geophysical Year when many nations are seeking the answer to the many Arctic mysteries. The work of the pioneer explorers serves as a springboard for present-day research. I would like to mention some highlights of Dr. Cook's epic journey across the unknown Arctic wastes.

In an airline measurement the distance from his Greenland camp is about 700 miles. This distance was for him to be extended to a walk of 4,000 miles over land and sea with the shadow of death daily on the horizon. It was the longest sledging record in history.

Dr. Cook's reaching the North Pole was the result of precision planning. Profiting from his studies of the work of other explorers he concluded that previous failures had been due to too heavy equipment and the attempt to maintain large parties. His equipment was specially designed. Hickory was taken to Greenland where the sledges were constructed. His special sled was the result of over 10 years' experimenta-

tion which started when Amundsen and Cook served their apprenticeship together on the Belgian Antarctic Expedition, 1897-99. It is significant that both these men, who apparently were made of the same stuff, reached the extremities of the earth because of streamlining their equipment—Amundsen, South Pole, 1911; Cook, North Pole, 1908.

Dr. Cook knew that, because of ice conditions, April was the best month and that a dash was important. He was certain that a small party could travel faster.

The expedition consisted of 2 Eskimos, young and in their prime; 26 dogs; 2 sleds loaded with 800 pounds apiece; and the leader, Dr. Cook, who was 43 and in perfect condition. They reached their goal in 34 days, sledging an average of 15 miles a day. These 520 miles were endless days of torture, of extreme thirst and slow starvation. Their ration of a pound of pemmican daily was not enough and their bodies slowly wasted away. They did not mind the cold which ranged as low as -50° but suffered from the bitter gale winds which peeled their skin from their cheeks and noses. It was a lifeless world, with no radios, no airplanes, no means of communicating with the world, and no hope of rescue. It is a story of forced marches beyond human endurance, yet the will and the mind somehow gave them the courage and strength for an almost impossible task.

Cook's route was over game lands discovered by Sverdrup, which gave the North Pole seekers another advantage. The liberal diet of raw meat kept the three men in top trim.

After the pole was reached there was the trip back. Instead of the return being easy, as it was expected it turned out to be the most heart-rending part of the entire trek. The story of the return is perhaps more exciting and pathetic than the dash for the pole.

Dr. Frederick A. Cook wrote two books about his North Pole experiences: *My Attainment of the Pole*, and *Return from the Pole*, and every American would do well to read these inspiring tales of what was perhaps one of the most heroic exploits in Arctic exploration, if not in the history of all exploration.

Surplus Foods for Needy Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. BROWN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, among the many problems that plague the Nation—our gravest domestic problem, I think, is that we have too many people trying to pay 1958 living costs with a 1948 income. People who established their social security or railroad retirement base when the average annual wage in this country was \$1,000 are caught in a vice. People getting a \$55-a-month old age assistance check—or \$60 from the Veterans' Administra-

tion—are, too. A young industrial worker, temporarily unemployed, trying to keep a big family of growing youngsters together on a \$30-a-week unemployment compensation check, is in the same vice.

Just the bare necessities of life—food, clothing, and shelter—have become a nightmarish problem to some 20 million American people.

For years, the retired and disabled have clung fast to the hope that, sooner or later, the cost of living will come back around to their level.

But it has been over a decade now since the inflation spiral started. Every day, we get more and more on a wartime footing—more and more of a wartime economy; and the end is nowhere in sight.

We are a Nation renowned for its abundance and its capacity to produce; but we have always had trouble distributing what we produce.

In recent years some progress has been made in housing, especially in the cities. Public housing projects have provided some of our retired people with shelter at discount prices. But too many of our people are trying to exist on inadequate diets. To them, food is a problem.

It is absurd for even one person to be hungry or on a totally inadequate diet when the Nation's Government is accumulating and maintaining stockpiles of surplus foodstuffs.

Surely, within the framework of our free enterprise system, there is some way to get our food surplus into the stomachs of those who need and should have it.

Every once in awhile, I hear the Secretary of Agriculture say that he wants to get some of this blessing of abundance into the mouths of people instead of in Government warehouses.

The Secretary has made some commendable progress in getting his surplus food into foreign mouths—at a 50 percent discount under Public Law 480.

But we are making no progress at all getting this food into 20 million American mouths—the pensioned, the needy, and the unemployed. There is no 50 percent discount for our own—that is only for the Pakistanians, the Japanese, the Yugoslavs, and others overseas.

I question the wisdom of this foreign discount policy not alone on the grounds that charity begins at home. I think we are overlooking a real opportunity for expanding the American farmer's market here at home, and the Government is buying the food, anyway.

Any good sales promotion manager would probably take one look at what we are doing and say: "Look—you are so fascinated with the green grass on the other side of the ocean that you are ignoring completely the best territory you have for increasing food sales.

"Get to work on these 20 million pensioners, disabled, and unemployed Americans who have been forced to cut down to one-half the milk they really want, or who are buying a half-dozen eggs when they really want to buy a dozen. There is your sales opportunity.

"And do not kid yourself that you will get the business by cutting the price one-

half cent or one cent. Go after it the way the soap companies do—with a coupon operation. That is one of the fastest sales stimulators there is."

Mr. Speaker, this committee is holding hearings on a food-stamp program. At long last, the Congress is getting down to business on a device by which this Nation can extend to 20 million deserving people a cost-of-living pension raise, in the form of a food-coupon program that will really stimulate sales and consumption of some farm commodities—a double-barrel job, if it is done right.

Now, what kind of a program would it have to be, to be right?

Well, I am no expert, but let us think together a little bit:

First, it must be handled through established channels of trade. We believe in the free-enterprise system and we must not circumvent or injure processors, wholesalers, or retailers.

Second, the regular channels of trade are familiar with coupons. They redeem and cash in coupons at grocery stores all over America every day. Why not call the program a food coupon plan instead of a food stamp plan?

Third, if we expect the program to increase per capita consumption—and I feel it should—there is where we get into merchandising.

I respectfully suggest that food coupons should not cover 100 percent of the retail price of a quart of milk or a pound of butter, except in cases of dire need. The coupon should be good for 50 percent of the retail price and the purchaser pays the other 50 percent in cash.

In this way, coupons can be distributed to twice as many worthy people for the same redemption cost; and it would stimulate more net increase in total food consumption.

If 20 million purchasers went into stores with coupons worth 12 cents on a 24-cent quart of milk, you would get more real stimulation into milk consumption than if 10 million purchasers went in with coupons worth 24 cents on a 24-cent quart of milk.

A per capita increase of 10 quarts of milk a year, multiplied by 20 million people is a total increase of 200 million quarts. But if the coupons were made redeemable for 100 percent of the retail price and thereby could be made available only to 10 million people, even if consumption increased 15 quarts each—the total increase would be less.

In instances where the sole purpose is relieving dire need, where people have no money, coupons would have to be worth full retail value. But to do the double-barrel job of getting food to people who cannot buy enough of it and at the same time stimulate consumption for producers—I wonder if the coupons should not be good for 50 percent of the retail value, with the purchaser putting up 50 percent of the retail price in cash.

There is another reason for the 50-percent-of-retail price coupon; and that is the farm value of surplus foodstuffs that best lend themselves to a food-coupon program represents less than 50 percent of the retail cost of the food through normal trade channels.

A coupon good for 24 cents on a 24-cent quart of milk actually is getting into consumption only about 10 cents worth of farm surplus milk. There is 14 cents for processing, transporting, distributing, and so forth.

Now, if you could move that quart of milk into consumption with a 12-cent coupon and 12 cents consumer's cash, the Government coupon is about the equivalent of what the CCC will pay for that much dried milk to put it in a warehouse.

And do not underestimate the power of a 12-cent coupon to get a housewife to purchase a 24-cent quart of milk, or a 40-cent coupon to get her to purchase an 80-cent package of flour.

The soap companies, the coffee blenders, the cereal manufacturers can prove to you that it works.

This is a way to stimulate increased consumption and take a big step forward toward eating our way out of some of this surplus production.

Now, everyone knows that it will not make any real dent in the 1 billion bushels of corn or the 900 million bushels of wheat now owned by the CCC.

Coupons cannot solve the problem-crop difficulties which plague us.

Certain commodities will lend themselves to a food-coupon program; and others will not. But let's not give up on the food stamp idea just because every commodity might not fit into it. Let us take those that do fit and see how it works.

The commodities that lend themselves most favorably to a food-stamp program, in my opinion, are fluid milk and cream, butter, cheese, wheat flour, dried beans, poultry meat and eggs, and red meat.

Right now the CCC does not own any red meat, poultry meat, or eggs. They do hold quantities of every other commodity I mentioned, and are apt to acquire additional quantities at any minute.

Now what about costs?

Here is what the average American spends at retail price for the following foodstuffs, now in surplus:

Commodity:	Per year
Fluid milk.....	\$34.90
Cream.....	4.35
Butter.....	6.30
Cheese.....	4.85
Wheat flour.....	4.70
Dried beans.....	1.05
Cornmeal.....	1.05
Oatmeal.....	.55
Rice.....	1.05

Retail expenditures per capita for other foodstuffs run approximately:

Product:	Per year
Eggs.....	\$16.80
Broiler meat.....	8.40
Turkey.....	1.63
Red meat.....	85.00

The average American consumes about 14 quarts of fluid milk a year. This is an average. Obviously, many people drink more than 14 quarts a month.

Chances are, our pensioners and our needy did not drink 7 quarts of milk a month last year. But if they got \$1.50 worth of food coupons each month with their Government check—the coupons good for one-half price on each quart—they could buy their 14 quarts for the

same amount of cash they have been spending for 7 quarts.

This would be really expanding markets. And the program can be as big or as small as Congress wishes to make it.

If the 5.5 million people now receiving public assistance were to receive coupons for milk, and flour, and other products now in Government surplus, and each got \$29.40 a year—the cost of the food coupon program would total \$165 million a year—or about \$75–\$80 million more than it costs the Government to hold the food in storage as is done now.

Actually, it may not run even this much, because present surplus disposal policies, wherein the food is sold in foreign markets at a 50-percent discount plus ocean transportation costs, are quite costly.

Personally, I would like to see this coupon program include more people. Everyone in the lower brackets of social-security retirement, railroad retirement, veterans, unemployment compensation, and so forth, need it.

There are some 16 million receiving retirement, disability, and survivor benefit checks from United States Government agencies.

Say, 8 million of them get less than \$30 a month. They could well be included in this program and not exceed the \$1 billion authorized.

For less than \$200 million a year, the unemployed could get a 50-percent discount on food in surplus. Why not coordinate this program with any changes in unemployment compensation now under consideration?

Milk, cheese, butter, flour, cornmeal, eggs, and poultry meat could move into the mouths of 20 million deserving Americans—our disabled, blind, our needy, and our sorely pressed retired. Instead of piling it up in warehouses, or selling it all to the Japanese or Pakistanis at a 50-percent discount, we could sell some of it to 20 million of our own people at the same 50-percent discount.

Surely, we can summon enough wisdom among us to devise a food-coupon program that will help alleviate some inflation problems and move surplus food into American stomach instead of storage.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, many of our fellow citizens of Polish ancestry will celebrate, on May 3, the 167th anniversary of the enactment of Poland's Constitution by the Polish Diet in Warsaw, in 1791. Exercises in commemoration of that historic action will be held in most of the Polish communities throughout the world—outside of Poland itself. I doubt that the Communists who rule there will permit any public

demonstrations but I am certain that their constitution day will be honored in the minds and hearts of the Poles now, unhappily, living under the Communist yoke.

I suspect that the average American of non-Polish background believes that Pulaski and Kosciuszko, heroes of the American Revolution, provide our principal links to Poland. Those two distinguished soldiers gave substantial help in the founding of our Republic, but the contribution of men and women of Polish blood did not end with them by any means. Over the years Polish brains have enriched our literature, our science, and our art; Polish valor has strengthened our fighting forces; and Polish skill and brawn have helped build our cities and our industrial plants. And, although Polish immigrants brought with them a passionate love of individual liberty, they left in their homeland as much dedication to freedom as they brought, and that dedication was forcefully expressed in the constitution enacted more than a century and a half ago. On the eve of their Constitution Day anniversary we should express our appreciation and gratitude to the Polish people for their long devotion to liberty.

Poland has a long and glorious history. Since it emerged as a nation in the middle of the 10th century a number of attempts have been made by aggressive neighbors to assimilate it. But the spirit of free Poland outlasted the czarist, Hapsburg, and Hohenzollern Empires. As we now congratulate our friends of Polish blood on their Constitution Day anniversary, we do so with confidence that free Poland will outlast the Communist Empire and eventually resume its place in the family of nations under a government of its own free choice.

The Old Quest for Peace in the New Age of Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address entitled "The Old Quest for Peace in the New Age of Science," which I delivered before the 11th Annual Borah Foundation Conference, at the University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho, on March 20, 1958.

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

THE OLD QUEST FOR PEACE IN THE NEW AGE OF SCIENCE

(Address by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON)

I deeply appreciate the invitation to come to the University of Idaho and to participate in your annual Borah conference.

I do not know of a more appropriate group before which to discuss the quest for peace in this perilous age.

For 11 years now this forum has given its participants new insights into foreign policy and the problems of peace. Indeed, this conference has achieved a well-earned national reputation.

As we meet, satellites are flying through the air above us. Newspapers are filled with H-bombs, outer space, intercontinental missiles, antimissile missiles, and anti-anti-anti-missile missiles.

In truth, everywhere we turn in the question of war and peace, we see the influence of science. There is no doubt that science has greatly complicated the problem of keeping the peace.

As one commentator put it: "The road to hell is paved with good inventions."

Gone are our two precious allies of the past, time in which to mobilize, and distance to protect our homeland. Today whatever force is required, either to deter war or to win it if deterrence fails, must be on hand, ready at all times.

On the other side of the world, we face an adversary who is deliberately determined to use science and technology as the handmaiden of ultimate world conquest.

As a result of Soviet advance in science and technology, they now challenge us across the board, in military prowess, in science, in economic and political affairs, in education, in person-to-person relations, indeed in about every area of activity.

It almost goes without saying that we must meet the material challenge by producing enough weapons, launching satellites, overcoming recessions, and increasing the rate of our industrial growth and development.

These are the dramatic things which we must do.

But there is real danger that we will think of this contest as only one of: number of planes against number of planes, range of missile against range of missile, size of satellite against size of satellite.

I'd like to talk with you now about a very undramatic, very commonplace, very obvious thing—and yet the most important thing of all—people.

The history of international politics, when you come down to the essence of it, is the history of individual human beings.

What are their loyalties? How hard will they work? What ultimately matters is what human beings believe in and how well they labor for it.

What counts is what a farmer in some remote Indian village, some university student in troubled Indonesia, or some civil servant in the new state of Ghana, believes and does.

There are over 2 billion people in the world. Roughly one-third follow Moscow. Another one-third follow the free way of life, the traditional centers of which are North America and free Europe. The final one-third are the uncommitted peoples across the broad sweep of the Afro-Asian area.

What matters is this: Will Moscow be able to hold the people behind the Iron Curtain and keep them working effectively and productively?

Will the Free World be able to hold itself together, with its people working effectively and productively?

And what will happen to the uncommitted peoples?

At this point we face a great paradox. On the one hand, we have our free tradition saying that the individual is everything, the individual person is what counts. On the other hand, we have Marxism saying that individual people are nothing and that all that matters are the laws of history. Yet despite this, it is the Soviets, more than we, that in practice seem to realize what really matters—people.

Look how they appeal to the ordinary person's hunger for peace. By a remarkable public relations job Khrushchev persuades many people that the Soviet system has

really changed since Stalin's day, into something less dangerous.

Take the recent example of Hungary—turning loose brutal murderers one day, turning loose the dove of peace the next. Within weeks after the enormous blood-letting in Hungary, the Kremlin was back in business cooling peace, and getting people to believe it.

Khrushchev's refrain seldom varies: "We want peace and the other side wants war," a heady tune for peoples who yearn for a future of peace and progress.

Not so long ago, the Kremlin showed no concern for other peoples—except to support Communist factions abroad. Today, however, Moscow gives the impression of being concerned with everyone. Anyone who is not aggressively against them is called friend. Khrushchev courts non-Communists, like Sukarno and Nehru, every bit as diligently as Stalin once courted his Communist agents.

Last January, a Gallup poll in New Delhi, India, asked this question: "Which is doing more to help peace in the world, Russia or the West?" The answers came out this way: Russia 54 percent; West 18 percent; don't know 28 percent. Note the ratio: 3 to 1 for Russia.

Another recent Gallup poll asked citizens of 12 world capitals: "Who is ahead in the cold war, Russia or the West?" The answers came out this way: Russia was rated ahead in 10 capitals, in some cases by 4 or 5 to 1, among those who gave definite answers. The West was rated ahead in only two capitals.

Around the whole globe today we are clearly on the defensive.

How has this happened?

One reason is that Moscow uses deliberate lies as a matter of policy and manages to fool many people a lot of the time.

A second reason is that we are an open society—we live in a goldfish bowl. People can see not only what is right with us, but everything that is wrong with us. People cannot easily see what is wrong with Moscow. Moscow lets the rest of the world see only what she wants them to see. No reports of the ruthless purges are issued by the Kremlin press. No accounts of the Siberian prison camps ever get through Kremlin censorship.

A third reason for our difficulty is that Moscow is consciously and deliberately going about being nice to people—ready to snap the trap shut when the time comes. The voice of Moscow is perhaps the least important weapon in the Soviet arsenal.

Rising Soviet industrial strength gives Moscow goods and brains for export, and Soviet leaders now exploit economic aid as an instrument of political warfare. More than 2,000 Soviet technicians are at work among the uncommitted peoples. Moscow has welcomed a steady stream of visitors from Asia and Africa for training programs behind the Iron Curtain.

A fourth reason for our defensive position is that Russian experience is just a generation away from that of the uncommitted peoples. Only recently the Soviet Union was a backward, feudal, and underdeveloped country, too. Persons in less well-developed countries are encouraged by Soviet experience, partly because it is closer to their own.

By contrast our experience as an old industrial nation seems very far ahead of theirs. The American standard of living is roughly 3 times as high as the Englishman's, 6 times as high as the Italian's, 11 times as high as the Turk's, 18 times as high as the Peruvian's; but it is 40 times as high as the Indonesian's.

When President Sukarno went to Moscow he reportedly told Khrushchev: "You people are still close to your revolution. You've managed to rise from feudalism, just like we're trying to do. We have more in common with you than with the West."

Finally, our own ineptness contributes greatly to our difficulty. Too often we give the impression that the only people we care about are those who play the game our way. We insist that people be in our own image. We suffer from a kind of national superiority complex. What America needs most is to learn the meaning of humility.

Take for example a familiar attitude toward allies. We expect allies to agree with us and to do what we want. We object when they don't. Yet this pressure to conform only alienates our good friends.

After all our allies are independent nations with their own special concerns. They are, and should be, free to take positions which differ from ours on many issues.

We need allies. But we want allies, not satellites.

As another example, take a familiar attitude toward neutral nations. We think that neutrals are somehow not playing fair. We want them to choose sides once and for all and join our coalition.

When, however, we try to drag them into alliance with us, we simply drive them further away.

The underdeveloped countries are not pawns in the power game, as some Americans think. They are young nations with interests and goals of their own. Burdened by pressing domestic problems, a nation like India prefers neutrality to the added cares of an alliance.

Soft neutrals who become overdependent on Communist help are a hazard. Hard neutrals, however, who recognize the full danger of Russian tactics are not a hazard, so long as they remain as independent of Moscow as they do of us.

Granted that we now find ourselves on the defensive, what are we going to do about it?

First of all, we must alter our own basic attitude. We should stop trying to mold other peoples in our own image.

Moscow tells people to be themselves, but what she really means is for them to be Communists. We too often say, "be like us," when all we need say is "be yourselves."

We should adopt the principles of the good politician. A good politician recognizes that different groups have diverse interests. He makes it his business to understand the state of mind of his constituents. He gets around to learn what people are thinking. He finds out what they want and tries to help them reach their goals. Where possible, he strives to assist each group in pursuit of its objectives.

Ladies and gentlemen, this approach to other peoples has important implications for our entire foreign policy. I believe that if we took this approach seriously, we could get off the defensive. We could promote programs that will gain us the friendship and respect of other peoples.

Let me suggest three particular programs, which I feel deserve our most urgent attention.

First, we should substantially increase our technical cooperation program, and make it a vehicle of our traditional respect for human dignity and liberty.

The proposed technical assistance program for fiscal 1959 is very modest. It would cost only \$163,500,000. I think we are missing a great opportunity and that we should expand the export of technical know-how to help people help themselves.

An increase in this area could be offset by reductions in military and economic aid. We get a better return for our dollars if we encourage more person-to-person cooperation and give less in the form of handouts.

Our friends abroad want material help. But they look also for intellectual and spiritual inspiration. Their hearts as well as their economic systems need a lift. One way to meet this need is to promote programs in which we work with other people rather than just do something for them.

Why should not our technical assistance program send thousands of Americans abroad each year to work together with the uncommitted peoples and so help strengthen the basis of common humanity that unites all people of good will? As nurses, doctors, soil conservationists, experts in mental health, and engineers, they could demonstrate by dedicated labor their genuine concern for the welfare of the people.

I wish we could arrange for large numbers of our young people, who are fresh from their college and technical training, to go abroad say for a term of 2 years.

No person should be recruited for the program simply because of his or her technical competence. Participants should also have these qualities: first, a catching idealism; second, an interest in people for their own sakes—they should genuinely want those with whom they will live and work to be better off and happier, irrespective of the Soviet threat; and third, they should be looking for contributions which others can make, treating their work as a two-way street.

In summary, participants in the program should be guided by the true spirit of humility.

This country need not and should not carry the sole burden of an expanded technical cooperation program among the uncommitted peoples. The entire NATO community can join in the effort.

There is a prevalent notion that unless America runs the show, America will not get the credit. But this is far from the case. Today, we are likely to gain more credit if we do not insist on doing it all ourselves, but rather join in genuinely common undertakings.

There is no more important task than speeding common scientific and technical programs within the NATO alliance. Such programs will promote the security and welfare of the Atlantic Community. They will also assure a greater reservoir of brains and know-how for technical cooperation in Asia and Africa.

Second, we should expand the exchange-of-persons programs in the Free World, and offer a full-scale person-to-person exchange program to the Soviets.

We have many excellent exchange-of-persons programs in the Free World, including the highly successful Fulbright program. But we could do far more than we are doing.

The best way to learn what other people are thinking and hoping is to go to see them, talk to them, and live among them. The best way for people to find out what we are really like is to come to see us.

When Nehru visited this country he went to see some of our most advanced welfare institutions, an insane asylum, a community center, and a public school. He reportedly commented: "If this is really typical of America, then I have certainly misunderstood you."

This is not the occasion to discuss the details of a greater exchange effort. I believe every proven and workable program should be pushed, both those financed by private money and those supported from public funds.

What I want to emphasize today is this: We should not limit our exchange efforts to the Free World. I believe we should offer the Russians a full-scale person-to-person exchange.

We may find that Moscow wants only the present token program—a few students, a few technicians, orchestras and movie stars. Whatever the Soviets have in mind, however, we should be well out ahead of Moscow in our proposals.

Quite probably exchange programs with Communist countries will net few dividends for peace. But it makes sense to keep open the lines of communication with ordinary people behind the Iron Curtain.

During my trip to Russia in 1956 I was deeply impressed with the friendliness of everyday Russians. I had an opportunity to go into their homes and to meet them, both in European Russia and in Asiatic Russia. I found that the Soviet leaders had made little headway among their people in destroying the good name of Western people, despite 40 years of vicious propaganda.

Even people who fall under the sway of evil ideas are not necessarily evil persons. One can talk to them and exchange ideas in many areas outside the realm of politics.

Perhaps we can make some headway if we send skilled specialists to Russia, for example, in surgery, in mental health, in family welfare, in classical studies, and even folk songs. These people can talk to their counterparts in Russia without becoming involved in ideological controversy. Some common understanding might be developed in fields of common interest. Certainly Soviet political ideology will be the last area to yield to any reconciliation.

Why should we not challenge Russia to give 50 Indian leaders the chance to go behind the Iron Curtain and then have those same 50 leaders come to visit us?

If Moscow accepted such a proposal, all to the good. If Moscow rejected it, still we could not lose. Neutral nations would be treated to a demonstration that Russian talk of freedom is a pretty shallow thing.

I am proposing that we maintain pressure on the Russians—that we keep them on the defensive in this field where they deserve to be on the defensive. Of all countries, America should never be caught reluctant to open its doors to those who want to visit us and get to know us.

Third, we should strengthen our education in the social and humanistic studies, including foreign languages, and assure ourselves the tools for working with other peoples.

Since sputnik we have heard a good deal of talk about our deficiencies in science education. These deficiencies are, indeed, serious and need correction. We cannot afford to be second best in technological progress.

Equally, however, we cannot afford to ignore the disciplines which can help us turn our technological progress to the benefit of mankind. A renaissance is needed in the teaching of the social and humanistic studies in history, economics, literature, philosophy, and foreign languages.

Every American should be steeped in the humane tradition including scientists, engineers, and technicians, themselves. When the critical issues lie, as they do today, in the area of the relation of science to human behavior, then science training by itself is not enough.

In particular, I want to urge greater foresight and greater effort in the study of foreign languages.

Compared to the Soviet Union we are doing a fifth-rate job in language training.

An estimated 10 million Russians are studying English. Less than 8,000 Americans are studying Russian.

Every child in a Soviet high school is required to study German, French, English, Spanish, or Latin. One-half of our American high schools do not even offer modern languages. In the American high schools which do offer foreign languages, less than 15 percent of the students take them.

Russian universities teach well over 40 different foreign languages including Manchurian, Uigur, and the Burmese, Vietnamese, Malayan, and Indonesian languages. I might point out that Russian universities also have to teach the 17 native languages spoken in the Soviet Union.

Some of the Russian grade schools now even instruct 8- and 9-year-olds in Chinese, Hindi, Arabic, Parsi, and Urdu.

One can almost anticipate what countries are next on the Soviet calendar of conquest from their language curriculum.

America still lingers along emphasizing the colonial languages, French and German. How unimaginative can we be to send our emissaries to the former colonial areas speaking only the language of the old rulers?

For example, Telugu is the language of 33 million people in India. Not six people in this country, however, can read a newspaper in Telugu. Yet members of a Soviet delegation arriving in India can speak it and read it.

In person-to-person contacts Americans should talk the native languages, even the dialects. We should equip our technicians to meet the village chief at his door, address him in his own tongue, and offer to work with him on a project he holds dear. This would promptly make us a new friend.

To prepare for mastery of a language one needs one elementary text, preferably with accompanying tapes or phonograph records, as well as a student dictionary and a series of graded readers. These works take years to produce and require the talents of highly trained linguistic scholars. And until these materials are available there is no possibility to teach the language on a sound basis.

Yet today there are about 40 important languages of Asia alone for which our working tools are sketchy or nonexistent.

Urgent steps should be taken to put this country's language-study program in good shape. This will take a national effort. We need a long-range plan. Then we need coordination among all the interested public and private agencies to get the plan implemented.

In conclusion, let me say this:

The past is littered with the wreckage of nations that made only a material response to the challenge of their times. We must not make that mistake.

In our struggle with the Soviet Union we have one weapon which the Soviets do not have, and cannot have. That weapon is our democratic tradition of respect for human dignity and liberty.

The Kremlin can build the same planes and missiles we do, it may build even better ones. The Kremlin can use the slogans of freedom, it may even use them better. But it does not have the respect for human dignity and liberty that really counts.

Our greatest strength is our intellectual and spiritual heritage. May we, in our time, prove true to that heritage.

Report From Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, following is my regular report to my constituents in California's 25th Congressional District:

COMMUNIST CLOUDS OVER LATIN AMERICA

There is little doubt that the master strategy of the Kremlin now is directed at our friends in Latin America. The Communist plot was tellingly revealed by the demonstrations and riots that threatened the lives of our Vice President and his wife during their good will tour of South America. This tour has placed in sharp focus the following:

1. We can be proud of Vice President **RICHARD NIXON** and his wife for the remarkable courage, dignity, calmness, and diplomacy they displayed in the face of agitators who obviously were bent on destroying them.

2. Our policy toward our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere must be given a thorough reappraisal, for there was more to the demonstrations against the Nixons than just Communist agitation; there is economic distress in many of the countries to the south and it is absolutely necessary that our country take this into account on future foreign-aid programs.

3. Communist infiltration of the Western Hemisphere has abandoned the subtle technique and has reached the point of outright aggression against the institutions of personal freedom and liberty.

Again we can be proud of our outstanding constituents in the 25th Congressional District—Vice President and Mrs. Nixon.

RED MENACE STILL HERE

Recently the San Francisco Chronicle attacked me for my stand in support of the action of immigration officials in deporting one William Heikkila, an admitted Communist, to Finland. Some of you may have read about this case in the newspapers. It was claimed that Mr. Heikkila was deported without just cause; was spirited away in the dead of night while a court order was pending; that he had no opportunity to inform his wife or attorney of his arrest and that he could not speak or write the language of Finland, the country to which he was being deported; that he had no relatives there; and that the Congressional investigation of the case had only taken 1 hour. My investigation was termed another "red herring" in much the same manner as the Alger Hiss case. All of these allegations are false. The plain facts are that Heikkila has lived in the United States for 52 years without even bothering to become a citizen; that he has refused under oath, as late as December 1956, to tell whether he is or is not an agent of the Communist Party; that his arrest was perfectly legal, and that he was allowed to notify his family. As a lawyer, as a Congressman, and as a citizen, I have always believed in due process of law. For 11 years, Mr. Heikkila fought his case through the courts and even though an alien, had every benefit of our judicial system although he was dedicated to the overthrow of our Government. I predict that as a result of the continuing investigation of this case by my committee in the Congress, the evidence will show that Heikkila does not deserve to remain in our country and that the United States Immigration Service was perfectly justified in deporting him to his native Finland.

NUCLEAR TESTS SHOULD CONTINUE

There has been a clamor for the end of testing of nuclear weapons. I would subscribe to the end of such tests 100 percent if the Soviet Union would agree to an ironclad inspection plan. But the leaders of the Kremlin won't agree to inspection despite all the propaganda that has been pouring out of Moscow that Russia has ended such tests.

I have sponsored a resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that such tests should be continued by the Free World as long as the Soviet Union refuses to agree to a suitable inspection plan and presents a threat to the security, freedom, and liberty of peoples in the Free World.

Moreover, I checked with Adm. Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, on the safeguards being taken to reduce the hazard of radioactive fallout during the current experiments being undertaken at the Eniwetok Proving Ground in the mid-Pacific area.

Admiral Strauss told me: "Protection of health and safety is a primary consideration during the current tests. . . . The test series will advance the development of weapons for defense against aggression whether airborne, missile-borne, or otherwise

mounted. * * * Test operations will be conducted in a manner designed to keep as low as possible the public exposure to radiation arising from the detonation of nuclear weapons."

The Financing of Small Business—Long-Term and Equity Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the Republican members of the House Select Committee on Small Business yesterday introduced legislation amending the Small Business Act to provide long-term loans for small business in increased amounts and to provide an additional method to help small business secure equity capital. My bill is H. R. 12026. The other Republican members of this committee and their bill numbers are: Hon. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, of New York, H. R. 12027; Hon. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR., of Connecticut, H. R. 12028; Hon. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH, of Ohio, H. R. 12029; Hon. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, of Illinois, H. R. 12030; and Hon. ARCH A. MOORE, of West Virginia, H. R. 12031.

There is almost complete agreement that a practical way must be found to increase the availability of credit and risk capital to our small-business concerns. This does not mean for any particular endeavor, but it means for small-business concerns whether they are engaged in manufacturing, processing, wholesaling, retailing, or the service industries. The question is by what means or methods may the Federal Government properly assist in solving the financing problems of small business. There have been many approaches to the problem as is evidenced by the number of bills which have been introduced on this subject. Each bill has its good points; the question is which points outweigh others in making a final decision which the Congress will enact into law.

Many of us believe that the best approach is by amending existing legislation. The Small Business Administration, through its nationwide organization, is equipped to carry out the will of Congress when legislation is enacted for the financing of small business. At the present time it would seem that once a sound program has been decided upon, getting it into effective use at the earliest possible moment would be of the utmost importance.

STATE COOPERATION AND PARTICIPATION

The central core of our proposal is to have the Federal and State Governments working together in encouraging private capital to assist and finally take over the job of providing long-term loans and equity capital for the small-business sector of our economy. We propose that each State, Territory, and Commonwealth, 51 in all, establish under State law a development, investment, and credit corporation. It is contemplated that each State development, investment,

and credit corporation would operate under a State charter and would in turn be chartered by the Small Business Administration. Both long-term loans and equity capital would be provided through the State development, investment, and credit corporation. At the same time, none of the present duties of the Small Business Administration would be diminished. In fact, the responsibilities of the Small Business Administration would be materially increased.

INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT AND TERM OF SMALL-BUSINESS LOANS

We feel in making these proposals that it is important to the success of any plan to provide financing to small business that the term of the loans be of sufficient length and the loans be in sufficient amount to encourage the several State governments to cooperate and participate to the limit. Therefore, we propose that the maximum amount or regular small-business loans be increased from \$250,000 to \$500,000 and that the maximum maturity be extended from 10 to 15 years.

On the equity-capital side, the Federal Government is permitted to supply on a matching basis a maximum amount of \$5 million. This is the total which may be outstanding at any one time for each of the State development, investment, and credit corporations.

HELPING SMALL BUSINESS WITHIN A STATE

Our bill provides that under no circumstances can any of the money borrowed or invested be utilized to relocate a business concern. We believe this to be very important because the whole intent and purpose is to build up small business within the State and in localities within the State. We feel that if a concern desires to relocate, it should not be at the expense of the State or the Federal Government, but that the money should be otherwise provided.

EXPLANATION

The Republican members of the House Select Committee on Small Business believe that the best features of its bill are reflected through its simplicity; through the fact that a new agency does not need to be established; and through the fact that the Federal Government will be supplementing rather than replacing private financial institutions. In fact, the whole proposal contemplates private capital taking over this job as soon as is practicable. A short explanation and the bill follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

The first section provides that the act may be cited as the Small Business Investment and Development Act.

Section 2 sets forth the finding of Congress that the continuing growth and development of small business is essential to a sound national economy, but that such growth and development is impeded by the inability of small-business concerns (because of various factors, of which the principal ones are specifically stated) to obtain equity capital. It is therefore declared to be the policy of Congress and the purpose of the act to promote the sound development of small business by providing a source of such capital.

Section 3 adds a new subsection (c) to section 207 of the Small Business Act of 1953.

Paragraph (1) of the new subsection (c) authorizes the Small Business Administration to purchase investment securities issued by State development investment and credit corporations and having specified rates of interest and maturities. The administration could not hold investment securities of any such corporation in an amount exceeding \$5 million at any one time and purchases of such securities by the Administration would have to be matched by other purchasers of such corporation's securities.

Paragraph (2) provides that the Administration shall not purchase investment securities from a corporation unless, first, the corporation will use the proceeds exclusively to assist small-business concerns of stated types in its State and will not use any of such proceeds to finance the relocation of existing concerns; second, the corporation, in furnishing such assistance, will meet the conditions and standards set forth in the act and those prescribed by the Administration, and third, the corporation, in furnishing such assistance, will use funds obtained from other sources in an amount at least equal to the funds obtained from the Administration.

Paragraph (3) provides that only one corporation per State can participate in the program of assistance, and requires any such corporation to have been chartered by the State for substantially the same purposes as the purpose of the act and to meet minimum standards and criteria prescribed by the Administration.

Paragraph (4) authorizes the Administration to obtain the funds needed to carry out the program by issuing notes and obligations in an aggregate amount not exceeding \$255 million and selling such notes and obligations to the Secretary of the Treasury. The proceeds of such notes and obligations would be used to establish the special revolving funds which would be used to purchase investment securities under the program.

Paragraph (5) allows any State development investment and credit corporation or its shareholders to repurchase any of its investment securities purchased by the Administration.

Paragraph (6) directs the Administration to impose reasonable service charges in connection with its purchase of investment securities; and such charges would constitute a reserve fund for the payment of any losses under the program.

Paragraph (7) provides that assistance under the program would not reduce or otherwise affect any similar assistance being furnished under State or local programs.

Paragraph (8) provides that the Administration's claims for repayment on investment securities which it purchases from a corporation shall not be subordinated to any other claims against such corporation.

Paragraph (9) contains definitions of the terms "State development investment and credit corporation," "investment securities," and "State".

Section 4 authorizes the Administration to make grants to State agencies, State development investment and credit corporations, and schools, for studies, research, counselling, and information concerning small business. Such grants would be limited to one—not exceeding \$40,000—per State, and \$2 million annually in the aggregate.

Section 5 replaces the present administrator of the Small Business Administration with a 5-man Small Business Board appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate from among individuals truly representative of small business and thoroughly experienced in small-business operations. Each member of the Board would serve for a 5-year term, and would receive a salary of \$20,000 plus travel and subsistence expenses. The functions, powers, and duties of the Administration and the Board would be exercised by an Executive Director subject to the Board's direction and supervision.

Section 6 increases the maximum amount of a regular small-business loan under the Small Business Act of 1953 from \$250,000 to \$500,000, with a corresponding increase—subject to a ceiling of \$5 million—in the maximum amount of a loan to a corporation formed and capitalized by small-business concerns. It also increases the maximum maturity of a regular small-business loan from 10 to 15 years.

Section 7 permits the securities of a State development investment and credit corporation or a small-business concern to be exempted from the provisions—principally those requiring registration—of the Securities Act of 1933 and the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 if the Securities and Exchange Commission finds that enforcement of such provisions with respect to such securities is not necessary in the public interest and for the protection of investors.

Section 8 repeals section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act and provides that future repayments of loans made under that section, as well as amounts available for such loans but not yet used, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to provide a source of equity and long-term loan capital for small-business concerns in the United States, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Small Business Investment and Development Act."

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds that the continuing growth and development of small business is essential to a sound national economy, but that this growth and development is being impeded by the inability of small-business concerns to obtain sufficient amounts of equity capital. The Congress further finds that this situation is a result of many factors, chief among which are (1) the possession by the small-business concerns of insufficient ownership capital, with too much reliance on borrowed funds, at the time when they are established; (2) the existing narrow market for small-business securities, resulting in excessive costs for small-business security issues; (3) wide fluctuations in small-business profits over periods of time, deterring outside investment in small-business concerns and causing investors to prefer security issues of large and

established businesses; and (4) inadequate retained earnings resulting from the current tax rates. It is, therefore, declared to be the policy of the Congress and the purpose of this act to promote the sound development of small business in the United States by providing small-business concerns with a more adequate source of equity and long-term loan capital.

SEC. 3. Section 207 of the Small Business Act of 1953 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) (1) The Administration is empowered to purchase investment securities issued by State development investment and credit corporations which have been chartered under paragraph (3) and meet the conditions set forth in paragraph (2). The Administration shall not purchase investment securities of any such corporation in an amount exceeding the amount of the securities of such corporation which are held by other purchasers; and in no event shall the Administration at any one time hold investment securities of any one such corporation purchased under this paragraph in an amount exceeding \$5 million. Investment securities purchased by the Administration under this paragraph shall bear interest at a rate not less than the rate of interest paid by the Administration on funds obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury under paragraph (4) plus one-fourth of 1 percent per annum, and shall have maturity dates of 20 years or less.

"(2) The Administration shall not purchase the investment securities of any corporation under paragraph (1) unless it has determined—

"(A) that the corporation will use the proceeds thereof exclusively to provide equity capital or make loans to small-business concerns within the State where it is located;

"(B) that the proceeds thereof will not be used in whole or in part to finance the relocation of existing business concerns or their affiliates or subsidiaries;

"(C) the character and field of operations of the small-business concerns to which assistance will be furnished by the corporation with the proceeds thereof;

"(D) that any loan made by the corporation with the proceeds thereof will have a maturity not exceeding 15 years and will be subject to such other terms and conditions as the Administration may deem necessary or appropriate;

"(E) that, so long as the Administration holds any of the investment securities of the corporation, the governing body of such corporation will include such representatives of the Federal Government (including the Administration), State, and local governments, and other groups having an interest in small-business development as the Administration may deem appropriate;

"(F) that the corporation, in furnishing equity capital or making loans to small-business concerns, will use funds obtained from other sources in an amount at least equal to the funds obtained through the sale of its investment securities to the Administration under this subsection; and

"(G) that the corporation will comply with such other conditions and meet such other standards as the Administration may prescribe to carry out this subsection.

"(3) The Administration shall grant to not more than one State development investment and credit corporation (either existing on the date of the enactment of this subsection or hereafter organized) in each State a charter authorizing such corporation to participate in the program of assistance to small business established by this subsection. Such charter shall be granted to any corporation only after the Administration has determined that it has been chartered by the State in which it is located for purposes substantially similar to the purpose of the Small Business Investment and Development Act, and that it meets such

other minimum standards and criteria as the Administration may deem appropriate to carry out this subsection; and any charter issued to a corporation by the Administration under this paragraph shall constitute formal recognition of such corporation's exclusive right in its State to participate in the program of assistance to small business established by this subsection.

"(4) To obtain funds for the purchase of investment securities of State development investment and credit corporations under paragraph (1), the Administration may issue and have outstanding at any one time notes and obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not exceeding \$255 million. Such obligations shall be in such forms and denominations, and be subject to such terms and conditions, as may be prescribed by the Administration with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and obligations of the Administration issued under this paragraph, and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended; and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act, as amended, and extended to include any purchases of such notes and obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes and obligations acquired by him under this paragraph. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes and obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States. Funds obtained under this paragraph and any proceeds therefrom shall constitute a revolving fund which may be used by the Administration in the exercise of its functions under paragraph (1).

"(5) Any State development investment and credit corporation whose investment securities are purchased by the Administration under paragraph (1), or any shareholder or shareholders of such corporation, may at any time, under regulations prescribed by the Administration, repurchase any or all of the securities so purchased.

"(6) The Administration shall fix and impose reasonable service charges in connection with the purchase and handling of investment securities under paragraph (1), and the charges so imposed shall be placed in a special reserve fund in the Treasury and used from time to time as needed to reimburse the Administration for any losses resulting from the purchase and handling of such securities.

"(7) The assistance furnished small-business concerns under the program established by this subsection shall not affect, and shall be in addition to, any State or local programs established to provide assistance for such concerns.

"(8) In purchasing the investment securities of any corporation under paragraph (1), the Administration shall impose such requirements as may be necessary to insure that its claim for repayment with respect to such securities will not be subordinated to any other claim for the repayment of funds owed by such corporation.

"(9) As used in this subsection:

"(A) the term 'State development investment and credit corporation' means an enterprise which is incorporated under the law of any State and one of the primary purposes of which is promoting and assisting the growth and development of small-busi-

ness concerns within such State as a means of assisting, developing, and expanding its economy;

"(B) the term 'investment securities' means any obligations evidencing the indebtedness of a State development investment and credit corporation in the form of bonds, notes, or debentures, or in such other form as may be prescribed by regulations of the Administration; and

"(C) the term 'State' means the 48 States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."

SEC. 4. Section 207 (b) of the Small Business Act of 1953 is amended (1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (4), (2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and (3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(6) to make grants to any State government or agency thereof, to any State development investment and credit corporation (as defined in subsection (c) (8) (A)), or to any land-grant college or university or any other college or school of business, engineering, commerce, or agriculture, for studies, research, and counseling concerning the management, financing, and operation of small-business concerns, and for the dissemination of technical and statistical information needed in order to carry out paragraph (4) by coordinating such information with existing information facilities within the State and making such information available to State and local agencies. Only one such grant shall be made within any one State in any 1 year, and no such grant shall exceed \$40,000 in the aggregate. Not to exceed \$2 million annually shall be made available for the purposes of this paragraph from the amounts provided for the purposes enumerated in this subsection from the revolving fund established by section 204 (b)."

SEC. 5. (a) Section 204 (c) of the Small Business Act of 1953 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) (1) The management of the Administration shall be vested in a Small Business Board (hereinafter referred to as the Board), which shall consist of five members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among individuals who are truly representative of small-business interests and thoroughly experienced in matters affecting small-business operations. No more than three of the members of the Board at any time shall be members of the same political party.

"(2) Each member of the Board shall be appointed for a term of 5 years; except that (A) of the members first appointed, one shall be appointed for a term of 1 year, one for a term of 2 years, one for a term of 3 years, one for a term of 4 years, and one for a term of 5 years, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, and (B) any member appointed to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired portion of his predecessor's term.

"(3) Each member of the Board shall receive basic compensation at an annual rate of \$20,000.

"(4) Each member of the Board, in addition to receiving compensation as provided in paragraph (3), shall be reimbursed for necessary travel, subsistence, and other expenses actually incurred in the discharge of his duties as such member.

"(5) No member of the Board shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment while he is serving as a member of the Board.

"(6) The Board shall annually elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

"(7) Three members of the Board shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business."

(b) Section 204 (d) of such act is amended by striking out "Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "chairman of the Small Business Board".

(c) Section 204 (f) of such act is amended by striking out "Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Board".

(d) Section 204 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) (1) The Board shall appoint an executive director, who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board and shall, subject to its supervision and direction, be responsible for the execution of the functions of the administration. Except as otherwise specifically provided in this act or as otherwise directed by the Board, all of the functions, powers, and duties vested in the administration and the Board shall be exercised and performed by the executive director and may be exercised and performed by him through such officers, employees, or other personnel of the administration as he may designate.

"(2) The executive director shall receive compensation fixed by the Board at an annual rate of basic compensation not exceeding \$17,500; and he shall in addition be reimbursed for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses, or paid a per diem allowance in lieu thereof within the limitations prescribed by law, while away from his official station upon official business.

"(3) The executive director shall comply with all orders and directions which he receives from the Board; but as to all third persons his acts shall be presumed to be in compliance with the orders and directions of the Board."

(e) Section 205 (a) of such act is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Board".

(f) Section 205 (b) of such act is amended—

(1) by striking out "Administrator" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Board";

(2) by striking out "him" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "it";

(3) by striking out "his" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "its"; and

(4) by striking out "he" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "it".

(g) The first sentence of section 205 (c) of such act is amended by striking out "he" and "Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "it" and "Board", respectively.

(h) Section 206 (b) of such act is amended by striking out "Administrator" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Board".

(i) The Administrator of the Small Business Administration, provided for under the Small Business Act of 1953 as in effect immediately prior to the enactment of this act, shall continue in office until the members of the Small Business Board (established by section 204 (c) of such act as amended by this section) have been appointed and qualified. Nothing in this act or the amendments made by this act shall be construed as requiring or preventing the appointment of such Administrator as a member of such Board.

SEC. 6. (a) (1) Section 207 (a) (2) of the Small Business Act of 1953 is amended by striking out "\$250,000" the first two places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "\$500,000".

(2) Section 207 (a) (2) of such act is further amended by striking out "\$250,000 multiplied by the number of separate small businesses which have formed and capitalized a corporation as hereinbefore provided for in this section" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$500,000 multiplied by the number of separate small businesses which have formed and capitalized a corporation as hereinbefore provided for in this section, but in no case more than \$5 million."

(b) Section 207 (a) (2) of such act is further amended by striking out "10 years" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "15 years".

SEC. 7. Securities issued by State development investment and credit corporations (as defined in section 207 (c) (9) (A) of the Small Business Act of 1953) or by small-business concerns (as defined under section 203 of that act) may be exempted by the Securities and Exchange Commission from any of the provisions of the Securities Act of 1933 or the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, or issued under special regulations, if the Commission finds, having due regard for the purposes of the Small Business Act of 1953, that the enforcement of such provisions with respect to such securities is not necessary in the public interest and for the protection of investors.

SEC. 8. Effective 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act, section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U. S. C., sec. 352a) is repealed; but such repeal shall not affect the power of any Federal Reserve bank to carry out, or protect its interest under, any agreement theretofore made or transaction entered into in carrying on operations under that section. Within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this act, each Federal Reserve bank shall pay to the United States the aggregate amount which the Secretary of the Treasury has heretofore paid to such bank under the provisions of section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act; and such payment shall constitute a full discharge of any obligation or liability of the Federal Reserve bank to the United States or to the Secretary of the Treasury arising out of subsection (e) of such section 13b or out of any agreement thereunder. The amounts repaid to the United States pursuant to this section and any remaining balance of the funds set aside in the Treasury for payments under section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Address by Hon. John W. McCormack at 30th Anniversary Banquet of Northeastern Region of the National Conference of Christians and Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on April 1, 1958, the northeastern region of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Inc., held its 30th anniversary banquet, at which our friend and colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] was honored for his distinguished service in the field of human relations.

I am pleased to include in my extension the remarks made on that occasion by Majority Leader McCormack.

Mr. McCormack's remarks follow:

To be present as we are this evening, to meet and hear the principal speaker, Dr. Frank Graham, educator, statesman, diplomat, gentleman, and one of the greatest Americans of this challenging period, is an honor and treat in itself.

To be the recipient, as I am, of your great organization's award of this year is an additional honor, which Mrs. McCormack and I appreciate and will always treasure.

The fact that your organization without regard to religion, race or color, and dedicated to promote justice, amity, understanding, and cooperation, feels that I merit this award brings a feeling of happiness to me that I find difficult to express in words. For Mrs. McCormack and myself I express our sincere thanks. And I am proud to say that the guidance and protection of Mrs. McCormack has been my constant inspiration.

While I am the recipient of this award and honor tonight, there is in it a transcendent significance far more profound than any glory that may accrue to me personally. It is the deeper implications of the purposes and objectives of your organization—its spiritual origin and beneficial results, and the atmosphere of nobility of mind created by those present that impresses and dominates my mind.

For brotherhood is at the very heart of the issues that divide the world.

If my life's work had been different and this award were given me for inventing and launching an American earth satellite that would recognize America as the leader in this field of research and technology, important as that would be, I would not treasure it as much as I do the honor I have just received. For is it not true that in the age in which we live, brotherhood must be equated with survival?

Coexistence, as advocated by international communism, is a subzero atmosphere.

It is an expediency to deceive, to subvert, to dominate, with resultant enslavement, persecution, imprisonment, and even death and martyrdom.

It is the nearest communism and the Kremlin can come in implementing its dishonest interpretation of peace.

For the alleged brotherhood preached for temporary purposes by the Communist world is based on hatred. And brotherhood cannot result where hatred exists, whether in the minds of peoples, or in the minds of individuals.

Brushing aside the honeyed but insincere utterances of the Communist world, what they are really saying is that we are to get along with them, under their terms and conditions, until the time has come, as Khrushchev says, when they will bury us.

For we live in a world where the Communist regime does not want to understand the rest of the world.

For those with the origin of hate are men who fear to be men, and prefer to be robots.

On the international level the problem with brotherhood is that just as it takes two or more to make a fight, so it takes two or more to make for brotherhood.

To Lenin, Stalin, Hitler, now Khrushchev, brotherhood lacks the note, the stomp, and the brutishness of the dictator and master, and was and is synonymous with decay, social and otherwise.

But if history has proven anything, it is that what they stood and now stand for, was compounded with fear, of the unconscious arrogance of an inferiority complex, and of a disturbed sense of insecurity.

For a moral voidness or a vacuum exists in their lives.

And history shows what happened to Hitler. And while the form was different, in substance, nazism was the same as communism.

And Stalin lies in his Moscow mausoleum denigrated as a military phoney, blackened as a coward, a murderer, and a maniac by the very accomplices and his group of world killers who now rule in his place.

And if they are wise they will take recourse to history and govern themselves accordingly.

For the forces of hate, hatred of God and neighbor, cannot overcome and defeat the forces of love, love of God and love of neighbor.

Such forces might temporarily gain an advantage—they might win battles in a cold or hot war, but where the forces of hate try to defeat those of love—they cannot win the war.

One of the great weaknesses of the Communist world is lack of faith, lack of understanding, lack of brotherhood, of the hate of its dictators.

And if our foreign policy is positive—and takes this into consideration—we can effectively capitalize the same.

For the desire for liberty—which is directly connected with faith and brotherhood, may be temporarily suppressed by a dictator—but never destroyed. For the inherent desire for liberty comes from God, Himself. And what God bestows, man cannot destroy.

Brotherhood is something that has to be fought for with reservoirs of human energy, patience, and wisdom, beyond anything imaginable by a mind charged with aggression and brutality, and a mind charged with hatred and greed.

Brotherhood exacts the noblest manifestation of the human spirit. It is enjoined in the old and new testaments of love of God and love of neighbor. For love of God and neighbor, with brotherhood as the immediate result, is the rock upon which Judeo-Christianity stands.

"And thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Without confining myself to our country, it is, however, imperative that America be strong militarily and in our material resources and productive capacity.

We must utilize our brains and facilities, which we have, on a high decision making level, with the authority to carry out such decisions, so that even for a short period of time the Soviet Union may not have a decided advantage over us, when they can attack our targets and we cannot attack their targets.

For if that day should arrive they will probably offer us terms which if accepted would be capitulation on our part, and if we failed to accept, in my firm opinion, they would carry out a surprise attack.

With our avowed policy of nonaggression, which I do not completely agree with, it is imperative that our country always be in a position where we can, if attacked, retaliate and so so effectively and decisively.

For while the Communists hate and deny God, and as a result idealism does not exist in their minds, they cannot deny that the law of self-preservation applies to them as well as to others.

And if we keep strong militarily always having the power to retaliate, that power might be a deterrent to attack, and as time passes, out of evil might come good. But we cannot rely on that. While we can hope for the best, we must be prepared for the worst.

And the spirit of brotherhood must be strengthened, intensified, and broadened, not only here but abroad.

For brotherhood brushes aside misunderstanding—it brings about unity.

For we of America are not a race. We are a people, of all races, colors, and creeds. The areas of agreement are so wide there should be no bigots amongst us.

For lower than the lowest animal that roams the woods; meaner than the meanest animal, and more cruel than the cruellest animal is a human being who hates another, and particularly because of a difference of race, color, or creed.

For the animal does not know better. But the human being is gifted and endowed by God with a mind, with the power to think and reason, to resolve his or her reason into a will, and to exercise that will for good or for evil.

The advancement of brotherhood, in deeds as well as words, means a unified and

strengthened America, better able to meet the challenge of today.

For the undeniable fact is that spiritual strength is necessary to ultimate victory.

And while we must be strong in this period of strain in things material, we must above all be strong spiritually. For spiritual strength is the reserve strength that could be the difference between victory and defeat.

And in your dedication to brotherhood and understanding your organization is playing an important part in the real strength of a nation, in this case our beloved country, its spiritual strength and unifying results.

It is with a spirit of humbleness that I accept the award you have conferred upon me, an award which Mrs. McCormack and I shall always treasure.

And in a broader sense, I am representing tonight men and women everywhere of good will.

Otto Z. Fox, Charleston, S. C., Receives America's Highest Brand Names Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent testimonial dinner in New York City, Brand Names Foundation, an organization designed and created for the purpose of protecting legitimate products by the producers of commodities familiar to every American, awarded a bronze plaque as a top award for 1957 competition to Otto Z. Fox, owner of Fox Music House, Charleston, S. C. This bronze award was the result of Mr. Fox's having been selected from the competition of 134 firms and 25 retail categories. The ceremonies attendant to this fine and distinguished honor awarded to my friend, this outstanding Charlestonian, culminated a week's celebration, and it was held in the grand ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, in the great city of New York on April 16, 1958.

Charleston and the Nation are proud of Mr. Fox. Mr. Fox is identified with the civic and community pride for which Charleston has been famous over the centuries. Mr. Fox never loses an opportunity to contribute to every program designed for the betterment of the vast and sprawling community of Charleston. He is a fervent believer in the American enterprise system and the right of small business to exist in this era in which big business is getting bigger and little business is getting smaller. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress this singular and outstanding contribution Mr. Fox has made to music and to the industry which produces the finest musical instruments the world has ever known.

This week, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Fox visited me in Washington and was my guest along with his charming wife for lunch in the Capitol of the United States. I want the RECORD of the Congress to show that from the city of Charleston came the outstanding music dealer in the Nation for 1957, and I want the RECORD to show that this fine American achieved

this honor in one of the most competitive communities the world has ever known. He achieved this distinction in an era when the capacity to stay in business taxes every fiber of every business and every sinew of every American.

It Is Time for Congress To Act in Order To Curb the Southern Bombings and Other Interstate Criminal Conspiracies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, a very serious situation has recently been spotlighted in our Nation which demands the urgent attention of Congress. That is the dire threat posed to many of our citizens as a result of the concerted criminal conspiracy which in recent weeks has resulted in six vicious bombings or attempted bombings involving Jewish centers and synagogues in the South.

Our information concerning these outbreaks of lawlessness is sketchy and incomplete. But a certain pattern is emerging, which indicates there is at work a coordinated interstate effort to intimidate Jewish citizens and others concerned with upholding the law of our land.

We do know that within the last 6 months there have been bombings and attempted dynamitings in 6 cities. A synagogue in Charlotte, N. C. A synagogue in Gastonia, N. C. A Jewish center in Miami, Fla. A Jewish center in Nashville, Tenn. A center-synagogue and public school in Jacksonville, Fla. And a synagogue in Birmingham, Ala.

It is significant to note that the latest outbreak of violence—the dynamiting of a Jewish center and a Negro school in Jacksonville—apparently followed the exact pattern of earlier incidents in Nashville and Montgomery.

In addition, it is significant that the abortive attempt to dynamite the synagogue in Birmingham, had it succeeded, would have coincided with the blast at the center and school in Jacksonville.

These are not coincidences. They are evidences of an interstate conspiracy to coerce and intimidate those who are in good faith and honesty attempting to carry out the Supreme Court's decision concerning school integration. Leaders of the "Confederate Underground"—the group apparently behind the campaign—have boasted in their threatening phone calls that they are members of a widespread conspiracy. It is my opinion elements of the Ku Klux Klan form the hard core of this nefarious organization.

It is commendable that local authorities have taken stern and vigorous action in an attempt to round up the hoodlums perpetrating these dastardly deeds. It is commendable that the great majority of the local citizenries in

these communities and their vocal leaders have spoken out against these outbreaks. But that is not enough. The interstate nature of the plots—the ability of the bombers to flee swiftly across State lines—prevents an effective crack-down. For example, the only witness to the Jacksonville bombing reported seeing a car with Georgia plates pulling away from the scene of the blast. Jacksonville is close by the Georgia border.

It is, therefore, incumbent upon the Federal Government to step in and crumble this pattern of lawlessness. I have been in touch with officials of the Justice Department, inquiring as to what can be done to assert the interstate powers of Uncle Sam to curb this conspiracy. Right off the bat comes the suggestion that the FBI step in and conduct one of its famous and effective investigations. Unfortunately their hands are tied, under the status of our laws today.

Upon the evidence thus far presented to the Justice Department, there simply are no indications that Federal laws are being broken. The bombings break only State and local laws, in spite of the conspiratorial overtones involving several States. The FBI therefore cannot exert its considerable investigational powers, and enforcement must be left entirely to local and State officials.

The answer to this problem lies in bringing our laws up to date to meet the challenges posed by interstate conspiracies of this type. With the advent of modern transportation and communication facilities, the day of the merely statewide criminal organization is pretty much gone. In their place have come clever and well-heeled conspiracies operating across State lines in order to avoid effective investigation and prosecution by officials of any one State.

By making full use of State jurisdictional barriers, these conspiracies, which cover a wide range of activities from black market babies, narcotics, and gambling to bootlegging, have in many cases been allowed to operate with impunity, free from direct checks on them from any source.

A bill which I have introduced, H. R. 258, would close the gap in our Federal laws and permit the FBI to step in whenever interstate conspiracies were working to break State felony laws. The terms of this measure are simple. They would be effective in curbing a wide range of conspiracies across State lines. Particularly, enactment of this bill would give the FBI the green light to put an end to this dynamiting conspiracy in the South.

Simply stated, this measure would make it a Federal offense for two or more persons to conspire to commit any organized crime offense against any State if any facilities of interstate commerce were used in furtherance of the conspiracy. Any violation of a State felony law threatened by such an interstate conspiracy could come under the scrutiny of the FBI if this bill were enacted. It is the single most effective means for curbing these vicious criminals.

If this law had been on our statute books when these bombings took place, investigative powers of the Federal Government could have been brought to bear immediately. The hoodlums involved could not run and hide behind State jurisdictional lines, as they are apparently doing now.

In the past, efforts to have Congress pass such a measure have lacked the support of the Justice Department, which has felt it would place too great a burden on their agents and facilities. To my way of thinking, this admission that there would be a great deal of work to be done is the strongest argument possible for enactment of such a bill.

My conversations with Justice Department officials last week, in the wake of the spate of bombings in the South, indicate there may be a change of attitude within the Department. I am hopeful they are coming around to my way of thinking and that they will soon support my proposal or a similar one which would achieve the same ends. If the Department will support such a measure, I am confident the Congress will respond speedily in passing it.

We should, without further delay, put such a law on our statute books. It would enable the FBI to do what local officials simply cannot do—step in and prevent and prosecute bombings such as we have witnessed in recent months. It would prevent intimidation of citizens whose only fault is that of trying to carry out the law of the land. It would put an end to the utter disregard for law and order with which a few hoodlums have infected certain areas of the South.

The Recession and the Family Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COYA KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, since it is becoming increasingly difficult to pry information—even the most simple information—from the reluctant administration leaders, I am more than ever placed in the position of the late Will Rogers, who said, "All I know is what I read in the papers."

The lead story in the Washington (D. C.) Post of April 8, 1958, has this to say:

Unemployment rose 25,000 in March to 5,198,000—the highest jobless total in 16½ years. * * *

The 25,000 increase in unemployment, compared to an increase in February of almost 700,000 over January, indicated the rate of the economic slump may be slowing.

Twenty-five thousand does not seem to be, at first glance, a world-shaking advance in unemployment.

But it would be a world-shaking advance in unemployment if one of these 25,000 happened to be you.

In thumbing through the April 11, 1958, issue of U. S. News & World

Report I came across two timely, but seemingly unrelated items.

On page 23, I read:

"Unemployment" in the recent recession is tending to center in younger workers. "Among jobless" one out of four is age 24 or younger. These often are young heads of families, in debt for a car, furniture, maybe a house, and with one or two young children. The squeeze on these jobless is severe.

"The reason" why younger workers are hit hard? Often it's seniority rules. Union contracts usually call for the last worker hired to be the first laid off, and for the last laid off to be the first rehired.

"The younger worker" tends to be left out in the cold. Yet that younger worker usually is least able to stand unemployment. His children are growing, not grown; his debts are at the peak, not paid off. It is the younger worker who tends to be the biggest customer of business, and he is being hurt.

The words which are quoted in the above quotation were quoted by U. S. News & World Report editors; not by me.

There is no percentage figure in this article about the actors in this American tragedy of 1957 who come from family farms. We are well supplied with economic statistics. We have plenty of census statistics. But with all of our scientific advances it has been impossible to represent living human beings by lifeless calculations.

The best I can do is, as briefly as I can, to bring you a picture in words.

Gus Hanson does not exist. I have literally picked his name from a hat. Yet Gus Hanson is a symbol, an archetype. What is happening to him is happening to scores of thousands of young Americans, born and raised on a family farm.

Gus graduated from high school. Like so many of his contemporaries, he did his hitch in the armed services. After his tour of duty in the Army was completed, he came home. It didn't take Gus long to find out how things stacked up. There wasn't anything for him at home. The way things were going, the farm could barely support Mom and Dad and the two younger children still in school. So Gus took off for the city. He was hard working and ambitious. He got a job. He met a girl—the girl. They were married. Their first baby was born. A second was on the way.

Then, without warning, Gus found a pink slip in his pay envelop. There were a few extra dollars instead of the usual 2-week notice.

I want to know what will happen to Gus Hanson's family. I want to know what will happen to Gus Hanson's brothers and sisters, his mother and father. I want to know what will happen to America's Gus Hansons.

Why do I want to know this?

Another article in the U. S. News & World Report of April 11, 1958, has the answer.

On page 50, I read:

Russian farmers do not, cannot, own the land they farm. . . . There is little incentive to spur the peasants to more efficient work or greater production.

It was the land-owning peasant who stood in the way of those trying to communize Russia 40 years ago. Millions of peasants were liquidated before the Communists

could fasten their yoke on the Soviet people. And, today, the Soviet farmer is still a foe of communism—a source of constant fear to the rulers of the Kremlin.

I want to know what will happen to America's Gus Hansons because the family farm is, at one and the same time, the backbone of American financial stability and the first line of defense against communism. Gus Hanson deserves a future. He is our Nation's insurance against whatever comes tomorrow. No institution in the United States—our farms, our fields, our mines, our industries, our commerce—is as valuable to the United States as our Gus Hansons.

All this talk about "conquering outer space" is just jibberish if Congress and the administration do nothing about conquering the vast inner space in the hearts of young Americans—from the family farm, or whatever their origin—who have lost their jobs.

Let us get busy on our Gus Hansons.

At the Bottom of the Well

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, this is a speech, as revised, which was delivered at the 67th Annual Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution on April 17, 1958:

Distinguished guests, my subject was Have You a Pet Federal Aid Program? After attending two of the sessions of the Daughters of the American Revolution Congress, and on further reflection, I know that most people have had their pet Government dote. They have received some of the corrupt proceeds that always come from any Government socialized project. I have learned, also, that you are all heartily ashamed of that, and that you intend to reform. So I am going to talk about why your resolutions, so carefully prepared, are headed for the bottom of the well when they arrive in Congress on Capitol Hill. Then I will propose a remedy and give you and your husbands and brothers and, above all, your sons a job to do.

Last month, one of the most distinguished leading manufacturers in this country came to see me as ranking Republican member on the Labor and Education Committee. He wanted five perfectly sound, greatly needed amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act that we have been trying to get since 1947.

I told him, "Why, don't you know that you haven't a ghost of a chance to pass any such laws? We haven't the votes. . . ."

He looked surprised.

Another man came in and said, "We have been working on a tax-reform bill for years. We must take this incredible load of Government off the backs of the American people."

Neither of these men seemed to know, and indeed very few of us know, that in the last election we, and especially the businessmen, spent millions—we don't know how many millions—to elect a President of the United States.

But the AFL-CIO political action knew that they could not elect Mr. Stevenson, so

they went to work to elect a Congress, and did it. . . .

Now we have, after 10 years of their organized political action, this situation: At least 175 Members in the House of Representatives today owe their seats, wholly or partially, to the money and the work of the CIO-AFL and their allies. We now have 216 Congressmen and 45 Senators (that is, a working majority) who vote most of the time for the legislative programs of the Americans for Democratic Action. This is the front organization for labor bosses. This is the descendant of the Socialist Party in America, and the financial beneficiary of large sums from the CIO-AFL.

Free Enterprise, care of We, the People, put out a little pamphlet which you can get that gives the votes of all the Congressmen. The red votes are for the ADA propositions; the black marks are against them. It is remarkable how completely red some of our States have gone by the votes of their Congressmen. That is, they vote consistently for labor-Socialist measures. . . .

Walter Reuther is not going to be President of the United States some time in the future as some fear. He does not need to be President. Labor bosses have already taken over, in critical areas, and are now dominating Congress. When the elections are over this fall, they will have, in all probability, 25 or 30 more Members beholden to them, on the floor of the Houses of Congress. They will have been financed and selected and then elected by CIO-AFL. They expect to have no opposition by you or any other women's organizations or any businessmen's groups organized for political action.

How does the AFL-CIO political action and control by a labor-Socialist government in America affect you, the Daughters of the American Revolution?

It is perfectly obvious. You have passed certain important resolutions. . . . They will not receive the consideration that they deserve. . . . They represent the wisdom that resides in you, as delegates and officers. They are important and have been for years. I know of no organization whose judgment I respect more than the Daughters of the American Revolution. . . .

We have gotten to the point that such things as a billion dollar increase in Government lending authority is no longer socialism in the minds of most of our people. You know better. Your resolutions show that you know better and you must, above all, continue to meet, to discuss, and continue to tell America that our Government today is almost at the mercy of worldwide socialism. And that America too is Socialist in everything but name.

But you are prepared to see the Congress of the United States drop your resolutions to the bottom of a well.

Instead of reducing spending and taxes, and ending Government powerplants and irrigation projects, food subsidies, Government housing, vast and unprofitable Government lending and vast foreign aid, we get more and still more, and besides some 700 other Government projects.

Nearly all the people's petitions and resolutions are ignored. It's as useless to petition Congress today as it was for your ancestors to petition Parliament and King George in 1775.

Now what shall we do?

What we need to do now, my friends, is to imitate—to see to it that the great genius of organized American men and women—especially the businessmen—gets into the political battle. Their present organizations are the only forces in America that can possibly save us from an expansion of our present labor-socialist government.

Here is how labor does it:

Mr. Meany says, "Politics is labor's big job." Top officers spring into political action. AFL-CIO is put in fighting trim.

Here is a little book: "How to Win" elections, the best book published.

Sixty-two percent of the labor press is devoted not to just talk, but to political and legislative action.

As you carry your resolutions back home to get some action of your own, drop by the CIO-AFL offices and get a copy of "How to Win." They sell it to their workers for 50 cents. They will charge you \$3, but it's worth it.

Then go to the political boss in your county and say to him that you heard down in Washington that we are now designating candidates for Congress.

You'll find some young lawyer who would like to make the fight, but he has no money and no organization. If he runs he has to go out and get himself elected.

So, he doesn't run. Why should he?

He knows that he will be opposed by an organized political machine directed by extremely practical professional politicians who work for the leaders of organized labor. He knows that they have at their disposal more than 300,000 paid workers, in addition to millions of men and women who are so misled by our custom of misnaming socialism until they believe in it. They are dedicated to work against him.

The potential statesmen of tomorrow—they may be your sons—are staying out of politics today because they know that they alone cannot possibly win out against labor's political power. That must be your deep concern.

Call a meeting of all the people you know who believe in America and in what your ancestors fought and died for in those long-ago days.

Get the professionals who work for local conservative organizations. Get the paid secretaries of the local chamber of commerce, the local employers association, the medical society, the dental society, the bar associations, along with the elected officers of those organizations.

This local group can start now to develop the mechanics of political action.

This takes time. It takes planning. You will need professional help. You should be thinking about providing TV time, radio shows, getting together the money for newspaper ads, campaign literature, and direct mail to voters. Start holding rallies, picnics, coffee hours, and the other social activities which cement together people with a common objective. Provide the candidates with an opportunity to find out what you want your Congressman to be and see if the candidates measure up. Think about outdoor advertising, posters, buttons, bumper stickers on automobiles, matchbooks, pencils. They all cost money, but they are the mechanics of politics.

You may be told that these activities are against the law.

The most recent court actions are that you, the DAR, or any other association or group, or corporation, can spend money in such activities for the purpose of informing members, customers, stockholders, suppliers, and so forth, of their views on public issues, and the effect on their affairs and of the election to office of candidates who share or oppose those views.

Such organizations may use any mediums of communication known to mankind for this purpose.

Do not, as a matter of law and as a matter of practical common sense, go around endorsing candidates. Such endorsements, without more, are of utterly no value in a political campaign.

Your local group must do actual work in the election districts. You will need vot-

ing records of incumbent legislators, National, State and city councils. You will need information as to political spending by organized groups in your last elections. You will need authoritative discussions of the issues. You cannot rely solely on the news that comes out of Washington to give you the kind of information you need. Your local paper is more likely to give you the kind of information you need than the big city dailies. Furthermore, your local newspaper will look upon you as a potential advertiser.

All of this material is now available from public sources, from official reports, here in Washington. Steps are being taken now by several organizations to provide you with the kind of material which will give you the substance for political action.

Only the local people—you and you and you—can come up with the manpower and the money and the enthusiasm that will even begin to offset labor's political strength.

National organizations can, and God knows I hope they will, provide you with the material for you to use (as you best can decide) in selecting and electing to office the kind of men you want in office.

You, the DAR, cannot do it alone. You must persuade, demand, cajole all of the conservative organizations to lay aside their normal competitive instincts to engage in an organized, planned campaign that will encourage intelligent and conservative young people to go into public life. Many are now convinced that men of principles who believe in America and her former system of government are not wanted in public office. You must convince them otherwise.

Time is short. Labor leaders now have at their beck and call probably less than 2 million political workers out of their total of 18 million dues payers. This relatively small number has been organized calculatingly in exactly the places where it will bring about the most far-reaching political results.

Your job is to offset that organized minority. You can improve upon my suggestions as to how to run a political campaign. For a mere man to even assume superiority in any area over women, with their inborn instinct—their motherhood instinct to preserve the race—is ridiculous.

How can you do nothing in this fight? If you go home and stay inside, you will be doing something. You will be doing precisely what Walter Reuther and those others whose activities bring joy to the hearts of world communists want and expect you to do.

Bob Welch, whose reputation you all know, tells me that there is only 1 danger which the Communists face today and only 1 thing they fear. That is, for the American people to be awakened sufficiently, too soon, to the very nature and methods and existence and progress of the Communist conspiracy itself.

By doing nothing you and you and you will have become another ally of world communism.

Dean Manion, an old and cherished friend of mine, calls my attention to a quotation from the Book of Proverbs:

"Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set."

What is the landmark? What must we do if we had the votes?

We can restore the Constitution, and reassert its provisions so that even the Supreme Court of the United States cannot misinterpret it.

We can limit the power of Congress to tax, as it was limited until the 16th amendment.

We can take away—if the face of the Congress is changed—those things which the Federal Government is now doing which are immoral, unconstitutional, illegal, and outrageous.

We can once more set the free mind of America, the foundation, the creative, the atomic power of America, free America, further from the restrictions, the management of man over man, the compulsions, the propaganda, the deception, the unlimited, unconscionable power of government.

Almost 6 years ago Senator Taft and Candidate Eisenhower signed a manifesto of principles. This is what it says, in part:

"The greatest threat to liberty today is internal, from the constant growth of big government through the constantly increasing power and spending of the Federal Government. * * *

God help us as we organize for the peaceful revolution to restore constitutional government in our land.

Nuclear-Powered Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding Member of this body, our colleague from California, the Honorable CRAIG HOSMER, has written a revealing article entitled "Nuclear Power for the Navy" for the United States Naval Institute proceedings.

Mr. HOSMER is a commander in the United States Naval Reserve and is an articulate authority on nuclear energy as a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

I commend this article to your attention. The article follows:

NUCLEAR POWER FOR THE NAVY

(By Comdr. CRAIG HOSMER, United States Naval Reserve)

Fast becoming a reality is a powerful new nuclear-powered United States Navy—a Navy backboned by atomic-bomb-carrying 85,000-ton super-carriers, fast striking guided-missile cruisers and destroyers, and specially designed submarines for high-speed attack, hunter-killer, radar-picket, guided-missile and other new missions.

Already more than \$2 billion have been spent or programmed for research, development, and construction of such a Navy. The table on page 6970 sets out what is on hand and what is on order. Another \$500 million a year for at least 8 years ahead will be needed to bring it into full being.

It began in 1948 with a small but ambitious joint Navy-Atomic Energy Commission program aimed at submarine nuclear propulsion and later expanded to include design and development of a full spectrum of naval nuclear propulsion plants for new naval construction from small submarines to the largest aircraft carriers.

By early 1954 the basic question of feasibility of naval nuclear propulsion was affirmatively answered by successful completion of all critical tests of the *Nautilus* land-based prototype plant. That answer made possible continuous cruising at top speeds, unlimited cruising radii, and practically absolute freedom from fuel logistics. It has revitalized the role of seapower in geopolitics.

At the beginning of naval reactor development 10 years ago, even the most imaginative nuclear propulsion enthusiasts hardly foresaw such a future. Nor did even the most practical amongst them envisage the

full scope of difficulties ahead. Neither the technical problems nor their solutions were well understood. In fact, many of the problems were not even known.

The task was to devise a safe, reliable plant within naval space and weight limitations. It began with an examination of various possible reactor cycles. Gas-cooled reactors were discarded as involving too much space and too many technical problems. Other types were in turn rejected for various reasons. Finally left as promising to meet naval requirements were but two: a reactor utilizing liquid sodium as its coolant, or one utilizing pressurized water.

Liquid sodium seemed to offer the best approach because it permitted high steam temperatures and pressures, with consequent greater efficiency. But the physics and chemistry of liquid sodium were little known and insurmountable development problems might be encountered. Although pressurized water involved lowering steam temperatures and pressures, more was known of the characteristics of water. That could mean fewer problems of basic research and faster development of the plant.

Decision was made to pursue both approaches and preliminary design began. So dissimilar are the physics and chemistry of water and sodium that in effect two simultaneous but essentially independent projects were involved. Both were carried successfully through land prototype and shipboard installation stages.

Liquid sodium leakage problems appeared in the *Seawolf's* land prototype plant which were not in themselves insurmountable. However, they were considered in combination with other factors in an eventual decision favoring the *Nautilus'* pressurized water type reactor system as the accepted approach to practical naval nuclear propulsion.

The men who carried on the work had no experience or rules of thumb to guide them. No power reactor had ever been designed before. They had no science of reactor technology to apply to the job. They created it as they went along.

From the beginning they applied a "can of worms" description to their work, for each component and function of a nuclear power plant, from the reactor vessel through the turbine and all auxiliaries, are wholly interrelated and interdependent.

For example, raising turbine exhaust temperature or back pressure in a conventional plant is felt primarily in fuel economy. Such a reduction in thermal efficiency in a nuclear plant affects each of its complex components. The necessary increase in heat output requires size, capacity, and weight increases in the condensate, feedwater, and heat-generating systems, and equipment. Size of the reactor, steam generator, coolant system and auxiliaries is increased. Proportionate increases in radiation shielding must follow. These in turn affect the size, design, and characteristics of the hull into which the plant is to be placed, or, as a practical matter, thrust back upon the plant designer the necessity of selecting every characteristic of design in relation, not only to each function and component of his plant, but in relation to hull space and weight limitations as well.

Development of the two original naval, nuclear reactor plants, and to only a slightly lesser extent today's plants, involves creation not only of the total concept, but individually of each of its components. It demands tremendous and concurrent basic research into unexplored fields of the new science. Maximum assurance that all parts individually will work and that they will work as a unit when coupled together, and function with a high degree of safety, dictates what might otherwise be wasteful overdesign and overtesting.

Few, if any, off-the-shelf items exist which can be incorporated in nuclear plants.

Canned pumps are but one entirely new concept brought into being to make nuclear power possible. Prolonged successful effort to develop as complex a component as this often has to be discarded when efforts fail to develop another which is interdependent. Fresh starts must be made on the problems of both.

Reactor design develops the need to know undiscovered properties of common substances under conditions of reactor chemistry and irradiation. Requirements are generated for rare metals and alloys concerning which the full spectrum of chemistry, physics, and metallurgy need be researched and industries found or formed to produce them in quantities required. For example, such diverse enterprises as the Carborundum Co., National Distillers Corp., Wah Chang Corp., and National Research Corp. had to be persuaded to engage in large-scale zirconium production.

Not only has the naval nuclear reactors program faced mountainous technical problems, but it has been burdened from the beginning with a continuing necessity to seek answers to a variety of nontechnical questions affecting its ultimate success.

Wholly new and workable administrative and funding relationships, to be discussed later in detail, had to be evolved and must be continuously perfected between the Navy and the AEC, amongst naval personnel in and outside the reactors program, and between the Government reactors group and industry.

As operations expand, new personnel must be brought in; techniques must be developed for their rapid specialized training; and new facilities established for the basic research, design, and engineering functions involved in the work. Progress from design to construction of plants involves large-scale training of industry personnel. The design and construction of new ships for the new plants brings in a whole new group for specialized instruction; manning those ships brings in another.

During the process a basic philosophy on security of information had to be evolved, continuously adapted to an ever-increasing body of knowledge, and the mechanics of implementing it amongst public and private groups engaged in the program kept efficiently in motion. The approach has been to distinguish between specific design and dimensional characteristics which are classified, and technology as such which is unclassified. Communicating the latter has involved the writing of up-to-the-minute technical handbooks by scientific personnel engaged in the work concurrently as they do it. Six such handbooks have been published and another eight are currently in preparation.

Another essential task of those engaged in the program has been to translate difficult scientific concepts into information meaningful to the layman. It is fundamental to obtaining policy decisions from legislative and executive leaders of Government underlying financial support of the naval nuclear program. It is also vital to the public, which in a democracy ratifies those decisions at the polls.

The foregoing enumerations barely hint at the multiple technical and nontechnical problems involved in the naval nuclear reactors program from the beginning and which will continue to plague it for years ahead. Yet they are ample testimony to the outstanding devotion and qualities of the officers and civilians who carry it forward. Within 6 years from the start they produced the basic pressurized water nuclear propulsion plant illustrated on the following page which is now standard for all new nuclear naval vessels.

The plant arrangement shown approximates that developed for submarine propulsion, and it will vary only in details for the supercarrier with four dual reactor power-

plants, and the cruiser *Long Beach* and submarine *Triton*, each with dual reactors.

The naval nuclear propulsion plant consists of a nuclear reactor core contained in a pressure vessel; a primary coolant system utilizing fast-flowing pressurized water to remove the heat generated by nuclear fission in the core and transfer it via a steam generator to the secondary, or steam system; a steam machinery plant for propulsion and auxiliary electric power generation; and radiation shielding.

The reactor consists of a pressure vessel housing a core of enriched uranium fuel encased in a protective metal, such as zirconium, which passes heat to the coolant; a moderator, in this case the coolant itself, to slow down neutron emissions to efficient fission speeds; and rods of a neutron absorbing metal such as hafnium, together with machinery to insert and withdraw them from the core, to control rate of fission and thus amount of heat produced.

The primary coolant system consists of one or more loops, each having one or more coolant pumps; a steam generator (boiler); a pressurizing vessel; and connecting piping with appropriate valves.

Since the coolant water becomes radioactive in passing through the reactor core, shielding is required around the portion of the plant containing the coolant in order to protect personnel from radiation. A separate reactor shield surrounds the pressure vessel. It affords sufficient protection against radiation from the reactor core to allow access to the reactor compartment when the reactor is shut down. All shielding designs incorporate enough protection to meet civilian radiation exposure tolerances established by the AEC.

The steam produced in the separate secondary circuit by the steam generator is non-radioactive, and the steam propulsion machinery need not be shielded. This machinery and the necessary auxiliaries for electric power are arranged in a conventional way in the engine room. However, arrangements within the reactor compartment must of necessity be strongly influenced by considerations of accessibility in relation to radiation and the continuous necessity of removing heat even after the reactor has been shut down. The latter phenomenon, known as radioactive decay heat, results from the constant breakdown of radioactive materials even under normal conditions.

Penetrating to all parts of naval nuclear powerplant design are intensified requirements for ruggedness, reliability, and easy maintainability dictated by safety, the extreme endurance of nuclear plants, and higher average sustained ship speeds.

These various special nuclear plant considerations also complicate the work of designers of hulls into which they will fit. Gone are the days when minor weight allocation errors can be overcome by pumping fuel between tanks. Crew living and working spaces must be allocated with radiation hazard in mind. Stacks are eliminated, but vertical free spaces must be arranged for removal and renewal of reactor cores. Stowage space for consumable supplies and ammunition must be enlarged to take full advantage of the ship's longer range cruising capabilities. Many other specialized considerations are involved. A byproduct of tackling them has been experimentation with novel hull configurations that may substantially increase speed-power ratios of future ships.

Another byproduct of naval nuclear propulsion has been the evolution of a unique, hybrid military-civilian research and development organization that may well set administrative patterns for successful missile research and development and any similar future large-scale Government projects. Without it, there would probably be no nuclear powered naval ships in existence today.

Its antecedents are in the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 assigning responsibility for research and development in the theory and production of atomic energy, including processes, materials and devices related to such production, to the newly created Atomic Energy Commission.

Soon after passage of the act, Navy communications to AEC began setting out potential nuclear propulsion requirements in connection with the submarine program as defined by a small, cross-sectional group within the Bureau of Ships. AEC's response, in part, was to turn back to the very Bureau of Ships' group that generated the requirements for manpower assistance in meeting them.

By 1949 the Commission's activities in this field were sufficient to justify inclusion of a Naval Reactors Branch in its Division of Reactor Developments established that year. Also by that year it had become apparent in the Bureau of Ships that the activities of the cross-sectional group were sufficiently unique and unconventional to warrant special treatment. A period of organizational experimentation began, culminating in formal establishment in 1955 of Bureau of Ships Code 1500, designated as the Nuclear Propulsion Division and headed by a new assistant to the Chief of the Bureau for Nuclear Propulsion.

Code 1500, however, did not mean a separate Navy reactors program paralleling the AEC's program, because Code 1500 had by this time also developed into the Commission's Naval Reactors Branch, unofficially referred to as the "headquarters organization" by both Navy and AEC. Naval officers ordered to the program report to both AEC and BuShips. Navy and AEC civilian employees are utilized interchangeably. Rear Adm. H. G. Rickover, United States Navy, is both Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ships for Nuclear Propulsion and Chief of the Naval Reactors Branch, Division of Reactor Development, United States Atomic Energy Commission. So complete is the Navy-AEC integration in this "two-hat" organization that neither AEC nor naval personnel need switch headgear during the course of their work.

Possibly the only persons who can distinguish the military from the civilian characteristics of headquarters organization are the Government accountants who must assess its cost of operations between the AEC and the Navy. Even here the line of demarcation is often blurred; but, in general, nuclear research and development costs, including construction of land prototype powerplants, are paid for by AEC, while the Navy pays for research and development on steam parts of the plants and construction of nuclear ships. During the current fiscal year (1958) research and development money amounts to around \$86 million from the Commission and around \$11 million from the Navy. The prototype aircraft carrier propulsion plant has consumed the lion's share of these current funds.

Inherent in the headquarters organization setup is a flexibility and freedom in both administrative and funding action essential to rapid progress in complex scientific operations. This has speeded civilian as well as naval reactor development. No new group had to be organized from scratch to develop the \$110 million civilian pressurized water reactor at Shippingport, Pa. Naval Reactors Branch, long experienced in that type of reactor, was assigned the job and went to work without delay. Additionally, the organization's dual nature avoids duplication of effort and facilities, such as purchasing offices, inspection groups, and so on. For example, purchase of nuclear cores on competitive bidding for which the Navy pays is done through AEC purchasing offices.

The organization is unique in a number of other respects and bears substantially the image demanded by its strong-minded chief, and founder, Admiral Rickover.

In discussing the qualifications of some 90 officers and civilians assigned to Headquarters, Rickover told the Joint Atomic Energy Committee:

"By qualification I do not mean, necessarily, their technical ability, but their desire to work long hours and to be dedicated to the job as well. We adopted the procedure of getting only young people. If we get in people with more experience, it takes too long to have them unlearn the bad things they know. We haven't got time for that. We don't try to get top-flight scientists. A lot are top-flight scientists by reputation only. We can't afford to have people around who have reputations who don't work hard. We would rather have people who work hard and don't have reputations."

New recruits for headquarters organization come from a number of engineering and scientific schools which recommend their best graduates. After a series of 5 interviews, about 1 in 4 is accepted. A similar procedure applies to naval officers. Some 40 engineering duty officer applicants are screened annually and 4 or 5 finally accepted. Several naval reservists selected have stayed on in headquarters as civilian employees on completion of their duty tours.

Once selected for headquarters duty, officers as well as civilians are given at least six months' special training at schools and on projects, followed by assignments on the basis of ability, not rank, and irrespective of military or civilian status. "The best qualified man gets the job," Rickover states, "and in my opinion it is the only way you can run any kind of technical organization."

The organization also operates on a principle of retaining major control rather than assigning substantial areas of responsibility to contractors. This in effect draws contractors into an integration with Headquarters which expands the naval nuclear propulsion program from the "two hat" Navy-AEC concept to a "three hat" Navy-AEC-contractor concept. Headquarters control extends even as far as employment decisions on contractor personnel. "Anyone responsible for a reactor program," Rickover explains, "must take on the problem of seeing that his contractors hire the right sort of people and train them. Unless he does, he is in for trouble."

The centralized method of headquarters operation eliminates considerable redtape and memorandum writing. It permits quick decisions. But it violates generally accepted sound management criteria by overburdening key personnel with a large volume of both technical and nontechnical minor decisions. Justification for it is claimed not only from the inherently complex design interrelations within the powerplant itself, but in another circumstance explained to the Joint Atomic Energy Committee by Comdr. R. V. Laney, United States Navy:

"Each naval reactor project has a specific end in view. It is intended to be installed in a definite ship at some definite time. Because the building time for a ship and that for a reactor and the reactor plant components are different, the ship is partly built when the reactor and reactor equipment are still being designed. Its characteristics, its length, beam, its speed—all are determined, frozen. The task is very sharply defined, and there is a very high premium on success. The reactor designer must conceive, develop, design, and produce a reactor, which, when delivered to the ship, will fit into the reactor vessel which it has never seen before. That reactor vessel is resting in a ship which is a stranger, and the reactor, the vessel, the pumps, the heat exchangers, and the intricate control equipment must, the first time they operate in unison, operate correctly, so

the ship will have the necessary amount of power to produce the speed for which she was designed."

Projects such as Laney describes, together with necessary basic research, are presently carried on under close headquarters organization control at 3 development centers, 2 (Bettis Plant and Knolls Laboratory) operated for AEC by contractors, and 1 privately managed.

The Commission maintains Bettis Plant at Pittsburgh, operated by Westinghouse Electric, employing some 1,300 scientists and engineers, and Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory at Schenectady, operated by General Electric and employing another 500. Combustion Engineering, Inc., operates its own center near Windsor, Conn., employing approximately 200.

The centers, together with headquarters personnel, and close to 1,000 scientists and engineers on contractor payrolls, total nearly 3,000 highly skilled technicians at work on naval nuclear propulsion. Another 250 to 300 BuShips personnel engage in closely interrelated work.

Today bringing a new reactor concept into being takes about half the 6 years needed to produce the original *Nautilus* and *Seawolf* plants. A year is consumed by preliminary analysis and design studies to fix the essential nature of the project; another year is needed for detailed design and analysis, including mock-up critical experiment in the physics, chemistry, and metallurgy of the reactor. During the third year engineering, construction, and installation of the core, components, and machinery completes the work.

Throughout such a project weekly lists of critical items delayed, in trouble, or needing help is submitted by the development center to headquarters for priority attention. Detailed monthly reports on each phase of the project assist overall coordination. All major design and technical decisions in a program are made by agreement among the principals, that is, AEC, the Navy, and the development center. If there is strong dissent from any party, it is talked through until essential agreement is reached. Lesser technical decisions which derive from major ones, extending even to the contractor level, are made in somewhat the same way by being referred back to headquarters, the principal technical source of direction.

This pattern of vertical relationships between the development centers, contractors, and headquarters in its capacity as the AEC's Naval Nuclear Reactors Branch, does not, however, pertain to its intra-Navy relationships as Code 1500. These are substantially horizontal, particularly with the Preliminary Design Branch and with the Hull and Machinery Design Branches of the Bureau of Ships, where discussions are informal and close.

In general, Code 1500 is responsible for research, development, engineering, and installation of an entire nuclear plant of a new type. Reactors for subsequent plants remain a Code 1500 responsibility, but repeat machinery now comes under cognizance of BuShips Machinery Branch, the same as machinery for conventional ships. This shift back to conventional from task group administrative procedures as the program progresses from its research and development to production is a wise one.

Just as the development of naval nuclear propulsion created demand for special ships to utilize it, so has it created demand for specially selected and trained men to man them. The intricacies involved inevitably drew the Bureau of Ships into this field as a technical adviser to the Bureau of Naval Personnel. Large numbers of submariners have received the training and already some 200 men and 12 officers are being trained in anticipation of commissioning nuclear-powered surface ships.

Nuclear ship enlisted personnel are selected by forces afloat, but in accordance with strict standards of intelligence, ability, and conduct. So outstanding is this group that about 6 percent are further selected each year as officer candidates—20 times the overall Navy rate. Officers submit to a series of comprehensive interviews by Admiral Rickover and others before final acceptance for training.

Following selection both officers and men undergo 6 months' intensive schooling in physics, mathematics, and various nuclear subjects, followed by another 6 months' further study and practical operation of prototype plants at the National Nuclear Reactor Test Station, Arco, Idaho.

Officers are more intensely trained than enlisted men. All officers must, and a number of enlisted ratings do, qualify as nuclear plant chief operators before completing the course. Qualification establishes proficiency in all phases of reactor operation, particu-

larly in everything pertaining to safety. It requires at least 1,000 hours practical work on a prototype plant and is said to be several times as difficult as qualifying for submarine command.

In addition to regular training, prospective commanding officers are assigned several months' duty at headquarters organization and in the development centers. Each is placed in contact with the designers and developers of the powerplant destined for his command and acquires the same intimate knowledge of its capabilities as the men who created it.

The policy of building a land prototype of each naval nuclear plant type pays dividends, not only during development, but during the careful and meticulous training program as well. Crews go aboard ship fully experienced in operating a plant identical to the one which they must safely control to protect the lives of themselves and their shipmates. These factors, as well as care in design, are responsible for the excellent

safety records of presently operating nuclear submarines.

The advent of naval nuclear propulsion has, indeed, brought about as major a change in naval men, material, and methods as it has in concepts of naval tactics. It has placed on naval policy planners the difficult burden of allocating available naval funds to costly commitments for seapower in being to meet the crises of today and at the same time carrying forward the bold nuclear research, construction, and training programs needed to meet the crises of tomorrow.

But if Congress appropriates hoped-for funds, by 1966 the Nation will have in being 5 or 6 superflattops, half a dozen guided missile cruisers, the beginnings of a destroyer fleet, and some 45 submarines, all nuclear powered.

The substantial shift over from steam to naval nuclear power will have been made during a brief 18 years, compared to more than 50 years needed for the shift from sail to steam.

Naval nuclear ships and reactors

Ship	Purpose	Builder	Completion	Reactor ¹	Remarks
SSN571 <i>Nautilus</i>	Attack.....	Electric Boat.....	Sept. 30, 1954.....	S1W	Land prototype, Arco, Idaho.
SSN575 <i>Seawolf</i>	do.....	do.....	Mar. 20, 1957.....	S2W	First nuclear-powered ship.
SSN578 <i>Skate</i>	do.....	do.....	Dec. 23, 1957.....	S1G	Land prototype, West Milton, N. Y.
SSN579 <i>Swordfish</i>	do.....	Portsmouth.....	1958.....	S2G	Preliminary acceptance for limited service.
SSN583 <i>Sargo</i>	do.....	Mare Island.....	1958.....	S3W	Twin screw, conventional hull.
SSN584 <i>Seadragon</i>	do.....	Portsmouth.....	1959.....	S4W	Do.
SSGN587 <i>Halibut</i>	Guided missile.....	Mare Island.....	1959.....	S3W	Do.
SSRN586 <i>Triton</i>	Radar-picket.....	Electric Boat.....	1959.....	S3G	Hull modified for Regulus.
SSN585 <i>Skip Jack</i>	Attack.....	do.....	1959.....	S4G	Land prototype, West Milton, N. Y.
SSM588 <i>Scamp</i>	do.....	Mare Island.....	1960.....	S5W	Twin screw and twin reactor.
SSN589 <i>Scorpion</i>	do.....	Electric Boat.....	1960.....	S5W	Single screw, <i>Albacore</i> hull.
SSN590 <i>Sculpin</i>	do.....	Ingalls.....	1960.....	S5W	Do.
SSN591 <i>Shark</i>	do.....	Newport News.....	1960.....	S5W	Do.
SSN592 <i>Snook</i>	do.....	Ingalls.....	1960.....	S5W	Do.
SSN593 <i>Thresher</i>	do.....	Portsmouth.....	1960.....	S5W	Do.
SSGN594 <i>Permit</i>	Guided missile.....	Mare Island.....	1961.....	S5W	Fiscal year 1958 program. Regulus.
SSN595 <i>Pollack</i>	do.....	Portsmouth.....	1961.....	S5W	Do.
SSGN596 <i>Plunger</i>	do.....	Unassigned.....	1961.....	S5W	Do.
SSN597 <i>Tullibee</i>	Attack.....	Electric Boat.....	1961.....	S1C	Land prototype, Windsor, Conn.
SSGN(P?)598.....	Polars.....	do.....	1960(?).....	S2C	Fiscal year 1958 program. Small hull.
SSGN(P?)599.....	do.....	do.....	1960(?).....	S5W(?)	Fiscal year 1958 supplemental.
SSGN(P?)600.....	do.....	Mare Island.....	1960(?).....	S5W(?)	Do.
CLG(N)9 <i>Long Beach</i>	Guided-missile.....	Bethlehem (Fore River).....	1960.....	S5W(?)	Do.
CVA(N)65 <i>Enterprise</i>	Supercarrier.....	Newport News.....	1961.....	C1W	2 reactors.
DLG(N).....	Frigate.....	do.....	do.....	A1W	Land prototype, Arco, Idaho.
				A2W	8 reactors.
				D1W	AEC Knolls Laboratory assigned light weight design.
				D2W	Not yet authorized.

¹ In naval reactor code first letter indicates ship type, numeral indicates precedence in design series, second letter indicates developer: W, Westinghouse; G, General Electric; C, Combustion Engineering. All are of pressurized, water-cooled, water-

moderated types except S1G and S2G, cooled by liquid sodium and moderated by beryllium.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson Answers Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMER H. BUDGE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, there follows a radio report over station KRXX, of Rexburg, Idaho. I am sure readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be interested in the questions reported by Gene Shumate of Rexburg and the answers by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson:

A few weeks ago I wrote a letter to Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture. This followed the Presidential veto of the attempt by Congress to retain farm price supports at the present level for the remainder of the year. In the letter I explained to Mr. Benson that distance prevented attendance at his regular news con-

ferences and that in lieu of such attendance, I would like answers to seven specific questions. When the Secretary returned to Washington from a trip West, he answered the questions. I'm sure we all appreciate this consideration and I'm sure you will be interested in the questions and answers.

Mr. Benson wrote: "In reply to your questions in the order listed in your letter:

"Question. President Eisenhower commented, at the time he vetoed the latest farm legislation, that what the farmer needed was a 'thaw' and not a 'freeze.' Exactly what does this mean?

"Answer. The President was referring to the need for more freedom to farmers in determining their production and marketing plans to meet rapidly changing conditions and to more flexibility to the Secretary in establishing the national average support levels and acreage allotments. The thaw versus freeze concept is discussed in the concluding paragraph of the President's message."

Breaking away from the letter for just a moment, we will quote that last paragraph mentioned:

"To meet the rapidly changing conditions in agriculture, farmers must be able to make their own management decisions on their

own farms. They must not have their production and prices frozen in an outmoded pattern. They must not be made the captives of a restricted history; they must be given freedom to build a brighter future. This can be done if farmers and those who serve them will team up in support of sound legislative and administrative action."

That was the President's last paragraph in his message to Congress when he returned the Senate resolution without his approval.

Now, back to Secretary Benson's letter:

"Question. Is it your opinion that the lowering of support prices will lead to higher market prices for farm products in time for the farmer to benefit this year?

"Answer. The President's program is a long-time program which is not scheduled to go into effect until the 1959 crop season. Hence, there could be no benefits from the President's program in the 1958 crop season. Incidentally, to be effective beginning with the 1959 crop year, the President's program should be approved by Congress this year."

"Question. Is the recent 4-percent rise in farm prices due to a general improvement in farm produce or is it primarily livestock price rises?

"Answer. Prices of all the various groups for which the Department compiles prices

except wool and dairy products increased from mid-February to mid-March when farm prices in general advanced 4 percent. The most important increase was in the form of continued higher prices for meat animals. Higher prices for potatoes, fruit, and eggs also contributed substantially to the increase.

"Question. How much of the increase in beef prices is due to unfavorable weather in the Southeast?

"Answer. Recent unfavorable weather in the Southeast had practically no effect on beef prices. However, the current price is partly reflecting the drought 2 years ago in the Southeast.

"Question. How much of the increase in beef prices is due to the withholding of cattle from the market by southwestern raisers as they try to build up herds depleted by the recent drought?

"Answer. Most of the increase in beef prices is due to the reduction in slaughter supplies which is general throughout the United States, and the strong demand.

"Question. Is there any estimate in your Department of what the market prices on small grains would be if all supports and acreage allotments were removed; on wheat, for instance?

"Answer. The President's program does not contemplate the discontinuance of price supports. On the contrary, the program recognizes that there is nothing wrong with a sound and realistic storage and loan program. Under these circumstances we have not made any estimates as to what prices would be without supports.

"Question. Do you feel that in the future the farmer must accept the fact that open market prices on foods and fibers, as well as dairy products, will maintain a level below prevailing prices and that the answer to profitable farming is the elimination of smaller units in favor of larger, more-efficient units?

"Answer. There is no reason to believe that farm prices will decline under the President's program. Currently, prices of nonprice-supported commodities (such as livestock) are higher, relatively speaking, than prices of supported commodities. The level of farm prices in the future will be influenced to a large degree by the extent to which markets can be expanded. As far as future supports are concerned, the President has indicated that they will be set at levels as high as could be justified under the criteria specified by law. Incidentally, the basic objective of the President's program is higher net income which depends upon the volume sold as well as price per unit. While in recent years there has been a trend to larger land holdings and fewer farms, the family farm is holding its own. We believe the family farm will always continue to be the backbone of American agriculture."

And these have been the answers from Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson to a recent letter in which I wrote him some specific questions.

Financing Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, 1958, the Federal Reserve Board transmitted to the chairmen of the Banking and Currency Committees and the Select Committees on Small

Business of both Houses of Congress a document on the financing of small business which was very clearly labeled a study of financing of small business. The Board of Governors was very careful in the letter of transmittal not to refer to the document as a report. The four chairmen of the Congressional committees joined in the statement, submitting this study to the Congress for its attention. They, too, carefully referred to it as a study and not as a report.

In the preparation of the document as a committee print for use by Members of Congress, unfortunately, somebody placed upon the cover of the document the word "report" instead of "study."

That has brought about an unfortunate situation, due to careless reporting and careless editorializing on the part of some members of the press. One editorial in the Wall Street Journal editorialized about this study, indicating "it would be well if Congress paid attention to it" and further stated that the "report" indicated the Small Business Administration was a temporary and a "distress organization," holding out no promise to small business primarily because the agency was set up "to grant loans to applicants who cannot get them anywhere else." It then goes on to say that this is unsound business practice, and the Government should not encourage loans to poor credit risks.

It is easy to write, but it takes real hard work to become properly informed before writing.

Not only was the study not a report but the study itself very plainly states that no member of the Board participated in the writing of the material submitted, and, on the contrary, the "views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Bank."

Now let us turn our attention for a moment to the contents of the study to determine whether or not there is anything there to sustain the criticism and improper conclusions found in the news item.

The study very properly states that the law has always required of the Small Business Administration and its predecessor lending agencies, that before the Government makes any credit available, it must appear that the loans cannot be obtained from private financing.

This provision has been found sound and workable. It is necessary in order to protect private enterprise from Government competition.

That does not mean, however, that loans are to be made to bad risks. As a matter of fact, the Government lending agencies, and particularly the Small Business Administration, have a very good record in that respect. Actually, there have been more complaints made against the Small Business Administration because it adheres too strictly to the requirement of the law that no loan be made unless there is "reasonable assurance of repayment." The loss ratio by the Small Business Administration is much, much smaller than that experienced by private lenders.

There are many reasons why small business can get no loans from private

lenders other than the fact that it is a bad credit risk. There are plenty of good credit risks among the small-business men of the country who have been unable to get private loans. The Small Business Administration is filling that void to the limited extent permitted by existing law.

There is nothing in the study as presented by the Federal Reserve Board which justifies the conclusion that Government encourages private lenders to consider poor credit risks.

There is no doubt that the Government can and should play a greater role in connection with making risk or equity capital available to small business and there is much to be said for making loans available for a term beyond the 10 years permitted by the existing law to the Small Business Administration. Constructive criticisms along those lines will be helpful to the Congress in performing its duty. News items and editorials, such as referred to above, will do nothing except to create confusion.

In connection with the foregoing, I am pleased to call to the attention of our colleagues the following letters written to and received by the ever-vigilant George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, April 16, 1958.

MR. GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President, National Federation of
Independent Business, Washington
Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BURGER: Thank you for your letter of April 14. I am glad to have your further comments about the Small Business Administration.

The report to which the Wall Street Journal release referred is a technical study of the problem of small-business financing, prepared by the staff of the Federal Reserve System with a number of university or independent scholars also collaborating. The conclusions drawn in the individual studies are those of the authors, and do not necessarily represent the views of the Board of Governors. The published study was given to the press without an accompanying release prepared by the Board or its staff. Such comments as the press may have made of the study, or such points as the press may have taken out of context, are, therefore, the responsibility of the press and in no way the responsibility of the Board.

Sincerely yours,
WM. MCC. MARTIN, JR.

APRIL 14, 1958.

HON. WILLIAM MCC. MARTIN,
Chairman, Federal Reserve Board,
Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR MR. MARTIN: I noted in the Wall Street Journal today: "Reserve Board says small business agency, banks fail to aid growth." Of course both this office and our head office at Burlingame, Calif., will closely scrutinize and study the report issued by the Board to the Committee on Banking and Currency and the select Committees on Small Business. However, we do believe there is some need for a clarification and proper evaluation of the operations of the Small Business Administration.

As the saying goes: "Rome wasn't built in a day" and it goes without saying that in our opinion, after closely scrutinizing the operations of the agency from its inception, it may be found that the operation of the

agency was handicapped from the first instance through impediments. To substantiate that statement—from the very first instance the National Federation of Independent Business vigorously opposed the establishment within the agency of the Policy Board, and we are referring to the Secretary of the Treasury or his alternate, and the Secretary of Commerce or his alternate, and the SBA Administrator.

When the vote came up on this in the United States Senate in the first instance this office wired 96 Members of the Senate opposing that part of the act. In other words, we maintained that the administration of the act should rise or fall on the actions of the Administrator himself, and we have lived to see the day that we were correct in our findings.

We know that when the agency was originally established and a few months into its operation, after a hurried nationwide visit in key regional offices of SBA, and upon reporting our findings back to Washington the result was that the whole operation of the SBA as to its lending policy was changed as it related to those eligible to secure SBA loans.

The Wall Street Journal report further states: "The study criticized the SBA for granting loans only when small business finds it impossible to get them anywhere else." What's wrong with that? I believe it may be found in the act itself that small business is expected to attempt to secure loans from private sources, and when they are not available and the credit standing of the applicant is O. K., the Small Business Administration moves in. In other words the procedure used by SBA is not in competition with private banking circles.

The report further states: "The tremendous postwar increase in indebtedness of small businesses might raise the question of whether credit had become too readily available." The writer's experience in private business for better than a quarter of a century or more prior to my connection with the federation leads me to believe that where small business goes in for financial loans from private banking institutions their applications are generally scrutinized very very carefully before any consideration is given to the loan.

We believe, from reviewing the operations of the Small Business Administration, and after having recently completed personal visits to SBA Offices in Chicago, Minneapolis, Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and New York City, that the agency is showing consistent progress more in keeping with the will of the Congress and the full intent of the act.

We further believe, due to the splendid action of the House in the 1st session of the 85th Congress, which voted and approved improved SBA legislation expanding the powers and operations of the agency, and more important, the key to its operation as to financing matters—authorizing a new Advisory Board consisting of the Administrator, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of the Treasury, and not less than 3 nor more than 5 small-business men, this will go a long long ways in bringing long overdue financial assistance to small business where such credit is not available through private banking institutions, and in closing we might add that the opinion we have expressed above is also the opinion held by some members of the banking fraternity.

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President, National Federation
of Independent Business.

APRIL 17, 1958.

EDITOR, WALL STREET JOURNAL,
44 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I noted with considerable interest on the editorial page of today's Wall

Street Journal "Topsy-Turvy Business," which certainly calls for our attention in view of the interest our nationwide membership—all independent business and professional men—has in the operation of the Small Business Administration.

You state: "The temporary Small Business Administration will probably outlive us all." You are correct, and it will outlive us all until such time as banking institutions throughout the Nation are permitted to make long-term capital loans to small business. You are well aware that under present banking laws the banks more or less are regulated by State and Federal law on long-term loans.

We are leaving no stone unturned, which after all is the majority vote of our membership, to have the Senate take concurrent action on the improved Small Business Administration legislation which was voted by practically unanimous action in the House in the 1st session of the 85th Congress—to be exact, 392 for and 2 against.

Our understanding of the recently released report of the Federal Reserve Board, "Financing Small Business," is that it was not a report of the Board itself but was merely a report of the staff which was engaged to study the situation.

Page 19 of the report carries letter of transmittal dated March 31, 1958, directed to the chairman, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, Senate Select Committee on Small Business, House Committee on Banking and Currency, House Select Committee on Small Business, signed by Wm. McC. Martin, Jr., Chairman, in which he stated: "Last fall the research staffs of the Board of Governors and the Federal Reserve banks undertook a study of the financing problems of small business." We could find nothing in Mr. Martin's letter to the committees where he called the Small Business Administration a distress organization, nor do we find in his letter any comments as quoted: "hold out any promise for development" of small businesses.

We believe in fairness to your nationwide readers of the Journal that you may find it convenient to publish this letter as it goes without saying many thousands of small business people throughout the Nation do read the Wall Street Journal.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President, National Federation
of Independent Business.

Victory Without War—Is It Possible?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, an excellent new book published a few days ago has come to my attention. The title is Victory Without War. This is a challenging subject in which all of us are deeply interested.

This perceptive volume is written by a distinguished soldier-analyst, George Fielding Eliot. Mr. Eliot tells a sharply challenging story of the amazing build-up in the missile and space exploration field now credited to Soviet Russia. He recommends certain "must" courses to make war impossible. These are courses to be taken by the United States and the Free World if they are to equal the Soviet Union's remarkable advance.

To know current, vital problems in this most interesting area, I recommend this volume as an efficient and telling work which will make every intelligent American, regardless of party, stop, look, and listen.

I am particularly struck with the keen analysis embodied in these forward-looking views and want them to be considered by the careful and thinking Members of the Congress and the American people in broadening the basis for their judgment.

The Defense of America: A Special Debate on the Reorganization of the Defense Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following broadcast entitled "The Defense of America: A Special Debate on the Reorganization of the Defense Department," as broadcast over the CBS television network, April 20, 1958. Guests, the Honorable Leverett Saltonstall, United States Senator, Republican, of Massachusetts; the Honorable William C. Foster, Deputy Secretary of Defense, 1951-1953, member of the Advisory Committee to the Secretary of Defense To Study the Reorganization Plan, the Honorable F. Edward Hébert, United States House of Representatives, Democrat, of Louisiana; the Honorable John T. Koehler, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, 1949 to 1951. Moderator, George Herman, CBS News. Producer, Nancy Hanschman.

The broadcast follows:

Mr. HERMAN. I am George Herman. I am substituting for Eric Sevareid, who is unable to be here.

Gentlemen, President Eisenhower wants a major reorganization of the Defense Department involving the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

Do you agree, Senator SALTONSTALL? Senator SALTONSTALL. I am sympathetic with his objectives.

Mr. HERMAN. Congressman HÉBERT?

Mr. HÉBERT. I am opposed to the President's proposal.

Mr. FOSTER. The plan demonstrates the President's leadership in the field in which he is preeminent.

Mr. HERMAN. Mr. Koehler?

Mr. KOEHLER. I am opposed to any proposal which results in merger of the armed services.

ANNOUNCER. From Washington, the CBS Television Network brings you The Defense of America: A Special Debate on the Reorganization of the Defense Department.

Participating in the debate are Senator Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts, top Republican on the Senate Armed Services Committee; William C. Foster, former Deputy Secretary of Defense; Representative Edward Hébert, of Louisiana, one of the top Democrats on the House Armed Services Committee; and John T. Koehler, former Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

The moderator is George Herman, CBS News Washington correspondent.

Mr. HERMAN. Gentlemen, I think you all know that President Eisenhower told Congress last January that he was going to give them his plans for defense reorganization before long, and on the 3d of April he sent Congress a message which proposed a much broader and deeper reorganization than anyone had apparently expected.

On April 16, he sent a draft of legislation to bring about that reorganization, and a bill was promptly introduced in Congress, and the following day he delivered a strong and dramatic appeal for support in a speech before a gathering of news editors here in Washington.

Secretary of Defense McElroy has also spoken in defense of the plan, which very strongly bears his own imprint.

With the Department of Defense under Mr. McElroy, which drew up the main points of the plan after conferring with past and present Chiefs of Staff and with the five-man committee of which Mr. Foster was a member, the President's legislative leaders will now have the main burden of carrying forward this plan in Congress, and in particular that means Senator SALTONSTALL.

So, Senator, would you start off by telling us what you feel about the President's reorganization plan?

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Herman, I am glad to. First, let me say I am happy to be on this program with these 3 other gentlemen and yourself, because I have worked with all 4 of you, on Capitol Hill, on the subject, at one time or another.

Now, today what we all want is security and a great opportunity for peace in the world. What we need for our security is strong defense of a quick retaliatory effort, quick and very massive in the retaliatory effort. To get that quick retaliatory effort, we have got to have efficiency, and to be efficient we have got to today use as little money as we can, because of the tremendous expense that goes into our defensive effort.

Mr. HERMAN. And for that reason you plan to support the—

Senator SALTONSTALL. As I said, I am sympathetic with the objectives of the President. I think we have got to work out some of the details in the Congress that aren't perhaps entirely clear in his message or in the bill that he has submitted.

Mr. HERMAN. Thank you, Senator SALTONSTALL.

Congressman HÉBERT?

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Herman, I am surprised at Senator SALTONSTALL's statement, pleasantly so, because I can't be in disagreement with it.

Mr. HERMAN. Try.

Mr. HÉBERT. We aren't at all in disagreement on the objectives. We are all for mother and country and against sin, but the thing that strikes me most in the President's most recent proposition to reorganize the Department is the similarity of all previous reorganization attempts. I think it would be well to trace the history of these reorganization movements.

The original one began in 1947, at which time we had the original intent, and of course it was for efficiency and economy, the same words used today. At that time it was indicated that if we adopted the original Unification Act, everything would be solved and we would be on our way to efficiency and economy.

Admiral Forrest Sherman at that time then envisaged what the Defense Department would be, and his words were: there would be 1 Secretary, 4 deputies, 100 people, and a concentrated office, with a decentralization of power.

That Secretary and 4 deputies and 100 people has now grown to 33 individuals in the Department of Defense who can be

called Mr. Secretary, and the hundred people have grown to 3,500 people.

Now, the next time: we also heard of the reorganization as soon as we got a new Secretary of Defense, Mr. Louis Johnson. He came to the Hill in 1949, I think it was.

He said, "We want efficiency and we want economy. Now, if you will just give us this added power, it is going to solve everything."

So he marched up the hill. Then we had another Secretary of Defense come up, Mr. Charles Wilson, and he came to the Hill.

He said, "We want efficiency and we want economy. If you change this and give me more power, we are going to accomplish this and give us more Secretaries."

So we promptly gave him that. And now, several years later, we have another new Secretary. He marched up the hill again and we hear again efficiency and economy.

Now, these statements I am making in general and I am quoting the individuals in general, but for the benefit of my friend, Senator SALTONSTALL, and Mr. Foster, I have the records stacked here and here which can be found the accurate quotes, and I am sure you will accept my paraphrasing.

But I think there is one thing I want to leave, before I go on now, and that is this: The President has said that the present law causes waste and ineffectiveness, but I wonder who wrote the present law, except the President himself. The Congress had absolutely nothing to do with it. They accepted a blank check from him, and we couldn't change a comma or a semicolon.

Mr. HERMAN. I just want to ask you as you conclude that statement, Mr. HÉBERT, whether by this you mean that you do not think we need further efficiency, and you do not propose to support the President's—

Mr. HÉBERT. We need further efficiency and economy, but we could do it with what we have in hand and could have done it under the first act.

Mr. HERMAN. Mr. Foster, I am sure you will have a reaction to that.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I do. Of course, I think we all agree in the objectives. I think we all accept the Congressman's paraphrase, although he may have conceivably taken it a little bit black where it was gray instead of white.

You are quite right. There have been each time over these years a hope that the latest plan would meet the change in conditions a little bit better, and I think we must all realize that conditions have substantially changed since 1947.

I think the onrush of technology, to use the President's phrase, has been something that none of us could have foreseen. I think the substantial progress which our major enemy has made none of us could have foreseen.

I think it is quite clear today that we need a more direct command channel between the President as Commander in Chief through his deputy, the Secretary of Defense, to the operating commands, which are the cutting edges of our defense, and I think that each of these plans to which you refer has actually made an improvement.

True we have never reached perfection; we never will. I am sure that this plan will require amendment sometime in the future. But I do believe that this does meet the major things which we have to do; namely, to clarify command channels, to put research and technology at a high level where it can be developed and be available to the Chiefs of Staff to meet the kind of conditions which we face from here in.

And while I agree perhaps it could have been done better each time, Mr. Congressman, it has improved down through the years, but I believe we need this to make it better and good enough to meet today's challenge.

Mr. HERMAN. Mr. Foster, you were 1 of the 5 men on the committee which advised Secretary McElroy on the building of this plan. Let me ask you this: Were the past plans considered as evolutionary steps? Was that built upon the past, the changes of the past plans?

Mr. FOSTER. This is certainly evolutionary, and I would not say I was a member of the committee. I was 1 of the group of 5 consultants and we consulted, questioned, advised, in that sense, but the plan is the President's and the Secretary's, using, to the extent that he could, since he had not been there long, as you know, the experience which a number of us had had.

And you will recall the group, the three Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs, Mr. Rockefeller who has been active in administrative recommendations through the whole Government, and myself, and I think that as a group of consultants we were very effective in challenging major suggestions, and I think that what has come out as evolutionary is not destructive to what has gone on in the past, but will be an improvement over it.

Mr. HERMAN. Mr. Koehler, you were in the Pentagon from 1949 to 1951, I believe, as an Assistant Secretary of the Navy. You were there during the last reorganization. How does this one strike you?

Mr. KOEHLER. Well, I wasn't there during the last reorganization. I was there during the first two. I wasn't there in 1953.

As Congressman HÉBERT has said, this is No. 4.

Now, I would like to take a slightly different tack from that taken by the other three gentlemen. I agree, of course, with the objectives, that we must have the most efficient and the most capable military forces that our circumstances and our finances permit. But in view of some disagreements at very high level, and being a lawyer, I think that I can best perform my part of this task this afternoon to the language of the proposals.

The Congress has consistently repulsed attempts (1) to merge our armed services; (2) to create a single Chief of Staff; and (3) to authorize someone other than Congress to prescribe the roles and missions of the services, which authority is vested solely in the Congress by article 1, section A, clauses 12, 13, and 14 of the Constitution.

The President has said as recently as last Thursday that the proposed changes will not result in merger, nor the creation of a general staff system, and that the bill does not undermine the constitutional power of the Congress in this respect.

On the other hand, Chairman VINSON, of the House Armed Services Committee, has reached the opposite conclusion on each of those three points. It goes without saying that both statements are entitled to highest consideration and the highest respect. I believe, therefore, that we should, to the extent possible, address ourselves to the language of the bill and in considering the language, consider just as carefully the language that would be deleted from the present legislation.

Mr. HERMAN. Gentlemen, in listening to all four of you, one thing strikes me right away. We all talk about whether we call it chains of command, whether we call it efficiency, whether it gets called as it was called in the previous reorganization, "more bang for a buck," we all talk about improving the status of our Armed Forces and we all talk about getting more firepower, more defense power for our dollar.

What I would like to ask of you at this point is how bad are things? How urgently do we need reorganization? Are things in a devil of a mess, and how quickly must we move on this? Senator SALTONSTALL.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I would just say this, Mr. Herman, and you bring up a very good point. Things aren't in a mess. Things are going forward well. They can go

forward better. But we have always got to remember today is the speed of attack. Today or in a year or so the Russians presumably can send a missile over here that will come over in 30 minutes.

Now that is quite different from World War I or World War II or 1947, Mr. HÉBERT. It can come over very quickly. Therefore, we have got to organize our defense very quickly and very efficiently, and that has got to mean a quicker chain of command and a quicker action, and that action has got to be devastating if we are going to be secure, because if it is devastating we won't be attacked.

Mr. HÉBERT. Senator, show me one thing in the present law which the President himself wrote with a blank check which would prevent immediate action if we were attacked?

Senator SALTONSTALL. The one thing is the time that it takes to get a command, we will say, from the Secretary of Defense or from the Joint Chiefs of Staff down through to the command post for action.

Mr. HÉBERT. Where is that prevented in the present law?

Senator SALTONSTALL. There is nothing to prevent it.

Mr. HÉBERT. Of course there is not.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Except that the people that it has to go through. What we want to do is to have it go through as few people as possible, and yet keep a civilian head at the final command.

Mr. HÉBERT. I am thoroughly in accord, but I suggest there is not a thing in the present law that prevents immediate action. There is not one thing, and I would like to have it pointed out if there is one thing.

Keep in mind again, Senator, that the President himself in 1953—what has been so different from 1953 to 1958—the President himself wrote the present law under which they exist in the Defense Department, you will agree with me on that I am sure, because it was a reorganization act, not a statutory act, and the President wrote it and we couldn't change a comma. In this book back here which I won't have time to bring out, he says now is the time to perfect the Department, "and I am perfecting it now with this plan."

Mr. HERMAN. Congressman HÉBERT, before you come out with any more of your secret weapons from the table back there, let me ask you this:

Do you believe that things have not changed so radically from the production of missiles and from the shrinking of warning times, that things do not require a different frame now from the frame they required 5-10 years ago?

Mr. HÉBERT. No, sir. Our lack of a decision or, if not lack of decision, of an immediate decision. The stumbling block in the Defense Department has been in the area of the Comptroller who controls the money in which Mr. Eisenhower is so interested. We could have put up a satellite a year and a half ago if the decision had been made in the Defense Department, and it was not made.

Mr. FOSTER. May I go back to this question of command, and the President's former reorganization act, because I think this is extremely important. It is true it was written as a reorganization plan, by the President when he first came in. Five years have passed. We do have a strong security setup in our Armed Forces, but in 5 years we have learned, as Senator SALTONSTALL said, that the command lines are not as clear as we would like to have them.

The executive agent process is not as effective under these terms and times which we are up against today. Then when that was written we thought in terms of a manned air force attacking us. This is a matter of hours. We had sufficient tactical warning. We could get our deterrent forces, our retali-

atory forces in the air. Today, as Senator SALTONSTALL says, this is a matter of 30 minutes. In addition to that, in any passage of command down, the executive agent does introduce what have been determined to be unnecessary additional layers to go through.

Mr. HÉBERT. That is correct.

Mr. FOSTER. I remember in history, sir, and I appeared before you several times when I was there, you were very concerned about layers of command at that time. We were talking about cataloging, you will recall, and you felt there were too many. This is simply a movement toward the elimination of obstructive layers.

Mr. HÉBERT. I don't want to monopolize the time, Mr. Foster, but you injected something in there. I want to ask you a question.

You mentioned the cataloging situation. That was the one act that to unify and make uniform purchases, make a catalog with a single number, isn't that correct?

Mr. FOSTER. No; it didn't unify purchases.

Mr. HÉBERT. But it was direction for unification, wasn't it?

Mr. FOSTER. It was an attempt to get a common name for each and every item.

Mr. HÉBERT. And that is what is being done today at a savings of some \$5 billion, I think, estimated by the Hoover Commission, isn't that correct?

Mr. FOSTER. This is correct, and you and I both worked toward this end.

Mr. HÉBERT. You did? Wait just one second please, sir. I have the record here in which you opposed that bill and said you had enough laws; that you didn't need any more laws. Now where do you stand today?

Mr. FOSTER. We would have done it without the law and we do not feel that the Congress in that kind of a thing should get in and do the executive actions which you, sir, as a legislator write the policies and the executive branch carries out.

Mr. HÉBERT. I have proved my point.

Mr. HERMAN. Between the legislator and the administrator here, I think a lawyer wanted to get a word in.

Mr. KOEHLER. I wanted to get back to the discussion that Senator SALTONSTALL started; namely, that because of technological improvements and the fact that the new world, the new look is so different, we must be able to act very very speedily.

I agree, but it strikes me as more than a happenstance that this desire for speed in reaction has come about very recently. Now the missile program is not new. The missile program is not a matter of the last 6 months. And it seems very interesting that during the years 1953 through 1957 the organization of the Department of Defense was deemed amply capable of taking care of technological improvements under the present Joint Chiefs of Staff.

But the Rockefeller report has come out within the last few months; and the Rockefeller report, which I think in my humble way is the basis of this proposal; is replete with very sweeping statements—

Mr. FOSTER. May I interrupt there, because it is not the basis of this proposal, Mr. Koehler.

Mr. KOEHLER. Shall I say was taken into consideration then in preparing—

Mr. FOSTER. It was along with the advice and counsel of dozens, twenties of other people, all of whom were also experienced and competent.

Mr. KOEHLER. I stand corrected. Shall I say it had a bearing on the subject. But the Rockefeller report—and I, of course, have not had access to other reports—is complete with sweeping conclusions and generalizations; and, so far as I am concerned, it is very much like a brief without citation of authority.

I do not feel that the present Joint Chiefs of Staff have failed to make proper position for the protection of this country in the event of some international disaster. It may

be that their present system could be improved, because any system can be improved, but I am astonished that in a period of a few months a reorganization as sweeping as this should be necessary, in view of what I consider to be the tremendous advances we have made in the last 10 years in unification.

Senator SALTONSTALL. May I, Mr. Koehler, go into one part of that, and that is this: The position of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

We put in there our most experienced military man, a man with a hard personality and a man in whom the country has confidence.

We have had General Bradley, Admiral Radford, and now General Twining. Those are the three.

Now what we really in a way do is to downgrade him when we put him in there. We do not give him authority. Now that bothered me in 1947. It bothered me again in 1949, and I was on both those conference committees that worked out the technical language of those acts.

Now what the President is trying to do is not to downgrade the Chief of Staff, but to take advantage of his experience and to give him a true responsibility in working out our strategy, as I see it. And that is one very important part of this act. I do not think anybody will—well, I will not say anybody, but I do not think that that should be too much opposed.

Mr. HERMAN. Let me ask you four gentlemen this. At this point in our history, with the missile war apparently approaching the tilt, do you then think that we can respond to these future fast happening wars with our present setup, or some kind of a reorganization, whether it be a basic reorganization or a plan of this kind, or whether it would simply be a reorganization decided upon by the Chiefs of Staff, that some such reorganization is needed, or are we all right for a missile war now?

Mr. HÉBERT. I think the reorganization is needed in the other direction. Cut out all of these secretaries and all of these needless people. Let the Joint Chiefs of Staff have some authority right directly under the Secretary of Defense himself, and revert back to the original plan as it was drawn and as the testimony of General Eisenhower at that time and Forest Sherman, Bob Patterson, everybody that appeared said would settle it.

However, there is one thing, and Senator SALTONSTALL has put his finger on it. There is one thing that worries me greatly about this military thing, and that is a military man on horseback. That is the idea, of course, it has been thrown up as a screen, Senator.

I know they say even the President, and I may say here parenthetically something that I am deeply concerned about, and that is the language of the President in his speech the other day, as an example, before the national editors association in which he just tossed off with a wave of the hand and said of the people who criticized him: it was sheer nonsense. Does he mean to say that he can wave off a man like CARL VINSON, whom he undoubtedly was criticizing, 44 years of experience in military affairs in this country? Every man who wears a star on the uniform today was a lieutenant when he came to Congress, and that includes General Eisenhower. Whom General Eisenhower calls Uncle CARL. Is that nonsense when he gives forth? I don't think so.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. HÉBERT, we all have great respect for Uncle CARL. I have dealt with him across the table a good many times, and I know he is a man who has a great deal of knowledge on this subject. But that doesn't mean that the President necessarily was criticizing him.

What I think the President wants to do is to give a greater responsibility to the Joint

Chiefs of Staff, and to give duties to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Chairman, under this bill of the President's, isn't going to be a one man on horseback.

Mr. HÉBERT. Not at this time, but in the future.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Nor ever, I hope.

Mr. HÉBERT. You hope.

Senator SALTONSTALL. You are looking pessimistically at the future. I wouldn't agree with making him one man, but he has got the Joint Chiefs to work with. The Joint Chiefs are kept as operational heads, but at the same time they are allowed to delegate certain of their operational duties so as to have more time for strategic planning and for the overall operation. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is given certain managerial duties. He appoints the Director. The Director will be responsible to him, the Director of the Joint Staff Organization. And the Joint Staff Organization is built up to be the overall strategic command.

Mr. HÉBERT. And, mind you, this new bill or proposal of the President puts an unlimited number of people on the Joint Chiefs, where it was previously limited.

Mr. HERMAN. Let me go to the far end of the table now and ask first Mr. Foster—

Mr. FOSTER. As an engineer, may I get a word in with all these lawyers?

Mr. HÉBERT. I am not a lawyer.

Mr. FOSTER. I assumed you were a lawyer, but if not, I will get in anyway.

I would like to get back to Mr. Koehler's statement first about all this has developed in the last few months, and why didn't we know it before, since we have known about missiles for some time.

We have known about missiles for some time. They did not give evidence of becoming operational in the immediate future until the last several months. But there had been much study given to what we did about missiles over the last 4 or 5 years, and the military men who were concerned with this were those same three distinguished Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs that you speak of, General Eisenhower, and General Gruenther, each of whom believe at this point in history in order to meet these new threats that there should be a clarification of these lines of command in order to do it more rapidly.

Now, going to Mr. HÉBERT's statement about CARL VINSON, I think everyone in the Defense Department, everyone in the military services, has great respect for his experience and his ability. But I think in this he has perhaps felt, as you say, that there could be the man on horseback, but I wonder if that is realistic.

May I just finish one sentence. The President is the Commander in Chief of the military forces by that same Constitution to which we refer. He is charged with that responsibility and he must discharge it. It is a terrific responsibility. He must have under him a man who can pass those commands as clearly and quickly through as it is possible to do it.

And I think that this setup does exactly that. There can be no man on horseback with our system of government, because, you know, every single military man is under the direction of a civilian, and every civilian is under the direction and under the control of you gentlemen as Congress who will appropriate, and there are numerous other groups and controls within the Government that make it impossible to ever achieve the man on horseback under this or any other similar democratic plan of organization.

Mr. HERMAN. I would like to hear the lawyers' reaction to that.

Mr. KOEHLER. I think it is just about my turn to say something. Bill, I clearly would have no way of passing any informed comment on the extent to which or the manner

in which the chain of command over military operations should be clarified. I am a civilian. I just don't know. To the extent that it can be done properly, it should be done.

What concerns me, as I said before, is the necessity, the apparent necessity, of a sweeping reorganization of the entire Department of Defense. Now, I warned you originally that I was going to get to the law, and I think what is important is not only what is in the new proposal but what has been stricken out.

I now read the present law:

"Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act"—this is existing law—"the combatant functions assigned to the military services by section"—so and so and so and so—"shall not be transferred, reassigned, abolished or consolidated. Military personnel shall not be so detailed or assigned as to impair such combatant functions. The Secretary of Defense shall not direct the use and expenditure of funds of the Department of Defense in such manner as to affect the result prohibited by paragraphs 1 and 2."

And substituted therefor, the proposed law is a provision that the Secretary of Defense shall have authority to establish unified or specified commands and assign forces of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, to those commands.

When you add to that the provision that the requirement of law that the three Departments shall be separately administered is to be stricken out, and then when you add to that this provision, I mean by striking—this is in the present law which I am now about to read, and which is to be stricken:

"No provision of this act shall be so construed as to prevent a Secretary of a Military Department or a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff from presenting to the Congress on his own initiative, after first so informing the Secretary of Defense, any recommendation related to the Department of Defense that he may deem proper."

So the Congress, gentlemen, is forbidden to receive the very information it should have in order that it may judge more capabilities of the service.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Koehler, would you yield there?

Mr. KOEHLER. Certainly. I am finished.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I don't think the unified command violates any question or involves any question of merger of forces. We did it in the war. We are doing it now.

Mr. KOEHLER. I couldn't agree with you more.

Senator SALTONSTALL. So far as individual members of the Defense Department coming up to the Congress, I personally do not believe that the Congress will change that provision. Now, the President himself has said—

Mr. KOEHLER. I am pleased to hear you say that.

Senator SALTONSTALL. The President himself has said that he did not feel that a man, when he is asked questions, or at least McElroy said that, and I think the President has said it, that when a man is asked questions he should answer truthfully. And we have had a great deal of experience in that in the last 18 months, in the so-called Symington preparedness committee and in the Johnson preparedness committee. We have had other freedom of discussion with a man holding up his hand and taking an oath and speaking truthfully. So I wouldn't worry about that.

Now, I think so far as the merging of the services are concerned, we can't connect that with unified command.

Mr. KOEHLER. No.

Senator SALTONSTALL. That is another problem that has got to be argued out by itself. And there again the President has

said emphatically he did not wish to merge the services.

Mr. KOEHLER. I know that. The difficulty is, Senator, that I find it extremely difficult to square the language of the proposal as written. Now, when we come—section 2 is the declaration of intent of the statute, and section 2 says it shall be the intent of this legislation not to merge the armed services. Well and good.

Now, if we turn to the section of the statute which implements that section of intent, within the policy enunciated in section 2, that is the intent not to merge: "The Secretary of Defense shall take appropriate steps" and so forth "to provide for more effective" and so forth "eliminate duplication."

Now, "No function which has been or hereafter authorized by law to be performed by the Department of Defense or any officer or agency thereof shall be substantially transferred, reassigned, abolished or consolidated until 30 days after a report in regard to all pertinent details shall have been made by the Secretary of Defense to the Committees of the Armed Services of the Congress."

Now, he makes that report. He waits 30 days, and if Congress acts within the 30-day period, Congress can prevent the transfer of those functions. But if Congress does not act within the 30-day period, those functions are effective, as I read the law.

That seems to me that if he should do it during that period when Congress was in recess—

Senator SALTONSTALL. That has got to be clarified.

Mr. KOEHLER. I am reading the law as it is written.

Mr. HÉBERT. Senator, I am glad to hear you say that. I agree with what you said. I don't believe the Congress is going to buy this bill at all, and that is what we are discussing right now.

We are going to have some type of reorganization, but the question is, Are we going to take what the President has spoon-fed us? and I don't think—I don't think the President's bill will get out of the Armed Services Committee of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Congressman, you are entitled to your own opinion, and we will leave that go.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I think it will.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to get back to the legal brief here, because it seems to me that this whole question of separate administration is one of the key things in this whole argument.

Mr. KOEHLER. I agree with you.

Mr. FOSTER. You set up a law and I am not a lawyer, but you set up a law in which you allegedly give direction, control and authority and the complete responsibility for the security of the United States to the Secretary of Defense.

Then you go down four lines and say, but you can't do this, you can't do that, and you can't do the other things.

You say he can come up and he can make these changes. He gives the Congress notice and if the Congress says "no," he may not do it.

It seems to me with the unification of sea, air, and land forces which we must have in order to fight the kind of battles and wars we have today, you have got to give equal authority to the man to whom you have given responsibility, and this set of proposals is so designed to give that authority to the man on whom you have placed this terrific responsibility.

Mr. KOEHLER. Bill, I couldn't agree more with everything you have said. My only argument was this: I am dealing with the legislation that has been submitted to the Congress. I am not doing anything else but interpreting that legislation.

On the basis of this legislation, the President has said merger will not result. Chairman VINSON has said merger will result.

As I read this legislation, and I am not taking a position personally for or against merger, as I read this legislation a future unknown Secretary of Defense will have the authority if he chooses to exercise it to merge the services.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, perhaps that is so. The writers of the Constitution did not know the future people who were going to operate under it.

I do not think you can write a piece of law, and you legislators can advise me on this, that is only for this particular man. I think this is good sound legislation to meet the difficult problems we have, and I think that unless we do this kind of thing, we may be too little, too late, and too slow.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Foster, as I understood it, you complain now that the Secretary is responsible and then the authority is taken away from him.

Mr. FOSTER. That is correct.

Mr. HÉBERT. That is right. Now, in the bill which you subscribe to and which you like, if you will read the act in section 4, it gives the direction to the Secretary of the Navy, "the Chief of Operations shall exercise command and supervision over such of the forces of the Navy and the Marine Corps as the Secretary of the Navy determines."

That is an affirmative declaration that the Secretary and the Chief of Naval Operations has control, is that correct?

Mr. FOSTER. That is correct.

Mr. HÉBERT. Now we come to the "but": "Other than the forces assigned by the Secretary of Defense to unified or special commands."

Mr. FOSTER. That is correct.

Mr. HÉBERT. In other words, by the wave of his hand he could have Mr. Arleigh Burke up there with no forces under him at all.

Mr. FOSTER. That is correct.

Mr. HÉBERT. Why subscribe in one instance and complain in another?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no, this is not true at all. What we are saying is that in order to fight modern wars, you must have the ability to have in command forces as your cutting edge sea, land, and air forces.

Mr. HÉBERT. That is correct.

Mr. FOSTER. One assignment to a unified joint or specified command. The commander of that force by direction of the President through the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff is charged with the responsibility of operating that force.

Mr. HÉBERT. That is correct.

Mr. FOSTER. At that point the Chief of Naval Operations or the Secretary of the Navy does not have this command over those forces.

Mr. HÉBERT. Isn't that in existence today? Mr. FOSTER. But he must support them. It is in existence today.

Mr. HÉBERT. Then why do you need another law before—

Mr. FOSTER. I thought you meant—

Mr. HÉBERT. Admiral Stump commands the Pacific and he commands everybody in the Pacific.

Mr. KOEHLER. Mr. Herman, could I swing to something else again?

Mr. HERMAN. I was going to suggest at this particular point we had been discussing particularly the provisions of the Secretary of Defense to handle forces.

Now, another major point arises at this time, and I think is unalterably connected with it, and that is ability to handle funds and to transfer them from one force to another and I haven't heard that discussed.

Mr. KOEHLER. Maybe I could lead off on that and really divert a little from that.

Mr. HERMAN. Very well, sir.

Mr. KOEHLER. I am a veteran of two Pentagon reorganizations, the 1947 one and the 1949 one.

I recall distinctly when the first plan went into effect in 1947. Secretary Forrestal, in whom there was no abler public servant that I ever knew, Secretary Forrestal took the position that the Department of Defense could work successfully only if it had a very few number of people in the Secretary of Defense's organization. Some say 50, some say 100. That is unimportant.

In the 1949 act, specification was made for 3 Assistant Secretaries of Defense, and later in the 1953 act, 6 more were added.

Now, it seems to me, although I wasn't too much subjected to the intervening layer of Assistant Secretaries of Defense, it seems to me that the appointment of every additional Assistant Secretary of Defense downgrades to a certain extent a service Secretary, because he must be taking some of the secretary's functions, and also adds another burden to the already intolerable burden of the Secretary of Defense, because there is one more person who has to report to him.

Now, I believe that it would make very much sense if we are going to keep the services at all, to eliminate the greater part of that intervening layer.

Let the service Secretaries relieve the Secretary of Defense of a tremendous burden administrative and otherwise, and let the Secretary of Defense devote more of his time to his fundamental job, which is working with the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

That is the heart of his job.

Mr. HERMAN. Go ahead, Senator SALTONSTALL.

Mr. FOSTER. I do want to get in on that one.

Senator SALTONSTALL. As one that was on that conference committee, and worked out this act and who worked very closely with Mr. Forrestal at that time, I know something of what he was thinking.

Now the words that were finally put in, as you will recall, are "authority" and "control."

Mr. KOEHLER. That is correct.

Senator SALTONSTALL. But the Department shall be separately administered.

Mr. KOEHLER. That is correct.

Senator SALTONSTALL. That was done to work out this compromise, if you will, that could carry through. That has been interpreted since that time to give the Secretary of Defense the authority over the services.

On the other hand, it is clear that they should be separately administered.

Mr. KOEHLER. That is correct.

Senator SALTONSTALL. One of the purposes of this act, as I understand it, at the present time, is to clarify that.

Mr. KOEHLER. One purpose is to wipe up separate administration.

Senator SALTONSTALL. The words "separately administered" are wiped out as such, but the various services are not merged. The Secretary of the Navy, for instance, will continue to—

Mr. KOEHLER. Senator, could I ask you just one question?

Senator SALTONSTALL. Certainly. I don't know if I can answer it, but I shall try.

Mr. KOEHLER. If the services cease to be administered separately, and if they are taken out of the chain of command, the service Secretaries, which may be proper, as Mr. Foster said, I am not qualified, what then is left of the individual services? Are they organizational entities at all?

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, they are, and there is absolutely no thought of eliminating the services as such.

The elimination of the separately administered is to give the Secretary of Defense the authority which he needs to truly direct and coordinate these groups, and this story of 100

people to do this job, I have heard that a good many times, and you know, Jack, as well as I, that Jim very rapidly changed his feeling about that way of running the Department.

Mr. HÉBERT. Just a moment. It is in here if you want to read it, Admiral Sherman—

Mr. FOSTER. I don't care whose testimony it was that is contrary to this.

Mr. HÉBERT. It was never sold to the Congress other than what he said. Mr. Forrestal never told the Congress anything different.

Mr. FOSTER. He never went back for a hundred in the reorganization at all, and I can assure you to run a business—and I think perhaps you gentlemen are overlooking the magnitude of this operation that has to be done by the Secretary of Defense. On this I can speak with some authority. I am not a lawyer, but on this one I can speak with some authority.

You are running a \$40 billion or \$50 billion business. You have \$120 billion worth of plant and installations. You are complaining about seven vice presidents.

I think this is a very small number of vice presidents. I think the Office of the Secretary of Defense is one of the most efficient business operations that I know in terms of numbers, 1,500 civilians, 700 military people.

Mr. HERMAN. Let me get a question in here, please. I just want to say that as a former Deputy Secretary of Defense, yourself, perhaps you would want to comment on this question of how the Secretary of Defense's Office operates and also you might want to add at this point the question of the Deputy Secretary of Defense for Research.

Mr. FOSTER. His title will not be that, although he will be somewhat similar to that. Of course, research and technology is so obviously such a terrifically important part of our whole military activity now that unless we give to that the position of authority and prestige which it deserves, we may well be unable to attract the kind of real brains and real forward progress that we have to have in order to keep up in this terrific race.

I think that this plan, a Director of Defense Research and Engineer, provides that kind of authority. It gives to that man the prestige of authority in precedence, fifth in precedence behind the Secretary, the three Secretaries, and the Deputy Secretary. And it gives to him a control over, as well as an ability to advise, the Secretary of Defense on the highest research and technology level, and we need it. We must have it.

We have lost in this regard over these last few years. We know this, all of us. And unless we are able to give this kind of a job and get the kind of brains and support and direction that I believe can get through this device, we may really be in a desperate state.

Mr. HÉBERT. There is nothing in the law that prevents you from accomplishing everything you have said.

Mr. FOSTER. This I question.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. HÉBERT, may I just say this. This I personally know. Take for instance today, the solid fuel as opposed to the liquid fuel in the propulsion of a missile.

Today there are three separate investigations going on in solid fuel, in each one of the services. Now this was brought to my attention by a man who is involved in it. He says there simply isn't manpower enough to do it. I just give you that as one example.

I don't think there will be much debate over this one centralization of research, do you?

Mr. HÉBERT. Senator, I think we could take a cue from that on the Hill, too, the overlapping investigations we have got.

Mr. HERMAN. Let me ask all four of you gentlemen to turn your attention to that question, the question of inefficiency, need—

less duplication of which so much has been made and also of the funds involved here.

Is there so much inefficiency and needless duplication now going on in the Pentagon?

Mr. HÉBERT. May I address myself to the money question? That is very interesting.

When the President first came out with this very revolutionary plan, the straw man was put up as the moneyman.

The Secretary of Defense would control all this money. He knew the Congress never would buy anything like that. So he abandoned it and then in his statement he said he didn't really need that right now.

We will set that aside until a later date because he has the power now.

Whether he has the power now is debatable, but he exercised the power now because he is exercising a line item veto which the Congress has refused to give him by the conduct in the Comptroller's Office in the Department of Defense and in the Bureau of the Budget. And in the hearings of recent vintage by the House Armed Services Committee, when all of the services were there, every individual that testified, every Secretary, every general had one comment to make: that the reason for the tardiness and delay in our missile program and all hindrance rested in the Comptroller of the Defense Department and the Bureau of the Budget where the money is being controlled. So he has got it now and he says nothing about it, and that is where the delay is. This is—no, I won't use the word he used, "nonsense."

I think it is tragic that this matter has been placed out of focus and the word "nonsense" used, and every time the President speaks, he says, "I'm the man that knows. I'm the great military man."

Does the 44 years of Mr. VINSON, 22 years of Mr. BROOKS, the 22 years of Mr. ARENDS, the 22 years of Mr. KILDAY, 18 years of Mr. RIVERS mean anything—we are not children.

Mr. FOSTER. Administration or writing of the policy? I think that there is a good deal to be said for what really I believe was the President's thought on this, namely, to give some flexibility for transfers within the overall appropriations. You know, Mr. HÉBERT and Senator SALTONSTALL and Mr. Koehler, that the budgets are made up 3 years almost before they actually get to the point where they are being spent. With all the due wisdom that is accumulated in both the Congress and in the Department of Defense and in the Budget Bureau, it is impossible to foresee the changes that will take place in this rapidly changing world, and all that is being requested is, number one, that the budget be that of the overall Department of Defense, the overall plan of how to support, maintain and further these defense forces, and when the time comes to the actual expenditure, the right to move within line items and within the services some amount—Mr. McElroy said less than 10 percent.

Some other figure was mentioned as 5 percent. Say it is between 5 and 10 percent. I think that if you get the kind of problems we have today, this flexibility can save us a great deal of money, and will allow us to proceed with the new things that develop at the point the money is available.

Senator SALTONSTALL. We have a certain amount of flexibility today. The Defense Secretary in the last budget had, I think, \$100 million which is a comparatively small amount of \$40 billion that he had complete control over. He had also certain powers of transfer: As I remember it, not over 10 percent change in any one appropriation item, any one line item, and not over 5 percent could come from any other line item. Of course, that had to be within the services. That couldn't be shifted from one service to another.

Now we also have the power of transfer of funds for construction purposes. That has been done historically. And that comes down and goes through if it gets the approval of the Appropriations Committees in the House and in the Senate.

Now, how far Congress will go with allowing that transfer to be made between services is a problem that we have got to argue out and argue out very carefully.

Mr. HÉBERT. That is correct and that is the crux. Again, the Secretary has the power which the President is asking, but he wants just a little bit more, and I understand he is going to have \$500 million in that emergency fund.

Mr. FOSTER. He does not have it as between services.

Mr. HÉBERT. I think he was more fearful—

Mr. FOSTER. He wants flexibility in order to meet changes.

Mr. KOEHLER. I think that problem is one that lends itself admirably to resolution between the Congress and the Department, as Senator SALTONSTALL has said.

Senator SALTONSTALL. You have been down there many times.

Mr. KOEHLER. Many times. I would like to get back to this question and I trust, Bill, you would bear with me on this one of the Assistant Secretaries of Defense versus the Secretaries in the military departments.

As I told you and as you know, my experience there terminated late in 1951. But even then, I found difficulty as an Assistant Secretary of the Navy in carrying out what to me were the orders assigned to me by the Secretary. I found a rather diffuse situation at the Assistant Secretary of Defense level because it seemed to me that there you didn't have authority running hand in hand with responsibility.

You had authority, but the responsibility was down the line. Now, I think today—and I think it is a very sad thing—I think today the Secretaries of the military departments are of much lower stature than they were 10 years ago, and without question, if this proposed bill becomes law, the Secretaries of the military departments, for my money, will not amount to very much at all.

I would like to reverse the trend so that the carrying out of the tremendous administrative functions of the Department of Defense could be done under the aegis of the service Secretaries rather than under the aegis of the Assistant Secretaries of Defense.

Mr. HERMAN. I'd like to take this away from the officials at this point and ask the Members of Congress, Congressman HÉBERT and Senator SALTONSTALL, how they feel on that particular argument?

Senator SALTONSTALL. Well, I think that the Secretaries of the various services should have a very substantial authority. Now, I think that in these days of quick decisions and quick actions and strong actions, there has got to be a greater centralization of authority.

Therefore, I would make it perfectly clear in the law that the authority is in the Secretary of Defense under the President through the Joint Chiefs of Staff for action in these unified commands, for instance, and then the details of how to carry out a lot of that business have got to be left and given to the Secretaries of the services rather than assistant secretaries in the Defense Department.

Mr. FOSTER. If I may interrupt for 1 minute, it will just take a second, that the Secretaries of the services will continue to have tremendously important delegated authority under the authority of the Secretary of Defense. They have got to support the whole military—

Mr. HERMAN. I think we have come to the point where we are running out of time and

our agreements and disagreements are pretty well lined up, so I'd like to ask you to reflect back over your arguments here and offer you one last moment for rebuttal and restatement of your positions, starting as we started before with Senator SALTONSTALL.

How do you now feel that you should state your position?

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Herman, I am very glad to have been on this discussion because I think it has been very helpful, I hope, to people who have listened and certainly to me who have taken part.

I reiterate what I said before. In these days of missiles and supersonic airplanes and all that goes with speed, we need speed of decision, we need speed of action. We are never going to be an attacker. We are going to be attacked. We may be attacked. We hope we won't be. We are more liable not to be attacked if any possible enemy knows that we have got a speedy retaliatory effort that is going to be a very destructive and devastating effort.

Now to accomplish that, we have got to, because of the speed of action, we have got to have more authority in one person, more authority most essentially in a civilian. That is the Secretary of Defense.

We have got to give him the strategic powers of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. If we do that, and that is all the President wants to do, we will be able to give that massive retaliatory effort.

Mr. HERMAN. Very well, Congressman HÉBERT.

Mr. HÉBERT. I think after listening to the discussion today that I am more convinced than ever that those of us who oppose this extraordinary bill of the President's are thinking along the right lines.

There has been nothing developed today that has indicated in any manner, shape or form, that this speed that is desirable of which Senator SALTONSTALL has just spoken could not be accomplished.

You can write all the laws in the world, but you can't change human nature, and if the Secretary of Defense is not a man of action and speed, the added power which could well be misplaced, will not help him one iota. I believe it most important that we do reorganize the Department, but organize it downward instead of upward by giving more central authority to fewer people and drawing a definite line so we will know exactly where we stand and keep each service in its true autonomy, its true identity. And I hope that we can get the proper testimony on the Hill and I was very interested in Senator SALTONSTALL talking about the people who appeared, but the echoes of names like Denfeld, Gavin, and Putt ring in my mind.

Mr. HERMAN. Could I ask you just in a very brief word whether you propose to start some kind of reorganization downward?

Mr. HÉBERT. Oh, yes. There is a bill before the committee, positively. We have that bill. We have no negative approach. Mr. VINSON has a bill in with Mr. KILDAY. That is the bill that I support.

Mr. HERMAN. Thank you. And Mr. Foster.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I couldn't disagree more, of course, with the Congressman, and I think that it is a completely negative bill to which he refers. I am sure we are all aiming at the same objectives. We all want to have the most efficient, the most adaptable, the most decisive forces that we can get, and I think we have to ask ourselves these questions: Will this organization give us better coordination and direction of the Armed Forces? Will it give a better place in the scheme of things to research and technology? Will it make it possible for us to react more rapidly to the almost instantaneous attacks to which we may be subject? And will this in essence provide for us the kind of defense effort which will allow us to survive at a time in

history when we are truly threatened with destruction almost overnight if the enemy makes that choice?

Mr. HERMAN. Mr. Koehler, will it?

Mr. FOSTER. I say it will.

Mr. KOEHLER. I would just like to say this: That this is the first conference of this type in which I have participated in which there has been so much light and so little heat on a subject that is bound to raise so many different points of view. I would like to revert to a few remarks I made in my opening statement.

And regardless of my personal views, I would like to say that it may well be, for reasons that Mr. Foster knows much better than I, that our national security requires fundamental changes in our present defense structure. If the President and the Congress so determine and if those required changes include merger of the Armed Forces and the creation of a single Chief of Staff, that would, of course, be a definitive answer.

My concern, as I said earlier, lies not with the expressed intent of the proposed legislation, but with the conclusions I have drawn from a study of its language. We are a government of laws and not of men, and with that in mind, I am forced to conclude that this bill, if passed, would authorize some presently unknown and future Secretary of Defense to merge the armed services as we now know them and would also authorize, if not create, a command structure.

Mr. HERMAN. Mr. Koehler, I think we have just about run out of time. I want to thank all you gentlemen for joining with us today in this discussion of the defense of America.

The Attorney General Declares War on Organized Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, no problem facing this Nation today should cause greater concern than the rise in power of organized crime organizations. These gigantic octopi have stretched their tentacles across State borders until they have enveloped our Nation, reaching into the homes and businesses of Americans everywhere. Unless a death blow is struck at the heart of these monsters they can stifle our whole economy and threaten our very existence as a nation.

No State alone is equipped to deal effectively with these nefarious organizations. What is needed is a national crusade spurred on by the combined efforts of top crime fighters in both State and Federal Governments.

The Attorney General of the United States has announced his determination, as head of the Department of Justice, to conduct the kind of concentrated, coordinated, and sustained drive against organized crime that is needed to rid it from our land. In a speech delivered last night before the Advertising Council, Inc., he ably identified the target and outlined the plan of attack. It is a

speech which every Member of Congress and, indeed, every American should read.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot expect the Department of Justice, any more than our Armed Forces, to fight effectively without the proper weapons. Existing laws do not provide an up-to-date arsenal, and for some time I have urged Congress to supply one.

There are several bills, which I have introduced for a number of years, pending before the Committee on the Judiciary now. I intend to offer several more in the near future. The Department of Justice no doubt will have additional proposals.

I am especially pleased to note the indications in the Attorney General's speech that the Department is swinging around to the view that legislation embodying the principal of my bill, H. R. 258—to permit the Federal Government to crack down when interstate conspirators are breaking State felony laws—is the most effective and direct means for annihilating organized crime.

I am confident that this Congress will want to join in the battle against crime by giving early and favorable consideration to such measures before it adjourns.

I commend the Attorney General for his courage and determination in undertaking this enormous and vital task. I am sure that law-abiding citizens everywhere wish him every success, and will cooperate in every way possible.

Under leave previously granted, I insert Attorney General Rogers' fine speech at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM P. ROGERS, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE ADVERTISING COUNCIL, INC., HOTEL STATLER, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 5, 1958

Tonight I want to talk about a problem which I believe requires serious attention. These days, quite naturally, we are concerned with the economy of our country and our national defense. In a very real sense, the problem of crime is related both to our economy and to the future strength of our Nation.

As you know, this year the Nation will spend more than \$40 billion on national defense. But how many people know what crime costs our country? Most people are wholly unaware of the staggering proportions to which it has grown—unmindful of the fact that it is second only to national defense in terms of cost. The estimated cost of crime in the United States in 1 year is about \$20 billion.

Twenty-five years ago the Attorney General was appalled by the fact that in 1933 11½ million major crimes had occurred—one for each 84 persons in the Nation. In 1958, it appears now that about 3 million major crimes may be committed—twice as many as in 1933. This means that in 1958 one major crime will be committed for every 60 persons in the United States.

Since 1950 the rate of crime in our country has been exploding at a rate four times as fast as the rate of growth of our population. The rate of crime in 1957 increased 9 percent over 1956.

These statistics only begin to tell the story. One of the facts which stands out in bold relief is the alarming increase in the number of crimes committed by young people. Almost half of the persons arrested for major crimes last year were under 18 years of age. Somehow there has been a

failure properly to inculcate our people, particularly our young people, with a sense of moral values—with an awareness of how destructive crime is to them and to the country. These figures indicate that there is a tremendous job to be done by schools, churches, parents and organizations such as this in the years ahead.

Tonight I want to talk not about general problems relating to crime but rather about some of the things we hope to do in the field of law enforcement. Let me mention that I would hope too that this influential organization which has contributed so much to solving important problems of our Nation in the past, will want to give its thoughtful attention to what it can do to help reduce the rate of crime in our country.

What is one of the most obvious facts about the growth of crime in our country? It is the growth of organized crime and the success of its operation.

Syndicates made up of criminals have coordinated and extended their operations over many States and in many cases, across national boundaries. Why is this true? It is true because organized racketeers and hoodlums have learned how to make crime pay.

The top echelon of organized criminals have been able to remove themselves from exposed positions and now operate by scheming, directing and organizing. Organized criminals exert general control over those types of criminal activities that yield the most profits—gambling, narcotics, and extortion, to name the big three. And obviously they pay only a small portion of their taxes on these activities because if they paid all of their taxes as ordinary citizens do, a life of crime would not pay.

In order that you may have a better understanding of the problem from the standpoint of a law enforcement official let me make some general observations.

First, I notice that there is a widespread lack of awareness as to the respective roles of Federal responsibility as compared with the State and local responsibility in the field of law enforcement. Generally speaking responsibility for law enforcement in our country rests in large measure on the States and localities. The fact is that less than 10 percent of all crimes violate Federal law.

Yet almost every time a serious local crime is committed which gets national publicity some Senator, Congressman, Governor, or civic group will immediately demand that the FBI investigate it. This is a very fine tribute to the FBI but it demonstrates a lack of understanding of the law and tends to shift the responsibility away from the States and localities where it belongs.

Consider the recent atrocious bombings of schools, churches, and synagogues which have occurred in Florida and other Southern States. At first there were demands that the FBI take over the investigation. The Federal Government did not have jurisdiction in those cases because no Federal law was involved. The Federal Government does not have jurisdiction merely because the perpetrators of the crimes may have crossed State lines or because a conspiracy may be involved or because a series of crimes are involved. Unless a Federal law has been violated the FBI has no jurisdiction to investigate.

The law enforcement officials of the States and localities involved have recognized their responsibility. Officials from 29 southern cities have conferred for the purpose of taking cooperative action to solve these shocking crimes. Those responsible are to be complimented for taking this affirmative, determined action.

The FBI stands ready to help the local authorities in every way possible. Its laboratories, identification facilities, information from its files, etc., have been made available.

It is maintaining the closest liaison with the responsible authorities and will give them every assistance possible.

The point I hope you will remember is that it is important for the public to place responsibility where it belongs. Communities get the kind of law enforcement they deserve and the public must know where the responsibility lies.

Another fact which is not always fully appreciated is that within the Federal Government itself jurisdiction for investigating crime is divided. The jurisdiction of the FBI is limited to general crimes and crimes involving national security. Internal Revenue has its own investigating staff which has jurisdiction of matters pertaining to tax frauds. The Narcotics Bureau in the Treasury Department has primary responsibility for investigating narcotics violations. The Secret Service is responsible for investigating counterfeiting and crimes relating to the public moneys. The Post Office investigates misuse of the mails.

All of these investigating agencies have compiled outstanding records in their respective fields but organized criminals have not seen fit to compartmentalize their activities so as to fit neatly into these niches. The Department of Justice has complete and sole responsibility for the prosecution of all crimes. It seems obvious then that the information obtained by separate investigating agencies must be fitted together more effectively by the prosecutors than in the past if we are to meet today's crafty challenge of the organized criminal.

About a month ago, I announced a long-range program for combating organized crime in this country. Although as I have mentioned, the Federal Government has a limited jurisdiction we do have some powerful weapons. The main ones are the income-tax laws, the tax laws relating to narcotics, and the Hobbs Act and the Taft-Hartley Act relating to extortions and payoffs in union activities.

Let me briefly sketch the three main points of the program.

1. The program will be concentrated.

We will give top priority to 100 of the top racketeers in the United States. That is not to say we will ignore the others for we plan to attack crime on as many fronts as we can. It does mean, however, that we will give immediate and concentrated effort to the 100 worst hoodlums and racketeers in the country.

The list of names will not be made public for two reasons. In the first place, it would tip our hand and make the investigative work more difficult. In the second place such publication of the names might be attacked as prejudicial in the event of trial. After there have been convictions or deportations we will announce the names and will replenish the list with others who are deserving.

You may wonder why a list of 100. Of course, it is an arbitrary figure to be used principally for purposes of concentration of effort. A brief discussion of how organized crime functions today will indicate why this concentration, I believe, will be effective.

Last November at Apalachin, N. Y., a meeting of 64 top racketeers and hoodlums took place. A majority of those in attendance came from New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, but there was a fair representation from the South, Midwest, and even the west coast. A few of those in attendance had been in a similar meeting as far back as 1928 in Cleveland. Many of them were in attendance at a meeting in 1952 in the Florida Keys, in 1953 at Miami, in 1954 at Chicago, and in 1956 at Binghamton, N. Y. Meetings such as these at Apalachin, attended by what amounts to the board of

directors of organized crime for a given area, serve many nefarious purposes. Lines and means of communication are established, methods of distribution are agreed upon, territorial arrangements are made. As a result, gang wars of the twenties and thirties have been almost completely eliminated.

The members of these top-level planning boards are also the key figures in organizations with headquarters in New York, Miami, Chicago, and other cities in the United States. Here the multimillion dollar businesses take shape. Those on top seldom come in contact with the local hoodlums who are responsible for maintaining discipline, bribing local officials, or actually dispensing the products of crime. But through strong arm tactics carried out through subordinates in a chain of command and with the power to shut off necessary financing, production, and sources of supply, they exercise control over most of the profitable forms of illegal activities. The dope peddler, the bookie, the numbers runner, the vendor of obscene magazines, are all largely dependent for their illicit merchandise and for permission to engage in these activities upon these overlords of crime.

These overlords of crime in many instances have invested their ill-gotten gains in hotels, night clubs, coin-operated machines, scrap iron trucking, etc., and hide behind these legitimate fronts while directing their criminal activities.

It is our purpose to concentrate on these overlords. We plan to find out everything that we can find out about them—their sources of income, their present activities, how they invest their money, and how they avoid paying their taxes. Without in any way denying them any of the rights which our citizens have under our system of justice we will attempt to find out what Federal law they have violated and to obtain the necessary evidence to prove it.

2. The program will have a Government-wide coordination of effort.

After consultation with the Secretary and Under Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the FBI, the Commissioner of Narcotics, the Commissioner of Immigration, the Secret Service and the other investigative agencies we concluded that we would turn the combined strength and resources of all Federal investigative and law enforcement agencies in a common effort against the organized criminal.

Of course we have not been oblivious in the past to the activities of organized crime and the need for cooperation. What seemed to be lacking and what we are in the process of establishing is a unified prosecutive command, where all information on racketeers from all investigative agencies will be correlated, studied and acted upon.

Let me cite an illustration of what I mean. The distribution and sale of narcotics, particularly to young people, is one of the most reprehensible of all crimes. Almost all of it is imported, and it lends itself peculiarly to the control and distribution practices of the organized criminal conspiracy. Most heroin comes from Turkey, Syria, and Iran in the Near East and China in the Far East. Organized crime has built up a giant trans-shipment belt for securing this drug, for providing for its safe importation, and ultimately for its distribution to the dope peddlers. One pound of heroin is worth about \$150,000. The Bureau of Narcotics seized about 1,700 ounces of heroin in 1957.

Most marihuana comes from Mexico. Over 26,000 ounces of marihuana were seized at ports and borders, and over 11,000 ounces were seized within the United States in 1957. So you can see that the sale of narcotics is a huge business.

In many instances it is possible to identify top racketeers who traffic in narcotics but

not to obtain the necessary evidence to seek an indictment. Now the important thing is to put this criminal out of circulation—the crime for which he may be convicted is of secondary importance. So we will study all the evidence which the Government has in its possession from all the investigative agencies. Perhaps we can prove a tax-fraud case, possibly he may be subject to deportation, the FBI may have information which placed together with all other information obtained from the Narcotics Bureau, may show the violation of some other Federal law, or in some instances we may be able to supply local law-enforcement officers with evidence sufficient to convict for a local crime.

3. It will be a long-range, sustained program.

From my experience in law-enforcement work I have noticed that efforts directed on organized crime are apt to be sporadic. A series of vicious crimes occur or a Congressional investigation is held and a drive on crime is started. When the excitement dies down the drive is apt to die down.

The program we have in mind is not intended to produce quick or sensational results. Rather, it will be a long-range program built on policies which will be lasting and intended to meet a continuing and constantly changing problem.

Recently we have seen instances of how effective racketeers have been in taking over control of a few powerful labor unions. They not only steal money from the union treasury but they use the unions to extort huge sums of money from contractors.

Obviously, the efforts of the racketeers to penetrate these unions are well planned and sustained. A few years ago the most powerful racketeer in southern Illinois was Evan Dale, who was president of a union of hod-carriers and common laborers. For years he exercised complete control over the rank and file of his union, responsible to no one. During his trial for extortion Dale described himself in the following language:

"I am a Chicago boy. When I left Chicago I threw away my shovel for a blackjack and I have been using it effectively ever since. I came to southern Illinois 15 years ago to carve out an empire. I have carved out an empire. I have 38,000 laborers and 28 business agents under me."

For his part in the multi-million-dollar shakedown of contractors during the construction of a powerplant for the Atomic Energy Commission, he was sentenced to 15 years in jail.

There is only one way to combat successfully the activities of such racketeers who have taken over a few labor unions—and that is with a sustained and long-range program of law enforcement. Of course it is not possible or desirable to spell out in any detail all the plans of the Department in this field. What I have said represents a general approach to the problem.

The policy of the Department of Justice can be expressed this way:

1. We will attack the problem of crime on all fronts within the limit of our jurisdiction.

2. We will give top priority to concentrating on the top 100 racketeers.

3. We will urge the courts to impose maximum penalties and within the procedures laid down by the law will seek to expedite the trial of cases.

4. We will urge Federal legislation to give the Federal authorities more weapons to cope with organized criminal activities that have interstate ramifications.

5. We will cooperate with State and local authorities to the greatest extent possible.

The program which I have discussed this evening deals only with one phase of the crime problem in the United States. The

problem is a much broader and more serious one than anything that improved law enforcement alone can solve.

There are many things which must be done. For example, the public must be more alert to the tieup between crime and local politics. Experience shows that organized crime on a profitable basis cannot exist for long in any area without the connivance of local law enforcement officers.

Then too the public must be made more aware that their support and cooperation in giving information about crime especially in the field of extortion is essential if our law enforcement agencies are to cope effectively with the ever increasing rise of crime in the United States.

Finally, there is a heavy responsibility which rests on all of us more effectively to instill young people with the basic traits of character which are so vital to our free way of life.

The Advertising Council, which has given so generously and so successfully of its time and talents to programs for human betterment, may want to give some of these and other broader aspects of the problem its future consideration. If you do I assure you that all of us in the Department of Justice will give you our enthusiastic cooperation. I can think of nothing which would be more helpful to the Nation than to have the benefit of your thought and counsel and your active participation in helping to solve this grave national problem.

Increasing Pay for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MERWIN COAD

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, recently, many questions have been raised concerning the status of legislation increasing pay scales and benefits for various groups of Federal employees. I have conducted extensive research to find answers to these questions, a summary of which I have compiled for the following talk given to the Iowa State Federation of Federal Employees at Ames, Iowa, last Saturday.

AN ADDRESS BY MERWIN COAD, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS, SIXTH IOWA DISTRICT, BEFORE THE IOWA STATE FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES, AMES, IOWA, MAY 10, 1958

Before I get into the main part of my talk, I want to express my thanks for this opportunity to be with you today. It is always gratifying, of course, to get back to Iowa, and the pleasure of returning home is made greater by occasions like this where one can see old friends and talk to the people one admires and respects.

As many of you know, this year, 1958, marks the 75th anniversary of the Civil Service Act. The merit system in the Federal Government really began when the Pendleton Act was signed by President Arthur on January 16, 1883. This law was the culmination of many years of increasing public disgust and indignation at the spoils system and growing demands for reform.

Through the years the idea of a civil service based upon merit has become stronger, and the merit system has been steadily expanded to the point that it now includes

about 90 percent of all Government employees. The levels of efficiency and public service have grown and developed along with the merit system, and I believe that all thoughtful people would agree, in this diamond anniversary year, that the Civil Service Act of 1883 was one of the most significant pieces of legislation in American history.

I can say with all sincerity that I have always had a high regard for employees of the Government. Through the years they have given loyal and dedicated service, often in the face of criticism as widespread as it was unjust. Since I have been in Washington, I have seen no reason to change my long-held opinion on this matter; in fact, I am more than ever convinced that the American people are fortunate indeed to be served by Federal employees of such high caliber.

I would like to speak to you about some of the more important Congressional legislation affecting you as Federal employees. In some ways this is a bit risky because anyone who tries to foresee just what Congress will do is really sticking his neck out. However, there are some solid facts to work on, and maybe we can make some intelligent guesses.

The biggest and most important item is, of course, the pay raise. I hope that all of you know where I stand on this matter. I have been in favor of an adequate pay raise ever since I got into Congress, and I expect to do everything in my power to bring about its early enactment. To me it is a shameful thing that the increase was not granted long ago. The trouble is that too often matters of this kind get so tangled up with a whole assortment of other issues that they no longer are considered and treated upon their own merits alone.

Please do not misunderstand me. I certainly do not mean to imply that there will be no pay increases. By all indications, quite the contrary is the case. I really believe that there almost surely will be an increase. I am simply saying that all the delay and apparent stalling have been very unfortunate and frustrating and, perhaps to some extent at least, inexcusable.

Of course, we should not forget that the first session of this Congress did pass both postal and classified pay bills. You will recall that the President vetoed them. The principal argument at the time was that the bills were inflationary. Now, with the country in a recession, some administration people say the bills would cost too much.

I must confess that this line of economic reasoning is too deep for me. First, it argues that no pay raise should be granted in good times because it would be inflationary; second, it argues that there should be no increase when times are not so good because it would cost too much.

As I said, this is a bit too much for me, and it may be rather difficult for you, or any other rational people, to understand.

The truth is that these arguments ignore the basic, critical facts about pay raises. They ignore the greatly increased cost of living which, so far at least, has not heard about our recession. They ignore the fact that there has been no pay raise since 1955. They ignore the fact that the pay of Federal employees has always lagged behind the pay in private business and industry, and is now even further behind than usual. In general, they ignore the fact that by any equitable standards of need and merit, an immediate and substantial pay raise is fully justified.

As you probably know from reading your newspapers, the fate of the pay bills is now tied in with the measure to increase the postal rates. This is not the place for a lengthy discussion of the postage rates as such, but because the final outcome of the pay bills seems to depend on the postal-rate legislation, a brief comment is necessary.

Some of you may be wondering what postal-rate increases have to do with your pay hikes. This is a good question, and one that defies any reasonable explanation as far as I am concerned. The administration has declared that the rate increase is needed, partly to help finance the Post Office Department and partly to help finance employees' pay raises.

I would like to say, parenthetically, that in my opinion the post office is a public-service organization. Delivering the mail is one of the most important services the Federal Government performs. And it must remain a service. The Post Office Department is not in business to make money. It is in business to deliver the mail. If it can be more or less self-financing, that is fine. But there is no possible justification for foisting unreasonable and exorbitant postage rates onto the public.

The linking together of postage rates and Federal employee pay scales is difficult to understand on the basis of doing what ought to be done in the easiest, fairest, and most practical way. If civil servants deserve a wage increase—and they most assuredly do—they deserve it regardless of how much it costs to mail a letter. There simply is not even the remotest connection between the two. The merits of one have nothing whatsoever to do with the merits of the other.

I repeat, I think you are going to get a pay raise in spite of the obstacles that have been placed in the way. Many of these obstacles have indeed already been overcome. Bills for both postal and classified pay increases have already moved a considerable distance along the legislative trail. Both the House and the Senate have passed bills for increases for classified workers. The bills are not the same, and the differences will have to be ironed out, but ultimate passage seems pretty well assured.

The pay raise may be the most significant issue affecting Federal employees, but it should not be allowed to obscure the fact that there are other important matters under consideration as well. As members of a Federal employees' association, you will be interested in learning about the progress that has been made toward gaining more official recognition of unions made up of civil servants.

Because of their very nature, unions of Government employees must be weaker than other unions. For example, one of the big differences is that members of a Government union have no right to strike. I think most of us agree that there should be no right to strike against the Government of the United States, but this does not mean that some of the other union activities should not be strengthened.

A subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has recently held hearings on a bill that would increase the bargaining power of Federal unions. This measure officially recognizes the right of leaders of these unions to represent the membership in cases where there is a dispute or grievance with a Federal agency.

Under this bill these disputes would be referred to an impartial board of arbitration made up of a representative from the agency involved, from the employee union, and a representative appointed by the Secretary of Labor. The proposed law provides that the decision of the arbitration board would be final and conclusive.

If this bill becomes law, it probably won't solve all of the labor problems in the Federal service, but it should substantially increase the bargaining power of the unions. I am sure that all of you will be interested in future developments in this field.

With regard to retirement, you will recall that there were very sweeping amendments to the Retirement Act in 1956. Not much is

in the legislative mill at the present time touching upon the retirement of currently active civil servants.

However, those of you who have friends who retired before October 1956 will be happy to learn that they have a very good chance of receiving a boost in their annuities in the near future. Legislation to increase these annuities by about 10 percent has passed both Houses of Congress and is now before a conference committee which is working out differences in details.

This is essentially a cost of living increase, and certainly a much deserved one. Many annuitants who retired before the liberalizing amendments of 1956 have had a very difficult time making ends meet. This pending bill should be of considerable help to them.

Other significant legislation that Congress is now considering concerns your Government life insurance. The great majority of civil servants are covered by this program, and it is easy to understand why. This insurance is inexpensive to buy and simple in its operation, and it provides an extra means of protection for the family of each Federal worker who has taken advantage of it.

Under the present arrangement this insurance costs the employee 25 cents each pay period for every \$1,000 of coverage. The Government now pays in just one-half of this amount, or 12½ cents per each \$1,000 covering the employee.

The proposed legislation calls for increases to 32 cents and 16 cents respectively for the employee and the Government. In return the value of the policy would decline to a maximum of only 50 percent of its original value after the employee reaches age 65 instead of to 25 percent, as is now the case.

Another provision of this bill, designed to make the law more generous, changes the years-of-service requirement for continuing cost-free insurance coverage after retirement. At present, an employee must have completed at least 15 years in order to be eligible to keep his insurance. The pending bill changes this to 12 years.

There are several other matters of interest I would like to discuss with you if we had the time. I doubt if immediate action can be expected on many of these items, but I might mention a few of them very briefly in case you are interested.

For example, there is the question of hours of work. In some businesses and industries and in many State and local governments, employees have been working somewhat less than a 40-hour week for some time. There are stirrings of interest about changing the length of the Federal work week, but at present it is just something to file in the back of your head.

With regard to health insurance plans for civil servants, the administration has asked that any action be deferred until next year.

The Treasury Department has recently issued a ruling that may affect any of you who have taken extended leave for educational purposes. The Department has declared, retroactive to January 1, 1954, that these education expenses are deductible if the purpose of the schooling was primarily aimed at improving your skills and abilities for your job. Those of you who have taken such leave might check with your personnel people to see if you are eligible.

As employees of the Federal Government we are the ones charged with the responsibility of making democracy work in the everyday relations of life. We have a great opportunity and we are faced with mighty challenges. Surely we would every one renew the dedication we hold in those principles of democracy. We would make strong this Nation by our diligent and responsible service to the people of the entire Nation.

As persons employed by the Government we would make the whole strong by strengthening the individual. Let us not grow weary in well doing, but let us resolve that we shall serve admirably in the light of the knowledge that each servant is worthy of his hire.

America has been made great by the efforts of devoted persons in positions of public responsibility. America will remain strong and continue to be great for those who serve her will give in devotion to the task ahead.

"Nature Irresistibly Wills That Right Shall at Last Prevail," Wrote Immanuel Kant of Königsberg—The Case for the German Expellees With Special Emphasis on the Sudeten German Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1958

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today is the anniversary of the birth of one of the world's greatest thinkers, the German philosopher, Immanuel Kant. Born on April 22, 1724, at Königsberg in Prussia, he studied, taught, and at the age of 80 died there, seldom leaving his hometown and never venturing beyond the confines of his home province. Yet, to this very day, his thoughts have stirred the minds of people all over the world so much so that in the wake of World War II a new crop of reprints and republications of, and reedited commentaries on, his famous essay, *On Eternal Peace*, has appeared.

During Kant's lifetime his friends used to gather at his birthday to do him honor and a curious custom grew up: To address so wise a friend on his birthday was a task that required preparation. Therefore, the birthday cake, which the well-wishers brought, contained a bean. Whoever drew the slice with the bean was the bean king and entrusted to prepare next year's birthday speech. After Kant died, in 1804, his friends, forming a self-perpetuating group, continued the custom of meeting on his birthday and choosing the bean king in Königsberg until April 1945, and since then in Göttingen.

To me, the city of Kant still is Königsberg. That the Communists and their parrots should now call it Kaliningrad is a blasphemy on civilization to which the Free World cannot, and should not, reconcile itself.

Immanuel Kant was a patient and tireless student of the political systems which he then knew. His watchful and penetrating mind observed the political developments of his time and he maintained an impartial and enlightened attitude toward all political questions. It was with great reluctance that in his 77th year he felt it necessary to abandon the long cherished project of writing on

a System of Politics toward which his tract, *On Eternal Peace*, was to be but a first stage.

The small tract, *On Eternal Peace*, which Kant wrote at the time of Washington's second administration looks rather inconspicuous when compared with the weighty volumes that modern publishing mills are grinding out by the score. Nonetheless, it may be fitting and proper to quote from that tract a few lines which may well serve to guide those who earnestly search for a genuine solution to the world's problems. These are the words of Immanuel Kant:

Act so that thou canst will that thy maxim shall become a universal law.

Right must never be compromised to a line of policy, but policy always be subordinated to right. Woe to him who adopts a line of policy other than that which holds sacred the rule of justice.

A true policy, therefore, cannot advance a step without first paying homage to the moral law; and, although politics taken by itself is a difficult art, yet its union with morals removes it from the difficulties of art. For this combination of them cuts in two the knots which politics alone cannot untie whenever the two come into conflict with each other.

The rights of men must be held sacred, however great may be the sacrifice which the maintenance of them lays upon the governing power. We cannot divide right into halves, or devise a modified condition of right intermediate between justice and expediency. Rather must all politics bow the knee before the principle of right.

Nothing is more infuriating than an act of injustice. All other wrongs which we may suffer do not compare with it. No conclusion of peace shall be regarded as such, when it has been made with the mental reservation of conflict matter for a future war.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps few people in the world today are more firmly united in opposing communism than are the 16 million Germans expelled from the German provinces east of the Oder-Neisse line, the Sudetenland, and other parts of Europe. These sturdy people, outnumbering the total population of Sweden, Norway, and Denmark combined, experienced in 1945 the full impact of the Red invasion of their ancient homelands. Their expulsion to Western Germany resulted in the tragic death of more than 3 million of their number.

In the struggle against the Red octopus of Communist imperialism of the free peoples the Germans, because of their geographic location, play a notable role. No wonder that, when other plans miscarried, the Kremlin rulers launched the Polish Rapacki plan with the obvious intent to neutralize and immobilize West Germany. Removal from the society of free nations of the Germans surely remains to be a major policy objective of the Communists. It should not go unnoticed that this plan also wants to neutralize, that is to freeze, most of those parts of Europe which were eased into communism by the expulsion of the Germans, besides neutralizing West Germany where these expellees are now living.

There can be little doubt that the expulsion 13 years ago from their homelands, the German provinces east of the

Oder-Neisse line, the Sudetenland, and other regions of central and east Europe, of a considerable part of the German people has greatly helped bringing about the communization of these areas of the European Continent. Mr. Speaker, the Kersten report—House Report No. 2684, 83d Congress, 2d session—of the Special House Committee on Communist Aggression, in 1954, has given an account of Czechoslovakia's communization. I like to add to this excellent report by pointing to the important part—perhaps hitherto not fully recognized in its true proportion—which the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans had in bringing about the communization of that country.

Among the 16 million German expellees, mentioned before, were 3.3 million Sudeten Germans, the latter group equal in size to the total population of either Eire or Norway. They were expelled in 1945 and 1946 from their ancient homeland by the Communist-led Czechoslovak Government of the so-called national front. About 300,000 of them died during the process of expulsion.

Mr. Speaker, I wish here to emphasize once more that the expulsions of all these Germans established a wrong. They constituted a flagrant violation of the rules of international law, of the laws of humanity, of the basic principles of international morality and, thus, actually served the cause of Communist imperialism.

Then, as you may recall, 10 years ago, an out and out Communist regime took over in Czechoslovakia. That sad event in February 1948, shocked the free peoples throughout the world. However, Communist control had already asserted itself in 1945, when the Sudeten Germans were expelled. What we witnessed in 1948 was merely the shrewd legalization of a system illegally foisted upon the people in 1945.

When speaking of the Sudetenland, I refer to the territory comprising the border regions of Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia, that is, the border regions of the western part of present-day Czechoslovakia. In 1921, 3.2 million Sudeten Germans and 6.8 million Czechs were living in Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia while, in 1935, the figures showed 3.3 million Sudeten Germans and 7.4 million Czechs.

As a political entity, a state, Czechoslovakia does not antedate the year of 1918 when Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia with its Czech and German population were combined with Slovakia, the latter comprising 2.3 million Slovaks and 692,000 Magyars, and with Carpathian Ruthenia inhabited by 549,000 Ruthenians. Nevertheless, Czechs and Germans have been living side by side in those first-named regions for nearly a thousand years. About one-third of the Czechs today have German family names while a great many Sudeten Germans have Czech names.

HISTORICAL SURVEY: (1) EARLY HISTORY

In order to get a clear picture of the whole case it will be helpful to start with a historical survey showing the

background of Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia. Germanic tribes, namely the Marcomani, Quadii and Langobardi inhabited, exclusively, these provinces between the 1st and 6th centuries after Christ. It was not until the sixth century that Czech Slavic tribes came in from the east and settled in the interior area of these provinces among the remnants of the Germanic tribes most of whom had left. The border region, the later Sudetenland, was mainly primeval forest, sparsely inhabited and not settled by the Czechs. The sixth century then saw the invasion of Europe by the Asiatic Huns and Avars. The Slavs were liberated from the rule of the Avars with the help of a German chieftain, Samo, who later became their first duke.

In 845 A. D. 14 chieftains of Czech tribes came to Regensburg, Germany, and accepted the Christian faith. Since these early beginnings, Czech-German relations have been distinctly friendly, perhaps interrupted for only a brief period by the Hussite wars, those religious quarrels in the 15th century. Bohemian dukes intermarried with German princely families. Bohemia itself became a fief of the German empire or, stating the full title, the Holy Roman Empire of German Nation. Bohemian dukes, since 1198 kings, received their title from the German emperor; but they themselves were electors of the empire choosing at the death of an emperor the successor to the crown.

From the 12th century on, Bohemian dukes and lords began to welcome to Bohemia and Moravia German settlers who cleared the primeval forest of the sparsely inhabited border region, cultivating the new soil and developing the area that later became known as Sudetenland. Other Germans were welcomed to other parts of Bohemia and Moravia where they founded towns and, at an early date, began mining activities. Most towns in Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia have a German background. The Germans brought with them the great municipal codes of Magdeburg and Nuremberg; they cultivated crafts and trades. In 973, the first German bishopric was established in Prague and in the 14th century, during the reign of the German emperor, Charles IV, was raised to an archbishopric. Charles IV was, at the same time, king of Bohemia. He resided in Prague, spoke German as well as Czech, and was acclaimed by both peoples "father of the country." In 1348 Charles IV established at Prague the first university in Central Europe and decreed it to be a study center for scholars of all nations of his realm.

HISTORICAL SURVEY: (2) DURING THE CENTURIES OF THE HAPSBURG DYNASTY

When in 1526 a Hapsburg prince succeeded to the Bohemian throne, Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia became part of the Hapsburg domain, but continued to be an integral part of the Holy Roman Empire of German Nation until its end in 1806. The Hapsburg dynasty reigned there for nearly four centuries. In the early years of the 17th century, the German emperor, then Rudolf II of Hapsburg, again resided at Prague in the

Hradschin castle. In 1649, however, the Imperial Court was moved to Vienna and the latter, owing to its more central location, then became the residence of the emperors.

Individual nations within the Hapsburg realm enjoyed considerable prosperity in trade and commerce and there was much intermarriage among the various peoples. Though both languages, Czech and German, were used in Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia, Emperor Josef II decreed in 1784 that German be the official language in his domain which, at that time, included Belgium and Italy. It provoked opposition and was not long upheld; from 1790 on, German and Czech continued to be used side by side in Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia. By a ruling, in 1880, of the then Austrian Minister of Education, Julius von Stremayr, it was expressly stated that both tongues were the official languages in that area. This was reaffirmed by Count Kasimir Badeni, the Austrian Prime Minister in the late 1890's.

From the beginning of Austrian constitutionalism in 1860 to the end of the Dual Monarchy in 1918, the Czechs were represented in the imperial parliament at Vienna by their own deputies and were free to use their own language, build their own schools and establish other institutions of learning. Besides, in the provincial legislatures of Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia the Czechs had a majority and often outvoted the Sudeten Germans. At Prague in the governor's office, which at that time may have been more important than the ministry of interior at Vienna, Czechs held many influential positions. Provincial administration of schools, agriculture, and welfare was properly apportioned to both nationalities.

However, the 18th and 19th centuries had seen the rise in Europe of nationalism. Johann Gottfried Herder, born in 1744 in Mohrungen, East Prussia, became the great philosopher propounding his ideal of an enlightened humanitarian nationalism. Oddly he found the most ardent disciples among Slavic intellectuals. His ideas served as a guiding light for Czech nationalism which, thoroughly roused in 1848, then took a Pan-Slavic direction. This was manifestly evident in 1849 during the first Pan-Slavic Congress at Prague when the Russian anarchist, Mikhail Bakunin, as if in anticipation of what was to happen there a century later, played a leading role. Into the concept of the national state the Czechs introduced a dangerous element of their own. They began to mistake the Bohemian kingship for a Czech national kingship and the Bohemians for Czechs, claiming the country altogether for themselves and regarding Sudeten Germans as a minority of aliens.

In 1867, the Austrian empire was reorganized into the Dual Monarchy of Austria-Hungary and the Magyars thereby obtained a status equal to the Germans. People of Slavic nationalities then tried to have this arrangement widened into a triple monarchy by establishing under the Hapsburg crown an autonomous state of Bohemia. Because

of Hungarian opposition the plan failed. Czech refusal to guarantee as a precondition to the Sudeten Germans the right of self-administration contributed to the failure.

HISTORICAL SURVEY: (3) THE FIRST CZECHOSLOVAK REPUBLIC

Led by T. G. Masaryk and Eduard Beneš, Czech politicians saw in World War I the opportunity for their people to secede from the Hapsburg empire and set up an independent republic. Promising the Slovaks full autonomy, Masaryk persuaded them to join the Czechs in forming one state when he concluded with the Slovak League of America the Pittsburgh Agreement of May 30, 1918. The new Czechoslovak Republic then came into being on October 28, 1918.

At that hour the Sudeten Germans, on their part, decided to establish the provinces of German-Bohemia and Sudetenland, and to associate these with the new Republic of Austria. Head of the provincial government at Prague was at the time Dr. Rudolf Lodgman von Auen. He is today the president of the National Union of Sudeten German Expellees and a co-chairman of the Sudeten German Council. Dr. von Lodgman had long urged a solution of the problem of Austria-Hungary on lines of federalism. He advocated freedom—his ancestors had fled England at the time of Elizabeth I in search of freedom—and he stood for the right to self-determination. But in spite of the fact that Austria-Hungary was ostensibly dismembered so as to realize that right, firmly proclaimed by our President Woodrow Wilson, it was squarely refused to the 3.2 million Sudeten Germans who were forced against their will to be part of the new Czechoslovak Republic.

To subdue the demands of the people, the Czechs even dispatched troops to the Sudetenland and when, in March 1919, there were public demonstrations the Czech military fired into the crowds causing many casualties. Leading the resistance movement in those days was Josef Seliger, chairman of the Sudeten German Social Democratic Party.

Headed by Dr. Beneš, the Czech delegation to the Paris Peace Conference did not shrink away from using such tricks as presenting maps showing a Sudeten German area falsely reduced. The deceit was later contradicted even by the official Czechoslovak census figure. In an oral statement to the Big Four, Beneš admitted that the Sudeten Germans, if given a free choice, would probably secede from the new republic. To compensate for denying them the right to self-determination Beneš, in a written memorandum to the peace conference, went on record in favor of a Swiss type of constitution for Czechoslovakia. It remained an empty promise.

Dr. von Lodgman and the Slovak spokesman, Msgr. Andrew Hlinka, as well as leaders of the Magyars in Czechoslovakia also managed to go to Paris to attend the Peace Conference. But they were kept in their hotels behind barbed wire and were not given a hearing.

THE PROPHETIC WARNING OF A TRUE AMERICAN

Today we recall that it was a man representing the United States who objected to the flagrant violation of the right to self-determination in the specific instance of the Sudeten Germans. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a sense of gratification to remind the Members of this House of that great citizen of our country and to quote his prophetic words. I refer to Prof. Archibald Cary Coolidge, the well-known Harvard historian. In December 1918, he was appointed by the Secretary of State to be political observer in Austria-Hungary, assigned to the American Commission to Negotiate Peace and instructed to head a field mission to the former dual monarchy. Professor Coolidge incidentally is a founder-member of the New York Council in Foreign Relations and served as first editor of its quarterly, *Foreign Affairs*.

Reporting to the Commission from Vienna on January 12, 1919, Dr. Coolidge wrote:

The great argument on which the Germans of Austria and Bohemia rest their case is, as they are never tired of repeating, the principle of self-determination. . . . When after the cessation of hostilities the Czechs, instead of disarming, called their men to the colors and occupied the German parts of Bohemia, people in those regions were inclined to resist by force. The government of Vienna, however, forbade all such resistance, declaring that the matter could be settled only by the Peace Conference in Paris, and that the Germans of Austria and Bohemia should peacefully await its decision trusting to the justice of their case. . . . To tear away some three millions of Germans from their fellows and to unite them against their wills to a Czechish population of barely double their numbers would not only be a most flagrant violation of the principles which the Allies and especially the United States have proclaimed as their own and which have been accepted by Austria, but would utterly destroy any hope of a lasting peace. . . .

A decision which shall place one-third of them under the heel of a foreign people who have already begun to take steps to denationalize them will mean an end to any hope of a permanent peace in this part of the world. Sooner or later the question must and will come up again, and in the meantime the Balkanization of the former territories of Austria will be a source of woe and peril, not only to the territories themselves but to the rest of the world. In the eyes of the German Austrians today the issue is a clear one between the new doctrine of self-determination from which so much is hoped and naked imperialism of the old discredited type.

Dr. A. C. Coolidge summed up his observations in a detailed memorandum of March 10, 1919, which he submitted to the Peace Commission. He dealt with the problem of nationalities and new boundaries in all parts of the former Hapsburg monarchy and set out stating:

The opinions which I shall now venture to submit represent in many cases ideas of long standing confirmed or modified by unusual opportunities of observation in the last few months. I shall merely state my conclusions with but a few words of explanation, as it would take far too long to attempt anything like adequate treatment of the various questions. . . .

To grant to the Czechoslovaks all the territory they demand would be not only an

injustice to millions of people unwilling to come under Czech rule, but it would also be dangerous and perhaps fatal to the future of the new state. . . . The bloodshed on March 3 when Czech soldiers in several towns fired on German crowds . . . was shed in a manner that is not easily forgiven. . . . For the Bohemia of the future to contain within its limits great numbers of deeply discontented inhabitants . . . will be a perilous experiment and one which can hardly promise success in the long run. . . . I am aware that political and other considerations at the present time may make it impossible for our Commission to support all of the solutions I have advocated. Nevertheless, I am presenting them as those which seem to me best in themselves.

Three weeks later, on April 1, 1919, the Sudeten German question was taken up at a Peace Conference meeting discussing the report of the Czechoslovak Commission on the frontiers between Czechoslovakia and Germany. It was at this meeting when our Secretary of State, Mr. Lansing, objected to including into the Czechoslovak State large Sudeten German areas and declaring that—

The American delegates objected to the whole method of drawing frontier lines on strategic principles.

And that—

The fixing of frontier lines with a view to their military strength . . . was directly contrary to the whole spirit . . . of the policy of the United States as set forth in the declarations of President Wilson.

M. Laroche of the French delegation, upon being asked at this meeting whether the commission would approve of a plebiscite in the area, replied that a plebiscite could not be proposed without extending it to the remainder of the German Bohemians, which would reduce the Czechoslovak state to very slender proportions. Mr. Lansing thereupon plainly said that this was not a good reason to justify an injustice. However, the views of the French Foreign Minister prevailed, namely, to strengthen Czechoslovakia, which M. Pichon trusted "would remain an ally of France" as against Germany which, as far as the French Foreign Minister was concerned, still remained a country to be feared.

The clear analysis given of the situation in the reports of Archibald C. Coolidge and the correct attitude of Robert Lansing will remind us of the equally prophetic warning issued at about the same time by the South African statesman, Gen. Jan Smuts, and dealing with the injustice about to be done to the Germans in Prussia by turning over some of their homeland to the Poles:

I think we are building a house of sand. . . . I shudder to think of its ultimate effect.

Mr. Speaker, these warnings should be remembered today by those who may tend to place again expediency above right and justice.

The United States, however, then began to withdraw from the scene of European political intrigues. The constitution of the Czechoslovak Republic was devised by a mostly Czech commission and not by a duly elected convention. Czech became the official language.

The Sudeten Germans were not given a fair chance to participate. The facts of the undemocratic beginnings of Czechoslovakia should not be overlooked.

The Czech land reform law of 1919 allotted 2,025,400 acres of German property in the Sudetenland to proteges of the Czech political parties. Only 7 percent of the land taken from Sudeten German owners was given to Sudeten German farmers, while 93 percent was handed over to new Czech settlers. In addition, land property expropriated in the central parts of Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia, that is, outside of the Sudetenland, amounting to another 3,818,064 acres and owned by Germans, was also handed over to the Czechs. In the Sudetenland proper, 31 percent of the entire land area was confiscated in 1919. The Czech colonists were settled and Czech schools were built with the aim to break up the German language area.

Although the Sudeten Germans represented about 30 percent of the total population of Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia, they made up only 10 percent of the employees of the general civil service, 13.1 percent of the postal service, 12.8 percent of the judicial administration service, 12.4 percent of the railway employees, and only 5.4 percent of the army officer corps. The police force was almost exclusively Czech. Administrative reforms in 1927 must also be regarded as discriminatory, though a smoothly working publicity machine was able to show the outside world the picture of what appeared to be a democracy.

In the 1920 parliamentary elections the Sudeten German parties won 74 out of the 300 available seats. Some of these parties, the so-called Activists, entered the government coalition and, since 1926, most political parties of the Sudeten Germans participated in the government coalition, thus showing their honest desire to cooperate. But they were unable to gain any ground toward reforms on federative lines. Even a late-in-the-day palliative assurance of more posts to be assigned to Sudeten German civil servants remained an empty promise.

Upon being nominated ministers in the Czechoslovak Government, two Sudeten German politicians, Mr. Spina, of the Farmers Party, and Mr. Mayr-Hartig, of the Christian Social Party, accepted the call, but declared that Sudeten German representation in the Prague government was not to be interpreted as a solution of the nationalities problem of Czechoslovakia. They then requested Czech agreement to basic reforms and recognition of minority rights by allowing to bring the issue before the League of Nations. Their efforts failed.

The worldwide economic crisis at the end of the 1920's imposed a heavy burden on the Sudeten Germans. Czech bankers and administrators gave preference to Czech enterprises. Out of 800,000 unemployed 500,000 were Sudeten Germans. Little wonder that they began looking more and more for support from abroad.

In 1935, the Sudeten German Party, a union of a number of political groups, polled 1,249,530 votes and thus emerged as the largest political party in all of Czechoslovakia, but was forced to remain in opposition. Early in 1937, several younger members of those German parties that participated in the government coalition made once more a concerted effort to convince the Czechs of the urgency of thoroughgoing reforms. Hans Schutz, of the Christian Social Party, sternly demanded equal rights, while Wenzel Jaksch, of the Social Democratic Party, bluntly asked whether or not there was still a place in the Czechoslovak Republic for genuine Sudeten German partnership. Incidentally, both men are today distinguished members of the German Bundestag, the former also a co-chairman of the Sudeten German Council. Though these parties, until 1935, had held about 75 percent of the Sudeten German share of seats in the Prague Parliament, the Beneš government refused to make any concession.

Now the British became increasingly concerned about this situation in Czechoslovakia. In the growing crisis of 1938 Lord Runciman was chosen to head a mission of mediation and, after a close study on the ground, he reported:

It is hard to be ruled by an alien race. * * * In the last elections in 1935 the Sudeten German Party polled more votes than any other single party. * * * But they can always be outvoted; and consequently some of them feel that constitutional action is useless for them. * * * Even as late as the time of my mission, I could find no readiness on the part of the Czechoslovak Government to remedy (the complaints) on anything like an adequate scale. * * * Just as it is essential for the international position of Switzerland that her policy should be entirely neutral, so an analogous policy is necessary for Czechoslovakia—not only for her own future existence but for the peace of Europe.

However, Czechoslovakia refused to admit its multinational status and did not strive for a position of neutrality. In spite of its vulnerability because of the large percentage of citizens of non-Czech nationality it allowed itself to be used as a political pawn, and since the treaty in 1935 with the Soviet Union, increasingly as a pawn in the hands of the Kremlin, thereby causing its own gradual disintegration. The case was correctly diagnosed in the Kersten report—page 18:

Fateful for the people was the fact that they were misinformed by many fellow traveling intellectuals, by means of newspapers, books, and through all mediums of communication as to the real nature of communism, cleverly described for years even prior to World War II as undergoing an evolution toward a democratic humanitarian ideology.

The Kersten report correctly also points to the Slovaks as being thoroughly dissatisfied. The Prague government treated them in much the same way as the Sudeten Germans. About half of Czechoslovakia's total population was tired of being bossed by the 7.4 million Czechs. No wonder that the foundation of the republic began to crumble, when the Anglo-French dé-

marche of September 21, 1938, demanded the cession to Germany of the Sudeten region. It was soon followed by demands of Poland and Hungary for the cession of areas inhabited by their conationals, 131,000 Poles and 692,000 Magyars, and finally by the declaration of independence of the 2.3 million Slovaks who sought recognition as a nation.

From the beginning the Czechs had been showing a lack of realism, a lack of willingness to plan, in good time, for constitutional reforms. If in the years after 1918 a Swiss solution had earnestly been sought, events might well have taken a different course. The word "Munich" has since been linked in our mind with a short-sighted, dangerous policy vis-à-vis an aggressive dictator. Surely the right to self-determination should not be exercised by employing violence which would only bring about new injustice. Nevertheless, the right to self-determination is today recognized as a canon of international law. A brief glance at the map of Asia and Africa will suffice to convince everybody of its potency and potentiality, of its full meaning in the realities of present-day world affairs.

As to Munich, it should be remembered that neither the Czechs nor the Sudeten Germans were partners to that agreement. It was made by the four European big powers. When Hitler, in 1939, under a flimsy pretext occupied the central area of Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia he openly violated the right to an independent national life of the Czech people just as the Czechs, two decades before, had violated that same right of the Sudeten Germans. Thereafter, the Sudetenland was separated by state boundaries from the rest of Czechoslovakia.

To charge the Sudeten Germans with treason against the Czechoslovak Republic is beside the point, when the charge is made by the Czechs who themselves set the example. In opposing Austria-Hungary, Masaryk, Beneš, and their adherents had solicited during World War I the support of foreign governments and had organized thousands of Czech deserters from the Austrian Army to join Czech legions on the side of the Allies. It was hard to make Sudeten Germans later believe that as to their own case "sauce for the goose was not to be sauce for the gander." The expulsion of the Sudeten Germans cannot be based on treason allegedly committed by them against the Czechoslovak Republic nor upon the charge of association with Hitler's policy of suppressing the Czechs.

SUDETEN GERMAN CONTRIBUTIONS TO WESTERN CIVILIZATION

Before going into the events leading up to the expulsion it seems appropriate to refer to some of the contributions which Sudeten Germans have made to western civilization. These contributions are truly a part of the history of Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia and remain to this day an integral part of the picture of this area. It started, as we have seen, with the first traders and settlers, the founders of towns in the early Middle Ages. They brought Chris-

tianity and the culture of the West, the chivalry of medieval knighthood, the great legal codes of Magdeburg and Nuremberg, the sciences taught in schools. When the Hussite era temporarily interrupted this wholesome German influence it resulted in the decline of municipalities, of the liberties of its citizens and it brought about the rise of an oligarchic rule and a system of peasant bondage. During the 16th and 17th centuries Czechs and Sudeten Germans, united under the royal banner of Bohemia, fought side by side in defending European Christianity against the Mohammedan Turks. It was in Prague where the new High German language was developed, the same in which Martin Luther wrote his translation of the Bible.

Present Communist rulers of Czechoslovakia publish quite an amount of propaganda material to have tourists visit the beautiful cities of Bohemia and Moravia. Yet they as well as their fellow travelers in the West painstakingly omit to mention how much of all this is principally the accomplishment of the same Sudeten Germans whose descendants they have cruelly expelled. They try to nationalize, *ex post facto*, the history of the land and where, in 1787 at Prague, Mozart's opera, *Don Giovanni*, was first performed; where, in 1823 at Marienbad, Goethe wrote his *Marienbader Elegie*; and where, in 1844 at Karlsbad and Marienbad, Richard Wagner composed *Thannhäuser*.

Here are some more of the facts: During the reign of Charles IV, Peter Parler built the famous St. Vitus Cathedral and gave to Prague an individuality of its own when he also built the Town Hall, the Charles Bridge and the castle of Karlstein. Many other fine Gothic buildings were erected by Germans. The picturesqueness of Bohemian cities which we find so charming owes much to the Baroque period. The list of artists and architects of that time includes: A. Leithner, Christoph and Ignaz Dientzenhofer, Santin Aichel, Ignaz Bayer, Peter Brandel, Reiner Mathias Braun, Hartmann Balthasar Neumann, F. Dietz, Fischer von Erlach, Lukas von Hildebrandt, Anton Zimmer, J. M. Lassler, Ferdinand Max and Johann Brokoff—all of them German; Franz M. Kanka, Jakob Blazejovsky and Karel Skreta were Czech; in addition there was 1 French and 6 Italian architects. Castles, churches, monasteries, and town houses in all of Bohemia and Moravia bear evidence that Sudeten Germans cannot now, *ex post facto*, be separated even from those parts of the country which were inhabited by the Czechs.

Natives of the Sudetenland who made their mark in history include: Albrecht von Wallenstein, who led the Imperial armies in the Thirty-Years War; Prince Schwarzenberg, the Austrian statesman of the Napoleonic era; Count Radetzky, the Austrian field marshal; Hans Kudlich, known for his part in the struggle to liberate the peasant from bondage; Gregor Mendel, founder of modern genetics and author of the Mendelian law; writers like Karl Postl, known in this

country by his pen name of Charles Sealsfield, Maria Ebner-Eschenbach, Berta von Suttner, and Adalbert Stifter; Alois Senefelder, who invented the stone press; Joseph Ressel, who invented the ship screw; Mathias Schoenerer and Franz Josef Gersten, who built the first railway in Bohemia, and Anton von Gersten, who built the first railway in Russia; Johann Liebig and Johann Schicht, the industrialists, and Ferdinand Porsche, who constructed the Volkswagen; Johann Nepomuk and Clemens Maria Hofbauer, who were later canonized by the Catholic Church, and the late Cardinal Theodor Innitzer, of Vienna; the recent Austrian Presidents Karl Renner and Theodor Koerner as well as Adolf Schaerf, who occupies this high office now. We might add that the parents of the composer Franz Schubert came from the Sudetenland and that Archbishop Aloysius Muench, of Fargo, N. Dak., the papal nuntius in Germany, is of Sudeten German descent.

The following figures will illustrate the extent to which Sudeten Germans constituted an integral part of Czechoslovakia's economy. Their share of that country's various industries was as follows: Raw materials, 70 percent; coal mines, 66 percent; lignite mining, 80 percent; iron and steel foundries, 70 percent; sugar refineries, 58 percent; textile machinery factories, 80 percent; electrotechnical industry, 70 percent; porcelain and chinaware, 90 percent; glassworks, 80 percent; wool industry, 75 percent; textiles, 89 percent; silk factories, 100 percent; artificial silk, 80 percent; fringe and gimp industry, 100 percent; paper, 80 percent; chemicals, 70 percent; fertilizers, 60 percent; musical instruments, 90 percent.

In addition, Sudeten German farming and timberland property amounted to 11,095 square miles. Their property holdings had an estimated total value of \$19.5 billion. This figure does not include the Sudeten German share of Czechoslovak state property, natural resources, art collections, libraries, the value of Sudeten German international firms. Numerous products, such as some of the beer—Pilsener and Budweiser are German, not Czech names—and the Gablonz glassware and custom jewelry industry, carrying the imprint "Made in Czechoslovakia" were distinctly Sudeten German. Then there is the good will of people seeking the cures in world-famous health resorts like Karlsbad, Marienbad, Franzensbad, St. Joachimsthal, and Teplitz-Schönau. Also, not included, is the value of the recently developed uranium mines of Joachimsthal. Incidentally, students of history will recall that our own dollar, by way of abbreviation, derived its name from the Joachimsthaler Gulden, a coin minted from silver that was mined near this town.

The Potsdam decisions, by removing what a diabolic Communist propaganda had portrayed as a troublesome minority and thereby furthering the establishment in that area of a Communist regime, actually cut Bohemia's links to the West reaching back over nine cen-

turies and thus pushed that country into the lap of the Kremlin rulers. What has been through hundreds of years a vital part of Central Europe is now serving as an advance base of Soviet imperialism.

POLITICS DURING WORLD WAR II

Dr. Beneš unfortunately seems to have blamed the Sudeten Germans for his own shortcomings and considered them instrumental in his downfall in 1938. His mind was beclouded by Germanophobia. He did not seek a just and fair solution in his dealings with those Sudeten German politicians who were, like he himself, exiled by the Nazi regime and living in London during World War II. I refer to Wenzel Jaksch and Richard Reitzner, both of whom now are members of the German Bundestag.

According to his "Mémoires"—"Paméti"—published in Prague in 1947, this is what Beneš at a reception in London on January 7, 1942, told Wenzel Jaksch in an effort to have him agree to deportation from Czechoslovakia of all Sudeten Germans, excepting a limited number of anti-Fascists:

During the social revolution which will certainly occur we shall have to rid our country of all the German bourgeoisie, the Pan German intelligentsia and those workers who have turned Fascist. This would be the final solution and, so far as we are concerned, the only possible solution which we would be able to implement, namely combining our social revolution with the national revolution.

I added to Jaksch and his friends: We must have the courage to speak about this openly; and especially you Social Democrats should have the courage to do so. This plan even contains an element of Marxism and Marxist dialectics in the revolutionary process which must inevitably accompany the changes in the social structure of the nation as an outcome of this great and worldwide catastrophe. After the First World War * * * I foretold that the German nationalist bourgeoisie in our country would some time in the future attempt a counter-revolution and that there would be no peace between us until this bourgeoisie was subjected to a similar revolution to that which the Czechs had gone through in past centuries. Now, after the Second World War, this revolution is inevitable; and the entire nationalities problem in our country will be radically solved at the same time.

It is only fair to say that some Czech opposition was voiced against these plans, notably from Army General Lev Prchala.

It is rather unfortunate that Beneš apparently had no scruples as to how he would gain his end. For instance, in a conference on May 12, 1943, with President Roosevelt he asserted that the Russians were willing to agree to the transfer of the Sudeten Germans. Then, 17 days later, on May 29, Dr. Hubert Ripka explained to Mr. Bogomolov, the Soviet Ambassador in London, that the Americans had already agreed to the transfer, and that in these circumstances the Czechoslovak Government in Exile expected the Soviets to consent. On June 6, Ripka telephoned Beneš, who was at the time in the United States, that Soviet Russia had just agreed to the transfer—the same agreement which

Beneš had used as a lever in his conference with President Roosevelt on May 12, 1943.

The Soviets were the first allies granting to the Czech Government in Exile de jure recognition. Against the advice of western statesmen Beneš went to Moscow and in 1943 signed a new treaty with the Soviet Government. Eager to show his ability of playing an important role in the arena of world politics he may have thought of himself as a man who would build the great bridge between the West and the East. As seen in retrospect, however, he seems to have been prior to the Tehran Conference more than perhaps any other person active in strengthening Roosevelt's ill-conceived trust in Stalin. In this way, I regret to say, he certainly proved to be a valuable tool of the Kremlin.

Toward the end of World War II, Beneš returned to Prague by way of Moscow, accompanying the Red army, as it advanced from the east into Czechoslovakia, and himself being accompanied by a Czech Government group led by a Communist, Zdenek Fierlinger, who is today the President of the Czechoslovak Republic. At Košice in eastern Slovakia Beneš and his colleagues proclaimed on April 5, 1945, the so-called Košice program according to which the country for the time being was to be ruled by presidential decrees. The program was signed by: Zdenek Fierlinger, Josef David, Klement Gottwald, Viliam Široký—today the Prime Minister, Dr. Jan Šrámek, Jan Ursiny, Jan Masaryk—son of the first President of Czechoslovakia—Ludvik Svoboda, Dr. Hubert Ripka, Václav Nosek, Dr. Vavro Srobar, Dr. Zdenek Nejedlý, Dr. Jaroslav Stránský, Václav Kopecký, Bohumil Laušman, Julius Duriš, Dr. Jan Pietor, Antonin Hasal, Frantisek Hála, Dr. Jan Soltezs, Dr. Adolf Procházka, Václav Majer, Dr. Vladimír Clementis, Dr. Mikulaš Ferjencik, and Jan Lichner.

Czechoslovakia was now restored within the pre-Munich boundaries, except for Carpathian Ruthenia which the Soviets had seized and incorporated into the Soviet Ukraine, and which the new Czechoslovak Government then ceded to the Soviet Union. The Slovaks were once more subjected to Czech domination. The new government announced the formation of a so-called National Front, supposedly a coalition of the Communist Party and three parties willing to collaborate with them, that is, Social Democrats, National Socialists, and People's Party. All Czech political parties of the center and the right side were declared illegal, among them the National Democrats, the Artisans, and the Republican Agrarians, the latter being the biggest political party in pre-war Czechoslovakia. Their leaders and functionaries were jailed. All Slovak parties were likewise outlawed and, instead, new leftist parties such as the so-called Slovak Democratic Party and other puppet groups were artificially created. In this way, political parties were abolished which, before World War II had long represented the large majority of the non-Communist Czech and Slovak peo-

ples. In addition to these millions of Czechs and Slovaks all Sudeten Germans and Magyars were disfranchised. Only by applying this method of outlawing political opponents—exactly copying Hitler's procedure in Berlin in 1933—and of exploiting the prejudice of their willing collaborators, did the Communists succeed in 1946 to show up as the largest political party.

Now free elections, freedom of speech and press were abolished. Kangaroo courts, called people's courts were established in order to liquidate the opponents of Communism. So-called National Committees, fashioned after the Russian local "Soviets," were set up to take over the work of administrative offices. The economy was nationalized. While Beneš himself assumed the office of President, Communists were appointed to key positions at all levels and, from the beginning, were in control of police, army and the state propaganda machine.

The non-Communist ministers collaborated at every turn and supported the Communist line. Since some of these people later escaped to the West it may be of interest to mention, in addition to those who signed the Košice program, some of the prominent politicians of the era of the so-called National Front: Dr. Peter Zenkl—Vice Premier, Dr. Jozef Lettrich—leader of the Red puppet Slovak Democratic Party who, after the 1946 elections when the Slovaks had failed to vote for the Communists, signed the agreement abolishing Slovakia's autonomy, Dr. Jan Papánek, Dr. Juraj Slavik, and František Němec—who represented as ambassadors abroad the Red regime of Prague, Ferdinand Peroutka—a Socialist journalist, and Milos Vanek—one of the original bosses of the Czechoslovak Communist Party.

As the previously mentioned Kersten report—page 17—stated:

It should be pointed out that the Communist advance in Czechoslovakia was greatly facilitated by the behavior of the non-Communist parties and their leaders. The signing of the Soviet-Czechoslovak Agreement of December 12, 1943, and especially the proclamation of the Košice program of April 5, 1945, opened the door for an unreconstructed drive on the part of the Communists to seize full power in the country.

We know, however, that the so-called National Front represented merely a minority of the people. The last free election in Czechoslovakia returned a parliament of 300 deputies. Only 118 of them were of parties that later adhered to the so-called National Front. On the other hand, 107 deputies were of those Czech and Slovak parties that were declared illegal in 1945, while 75 deputies were of Sudeten German and Magyar parties.

THE REIGN OF TERROR—EXPULSION AND DECREES

A reign of terror began with the arrival of the Soviet Red army and the regime which was to become the government of the so-called National Front. One of the first administrative measures provided for the hasty construction of

concentration camps into which tens of thousands of Sudeten Germans were driven. The late R. R. Stokes, a former British minister, has given a vivid description of conditions in those camps which he himself had visited. Beneš' inciting words, "Annihilate the Germans where you find them," broadcast from Košice, led to a wave of cruel murder. The bloody Sunday at Aussig in July 1945, the massacres in Saaz, Brüx and Landskron, the death march of Brünn are only some of those outrages for which the Czechoslovak government of that time will be held fully responsible.

The Sudeten Germans were outlawed. Before being expropriated their homes were open for pillage either under the pretext of a raid for hidden weapons or merely by groups of police guards or plain Czech plunderers. In some towns orders were issued that homes of Germans must not be locked. Strict curfew was imposed on them. They were forced to wear white badges so as to make them conspicuous. They were forbidden to use public conveyances and the sidewalks, visit restaurants, write letters, change places of residence. They were restricted for buying groceries and shopping in stores to certain hours of the day, and special ration cards discriminating against them were issued. Schools and kindergartens were closed to their children. Adult Germans were called up and transported to the interior of Bohemia to provide forced labor on farms, in mines, and industry, at first without pay, later at low wages that were seldom paid. Still worse was the treatment in prisons, where overcrowded cells, brutalities and disease, in addition to insufficient rations, increased the death toll.

Article XIII of the Potsdam Protocol outlined the procedure for what was then called the transfer of the German population from Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. We know now that the Communists, by means of the expulsion, pursued the following objectives:

First. By eliminating the German element from the area, they wished to hasten the communization of those countries.

Second. In the depopulated regions, they wanted to introduce collective farms and state industrial enterprises fashioned after Russian Soviet examples before proceeding with those schemes on a general scale.

Third. The confiscated property was also to be used for bribery purposes, since destroying the sense of honesty turns people into more pliable tools of immoral communism.

Fourth. By inciting violence and acts of cruelty against the Germans, the Communists and their collaborators hoped to build up hatred between the Germans and these Slavic peoples so as to make the latter wholly dependent on the alliance with Communist Russia.

Fifth. The German expellees were to create social disorder and to be a hotbed of communism in overcrowded West Germany.

As to the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans, it may safely be said that this

was not a spontaneous reaction of the Czech people against the German occupation of their country, but an act planned by Czech politicians in exile and carried out by the government of the so-called National Front with all possible haste before the large majority of the Czech people would have second thoughts about it. Presidential decrees were supposed to give the proceedings a cloak of legality. Quotations from some of these decrees will point toward the responsibility of the government of the so-called National Front.

First. Constitutional decree of the President of the Republic of August 2, 1945:

ARTICLE 1

1. Czechoslovak citizens of German or Magyar nationality who acquired German or Magyar citizenship under the regulations of the foreign occupational forces shall have lost their Czechoslovak citizenship by so doing.

2. The other Czechoslovak citizens of German or Magyar nationality shall lose their Czechoslovak citizenship on the day when this decree will come into force.

Signed by Beneš, Fierlinger, Masaryk, Nosek, Svoboda.

Second. Decree of the President of the Republic of October 25, 1945:

Any immovable and movable property shall be confiscated without any compensation to the benefit of the Czechoslovak Republic * * * which is * * * owned:

1. By German or Magyar legal persons; or
2. By natural persons of German or Magyar nationality.

Signed by the signers of the Košice program.

Third. Decree of the President of the Republic of January 21, 1946:

ARTICLE 1

1. With immediate effect and without compensation and for the purpose of the land reform such land property shall be confiscated as is owned by—

(a) all persons of German or Magyar nationality without regard to their citizenship.

Signed by Beneš, Fierlinger, Nosek, Dr. Šrobar, Dr. Stránský, Duris, Majer.

Fourth. Law of May 8, 1946, passed by the provisional National Assembly:

ARTICLE 1

Any act committed between September 30, 1938, and October 28, 1945, the object of which was to aid the struggle for liberty of the Czechs and Slovaks, or which represented due reprisals for actions of the occupation forces and their accomplices, is not illegal, even when such actions may otherwise be punishable by law.

Signed by Beneš, Fierlinger, Drtina, Svoboda.

The last mentioned parliamentary act, which I have added to the decrees, provided for a general amnesty for all crimes committed against Germans, Magyars, and anti-Communist Czechs and Slovaks and thus gave ex post facto a semblance of legality to the law of the jungle.

Though Czechoslovakia was practically controlled by the Communists since 1945, the process of communization was completed when on February 25, 1948, the President of the Republic, Dr. Beneš, accepted the resignation of 12 non-Com-

munist ministers of the Cabinet and appointed a new out and out Communist Cabinet, headed by Klement Gottwald, who had been the prime minister since 1946 and merely continued in office. Thus the process of communization was completed in an apparently legal way. In the National Assembly both Communists and non-Communists, 230 out of 300 deputies, voted for the new government on March 10, 1948. Beneš remained President of the Republic. The whole tragedy shows a striking similarity to Hitler's taking over in Germany 15 years earlier with old Hindenburg continuing in the presidency.

EXPULSION WAS A VIOLATION OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

The expulsion of the Sudeten Germans from the homes which they had inhabited for a thousand years violated the principle of the right to self-determination of peoples. We should remember that this right was solemnly proclaimed by our own President Woodrow Wilson, who in his Mount Vernon address of July 4, 1918, declared:

The settlement of every question, whether of territory, of sovereignty, of economic arrangement or political relationship, must be upon the basis of the free acceptance of that settlement by the peoples immediately concerned.

It is well known that this Government has taken a prominent part in establishing this principle and in the development toward incorporating it in the law of nations. The expulsion of the Germans stands in direct contradiction to this great principle. I can here refer to a previous speech of mine in this House on May 16, 1957, wherein I have tried to show this Government's policy on the pertinent questions as it was clearly evolved during the last 4 decades to a point which should leave little room for doubt.

I might add that this Government was also strenuously opposed to arbitrary displacement of persons during both World Wars. We protested against the transfer during World War I of Belgian workers and condemned, as a grave violation of international law, the displacement during World War II of Poles and other peoples within the then Nazi orbit. We asserted the right to resettle in their home countries, of all displaced persons. As to our own fellow citizens of Japanese descent, temporarily displaced after Pearl Harbor from their homes near the Pacific Ocean, we reaffirmed by an act of Congress the right to their homes. Let me also point out that article 9 of the United Nations Human Rights Declaration of December 10, 1948, regards arbitrary expulsion as contrary to international law and states that "no one shall be subject to arbitrary exile."

Also relevant, it would seem to me, is the Convention on Genocide of December 11, 1946, which declares to be a crime, under international law, (a) killing members of a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group; (b) causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to

bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part. About 300,000 Sudeten Germans, that is, a considerable part of their total number, did not survive the removal from their ancient homeland, a fact which proves that they were victims of this crime.

Let me finally quote from the draft code, prepared in accordance with the resolution of November 21, 1947, of the United Nations General Assembly, to define "offenses against the peace and security of mankind" that would be "crimes under international law, for which the responsible individuals shall be punished." Article 2, paragraph 11, lists:

Inhuman acts such as murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation, or persecutions, committed against any civilian population on social, political, racial, religious, or cultural grounds by the authorities of a state or by private individuals acting at the instigation or with the toleration of such authorities.

This adequately covers the expulsion of the Germans from Sudetenland as well as those from the German provinces east of the Oder-Neisse line, and from other parts of Eastern Europe, and proves it to be—let me here repeat the words of article 1 of the penal draft code—among the "crimes under international law, for which the responsible individuals shall be punished."

I may remind this House of the fact that the offenses against the peace and security of mankind were drawn up by a commission of legal experts upon the direction of the United Nations General Assembly to formulate the principles of international law recognized in the charter of the Nuremberg tribunal and in the judgment of the tribunal. The above-cited articles cannot be dismissed as mere suppositions and theories or as a mental exercise in hypotheses. Their contents have been confirmed by the series of death sentences pronounced on the war criminals, sentences which speak the grim language of fiat justitia. Justice does not know a double standard. Justice is indivisible. It is, in the words we read on the face of our Supreme Court Building, "Equal justice under the law."

VOICES RAISED AGAINST THE EXPULSION

Many courageous persons have raised their voice against the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans. Even at the heyday of the so-called National Front regime, Roszevac, a Catholic paper in Olmütz, dared to protest on October 31, 1945, against cruelties in internment camps and the rape of Sudeten German women; and in another newspaper, Obzory, Dr. Helena Kozeluhova, a journalist, objected to the cruelties of the expulsion. Of course, such voices were quickly suppressed and Dr. Kozeluhova, for instance, was forbidden to write another line—curiously by men who themselves are now in exile and professing to be anti-Communist.

Czechs and Slovaks of the political parties that were suppressed by the Communists undoubtedly disapproved of the expulsion. Many of them opposed

it while in exile, among them Dr. Josef Cerny, a leader of the Agrarian Party and former Czechoslovak Minister; the Christian Democrats Josef Kalvoda and Simeon Ghelfand; Karel F. Stekr, the Artisan Party functionary and secretary general of the Union of Czechoslovak Industrialists in Exile; the former deputies, Dr. Bohdan Chudoba, Dr. Michael Zibrin and others of the National Democratic as well as other parties.

In 1945, the Czech National Committee in London under its chairman, Gen. Lev Prchala, issued a declaration denouncing the expulsion and condemning all acts of the so-called National Front regime as illegal and not binding upon the Czech people. A stand against the expulsion was also taken by most Slovak exiles such as the Slovak Liberation Committee, the Slovak National Council Abroad, the National Committee for the Liberation of Slovakia, and by that large organization of Americans of Slovak descent which, in 1918, signed the Pittsburgh agreement creating the Czechoslovak Republic.

In a speech before the National Conference of Americans of Slovak Descent at Washington, D. C., on May 24, 1954, which was attended by 5 Members of the Senate and 26 Members of this House, the president of the Slovak League of America, Philip A. Hrobak, declared:

The Slovaks do not want, nor do they request, the Czechs to represent them in any field of human endeavor, whether cultural, political, or spiritual. And, of course, the Slovaks do not want to be credited with the criminal acts committed by the Communist-dominated National Front government of Dr. Eduard Benes and Clement Gottwald. The Slovak nation has nothing to do with the criminal expulsion of Germans and Magyars from Czechoslovakia, nor with the brutal persecution and suppression of religion and of all anti-Communist opposition in that hapless country (Cf., CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 2, 1954; Mr. MUMMA, of Pennsylvania).

The preparatory committee of the Ecumenical Council of Churches asked on February 23, 1946, for a review of the policy which expelled the Germans, and called article XIII of the Potsdam Agreement a challenge of the Christian conscience.

On November 6, 1946, the Catholic Bishops of America at their annual convention in Washington, D. C., declared:

By agreement among the victors millions of Germans, who for centuries have lived in Eastern Europe, are being forced from their homes, without resources, into the heart of Germany. * * * We boast of our democracy, but in this transplantation of peoples we have, perhaps unwittingly, allowed ourselves to be influenced by the herd theory of heartless totalitarian political philosophy.

Pope Pius XII, in his letter of March 1, 1948, to the German Catholic bishops expressed his wish that the expulsions be renounced.

POSITION TAKEN BY THE GERMAN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

What, then, is the position taken by the German Federal Government with regard to the Sudeten German expulsion? With all votes except those of the Communist deputies, the German Bund-

estag on July 14, 1950, adopted the following resolution:

Subsequent to the abandonment of the territories east of the Oder-Neisse line, the fictitious government of the Russian occupied zone of Germany signed the Prague agreement on June 23, 1950, in which the illegal and inhuman expulsion of the Sudeten and Carpathian Germans is acknowledged as irrevocable, just, and final. On this occasion the German Bundestag declares once more that this fictitious government is not authorized, politically or morally, to speak for the whole German people or nation, not to sign any agreements whatsoever.

The Prague agreement is incompatible with the inalienable right of man to a homeland. Therefore, the German Bundestag solemnly protests against the abandonment of the right to a homeland for those Germans of Czechoslovakia, now under the protection of the German Federal Republic, and confirms the invalidity of the Prague agreement.

On the other hand, the German Bundestag appreciates the rejection by the High Commissioner of the Prague agreement. Moreover, it earnestly urges all free nations to work toward a peaceful solution in the true spirit of the Atlantic Charter which guarantees to the Germans, too, the natural rights of man.

The executive branch of the German Federal Government has also repeatedly stated its policy on the pertinent question of the expellees. Germany recognizes the boundaries of 1937. However, it also stands for the right of other expellees to return to their respective countries. Chancellor Konrad Adenauer has made this clear in various messages to Sudeten German expellees. On Palm Sunday of 1955, Dr. Adenauer declared:

General human rights must, in the opinion of the Federal Government, also include the right to a homeland.

Foreign Minister Heinrich von Brentano, speaking for the German Federal Government, declared in the Bundestag on June 28, 1956:

The right to their homeland and to self-determination is the inalienable prerequisite for settling the fate of men and peoples living in exile or in bondage.

The Under Secretary of the German Foreign Office, Dr. Walter Hallstein, stated on September 28, 1956:

When furthering on an international level the right to a homeland on the basis of the right to self-determination, the Federal Government relies principally on the provisions of the Atlantic Charter of August 12, 1941, the Charter of the United Nations of July 26, 1945, the General Declaration of Human Rights of December 10, 1948, and the European Convention for Protection of Human Rights and Basic Freedoms of November 4, 1950, with its supplementary protocol of March 26, 1953, all of which have been formulated in the spirit of the above mentioned principle.

In a statement before the Bundestag in October 1956, Under Secretary Hallstein added:

The Federal Government will at every suitable occasion point out to the nations concerned and to the world that the eleven million expellees now living in the Federal Republic, have never waived the claim to regain their homelands in justice, peace and freedom. Moreover, the Federal Government will call attention to the fact that this

position is shared by the whole of the German nation.

ACTIVITIES OF, AND POSITION TAKEN BY, SUDETEN GERMAN EXPELLEES

Let us now take a look at the expelled Sudeten Germans. Where are they today? What is their life and work in the country where they have found a refuge? What are their political activities? What, in particular, is their position with regard to their Czech neighbors? Are they perhaps planning a bloody revenge for the long suffering they have had to endure?

There are Sudeten German expellees today in the Soviet-occupied zone of Germany, in Austria, Great Britain, Sweden, the Argentine, Brazil, and the United States. But the great majority of them, more than 2 million, are living in West Germany. They have used their skill and industry in building up for themselves a new life in the West. They reopened markets which they had supplied at the time when their products bore the imprint "Made in Czechoslovakia." They created new industrial enterprise and even built new towns, such as Neu-Gablonz in West Germany, thereby notably contributing to that country's present-day economy. Quite a few, however, particularly farmers, are still compelled to a dismal existence in West German refugee camps. Generally speaking, despite their tragic fate they went to work in a free and competitive economy and show no sign of turning toward communism.

To the contrary, because of their past experience with the Communists they are contributing to an understanding of the danger to free institutions by creeping and cryptic Communist subversion. Recognition in this respect should be given to Dr. Walter Becher, member of the Bavarian Legislature and who is also secretary general of the Sudeten German Council, an organization of Sudeten German members of West German legislative bodies functioning under the joint chairmanship of the venerable Dr. Rudolf Lodgman von Auen and two distinguished members of the Bundestag, Hans Schütz and Richard Reitzner. Their principal organization, however, is the National Union—Landmannschaft—of Sudeten German Expellees, also headed by Dr. von Lodgman jointly with Dr. Hans Christoph Seeböhm. The latter is Federal Minister of Transportation and as such a member of Chancellor Adenauer's cabinet. Sudeten Germans are taking an active part in the political life of West Germany and are serving in important posts in the legislative and executive branches on the federal as well as state—Land—level.

While the Sudeten Germans have stood up for the right to return to their ancient homeland, they have expressly renounced any thought of vengeance on the Czech people. They have given solemn notice of their firm stand on these two points. As early as 1949, a number of Sudeten German politicians including Dr. Walter Becher, Dr. Emil Franzel, Hans Schütz, Richard Reitzner, Wenzel Jaksch, Dr. Hermann Goetz, and

Dr. Walter Zawadil had signed in Eichstätt, West Germany, a declaration stating:

The nations behind the Iron Curtain should be aware of the fact that the restoration of their own rights and their freedom is inseparably bound up with the recognition and realization of the right to their homelands of all expellees. In making this publicly known we do not wish to indict, collectively, the Czech and Polish nations. Sudeten Germans do not seek vengeance, but ask for justice. Though the overall recognition of right would require that legal measures be taken against criminal acts, we emphatically do not desire that fear of a collective revenge should impede the deliverance from Communist shackles of these unfortunate nations. We shall use the whole weight of influence with our own ethnic group as well as with other expellees to insure that the struggle for a return to our and their homelands will be part of the overall effort toward a Christian and humane rebirth of Europe.

Then on August 5, 1950, the chosen representatives of all German expellees, including the Sudeten Germans, signed at Stuttgart, West Germany, a solemn declaration which has become known as the Charter of the Expellees, and which is already being recognized as a great human document. I should like to quote from it these passages:

We . . . renounce all thought of revenge and retaliation. This is a solemn and sacred resolution, in memory of the infinite suffering of mankind, particularly during the past decade. . . . To separate a man from his native land by force is to kill his soul. We have suffered and experienced this fate. We feel qualified, therefore, to demand that the right to the native land be recognized and that it be realized as one of the basic human rights, granted to man by the grace of God.

The expellees then publicly declared that they will support every endeavor toward a united Europe in which the peoples may live in freedom from fear and coercion. They called upon all nations and men of good will to join them in this great undertaking. Since then, the German expellees have persistently followed the policy to which their representatives had set hand and seal at Stuttgart in 1950. Rejecting Communist and neutralist temptations as well as appeals to narrow nationalism, they are, today, perhaps the most dedicated adherents of a united Europe.

But the Sudeten Germans did not rest their case with a solemn declaration of faith. They took practical steps toward an agreement, on the basis of mutual respect and a genuine search for a real solution, with their Czech and Slovak neighbors, now also in exile. In 1950, the Sudeten German Council concluded an agreement in London with the Czech National Committee, headed by Army General Lev Prchala. The agreement recognizes the right to self-determination of both nations, Czechs and Sudeten Germans.

Since then, satisfactory meetings were had, and encouraging steps taken toward cooperation, with leading members of the Republican Agrarian Party, largest political party in prewar Czechoslovakia; the Artisan Party; the Czechoslovak In-

dustrialist Union in Exile; the Christian Democratic Movement in Exile; the National Democratic Party; and even with politicians, now in exile, who defected from the so-called National Front; leaders of the Slovak Liberation Committee; the Slovak National Council Abroad; the National Committee for the Liberation of Slovakia; and the Slovak League of America. Slovaks today are resolved that, unlike 1918, they shall not again compromise on the question of national independence. Their independence day is March 14, the day in 1939 when the Slovak Republic was established.

At a meeting held at Herrenchiemsee, West Germany, from May 24 to 26, 1956, Sudeten German members of the Bundestag declared in another statement that they will seek to realize the right to self-determination within the frame of a federated Europe and side by side with the Czech people.

Dr. Walter Becher recently submitted to me a statement from which I quote the following Sudeten German program:

The Sudeten Germans believe that for a future settlement of the problems of a free Central Europe certain basic principles of justice should be accepted as prerequisite. Accordingly they wish to advance the following aims which, in their belief, will guarantee freedom and justice to all nations of former Czechoslovakia: (1) Restoration of the status that existed prior to the Nazi and Communist interventions, including the restitution to Czechs, Slovaks, Hungarians, Carpathian Ruthenians, and Sudeten Germans of property; the return to their homelands of those who have been expelled; restoration of freedom of speech, press, and elections, of an independent judiciary, of private property; in short, full political and economic freedom; (2) the unrestricted exercise for all nations of former Czechoslovakia of the right to self-determination.

It is hoped that aims such as these would tend to unify the nations of former Czechoslovakia and, moreover, inspire other captive peoples and their exiles in the common task of overcoming the forces of communism. Since the Communist doctrine aims to eradicate any thought of property rights, the captive peoples in the Soviet-dominated countries develop a general attitude of apathy and indifference toward their places of work, collectivized farms or state enterprises. The return of the German expellees and the restoration to them of their properties may therefore prove to be less difficult than is sometimes anticipated.

SUGGESTING A REALISTIC APPROACH TOWARD A SOLUTION

In closing, I should like to revert to the tenor of an earlier speech, made in this House on May 16, 1957, on the subject of the expellees from the German provinces east of the Oder-Neisse Rivers. The general line of thought which I had then developed may be equally relevant to the case before us today.

A realistic policy for Central as well as East Central Europe, that is, concerning Czechoslovakia and the Sudeten Germans, as well as concerning Poland, the Germans of East Prussia, and the other German provinces east of the Oder-Neisse Rivers can only be a policy that

is both just and moral. It must be firmly based upon historical truth and the rule of international law. To assume that any government can ever develop a successful policy on the shaky structure of a wrong, and on perpetuating that wrong, is an illusion and, let me emphasize it with all solemnity, a dangerous illusion.

Moreover, a realistic policy for Central and East Central Europe must perforce take into consideration the magnitude of the Communist threat. It cannot but take an uncompromising stand against that threat. No one will deny that communism is an evil. To compromise with evil betrays weakness which is, at the same time, dangerous; for it encourages the forces of evil and allows them to become more firmly entrenched. A moral policy, refusing to compromise with evil, is thus the most realistic policy.

The case for the East Prussians, Pomeranians, Silesians, and others from the German provinces east of the Oder-Neisse line, and the case for the Sudeten Germans from Czechoslovakia show, in some respects, common features; but they also show, in other respects, differences that should be clearly understood and pointed out to the people concerned so that the issues will not be confused by minds that are perhaps not given to legal thinking.

The East Prussians and other Germans from the German provinces east of the Oder-Neisse line have been illegally expelled from an area which, by international agreement, has been certified as part of the Soviet-occupied zone of Germany. Their expulsion from this part of Germany is a criminal act in utter defiance of the rules of international law. Moreover, the purported annexation by the Soviet Union and Communist Poland of part of this Soviet-occupied zone of Germany is a flagrant violation of international law and is, therefore, null and void. So long as the German expellees from east of the Oder-Neisse line, and in fact, all Germans with the German Federal Government speaking on their behalf, do not renounce their inalienable right this area is part of Germany and will continue to be part of Germany, regardless of the jabbering to the contrary of a few muddle-headed individuals. Incidentally, students of linguistics may know that the verb jabber is also a German colloquialism of the East Prussians. It may have been introduced there by the English dissenters who found in East Prussia refuge from religious intolerance.

As to the Sudeten Germans, they also have been expelled from an area to which their ancestors had come, not as aggressors but as sturdy pioneers, eight centuries ago, and which they also have developed by their own skill and industry, by peaceful and patient labor to a high state of civilization. This fact cannot be disputed. Though the area was in pre-Hitler days part of the Czechoslovak Republic, the expulsion from their ancient homes of the Sudeten Germans was, as I have shown, a flagrant violation of the right to self-determination

and, in its execution, a crime under international law. The Sudeten Germans continue, therefore, to have a valid legal title to their homes of which they were illegally deprived.

Mr. Speaker, it is my considered opinion that the German expellees should be encouraged to stand firm upon their right. It is in the best tradition of American foreign policy to denounce the wrong and to uphold the right. Moreover, wavering would be tantamount to further tightening the stranglehold on the captive peoples by the Kremlin and would thus actually support Soviet imperialism.

Just as the Soviets dangled before the dizzy eyes of the Poles the enticing bait of the German provinces east of the Oder-Neisse line, so the Czechs were being dazzled by Kremlin stooges with the rich spoils in the Sudetenland. To the same degree that the Poles accepted the German provinces, and the Czechs accepted the Sudeten properties out of the bloody hands of Stalin, they both permitted themselves to be chained to Moscow. This has been the fateful and deadly but logical result. Both Czechs and Poles who think of keeping these spoils must continue to lean on Soviet

Russian backing and thus render themselves subservient to the Kremlin.

Would the present regimes in Warsaw, and possibly also in Prague, like to assure the Free World of a new trend toward what some people in the West wishfully call independent communism? Very well, then they should unmistakably renounce any claim on an area, respectively, on properties to which they have neither legal nor moral title. Nothing less will and can convince the Free World of their sincerity. Holding on to these spoils can only serve the purposes of the Kremlin and must logically subject them to a never-ending game of extortion. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the executive branch of this Government, in administering our foreign-aid program, keep this fact firmly in mind.

In proposing this realistic approach I am, as I believe all of us are, aware of the fact that this Nation of ours is the hope of the Free World and of the captive peoples longing to be free. We should, therefore, never think of suggesting a solution which would jeopardize the principles of right and justice. Instead, we should insist with firmness and perseverance that a status conforming with international law be restored. This will provide the only realistic basis upon

which to develop good German-Czech and good German-Polish relations and promote a climate conducive to the growth of a united Europe.

Mr. Speaker, today being the birthday anniversary of Immanuel Kant it may be fitting to end my remarks with yet another quotation from his essay, *On Eternal Peace*. Recalling to our mind the very memory of this, one of the world's greatest thinkers should make us feel uncomfortable in knowing that his home is now ravaged by the Communists, and it should make us resolve to insist that this wrong cannot last forever. As stated by Immanuel Kant:

Moral evil has this quality inseparable from its nature that, in carrying out its purposes, it is antagonistic and destructive to itself, especially in relation to such others as are also under its sway; and hence it must give place to the moral principle of goodness, although the progress to this may be slow. * * *

For the moral principle in man is never extinguished, and his reason, pragmatically trained to realize the ideas of right according to this principle, grows without ceasing through its constantly advancing culture, while the guilt of such transgressions also comes more clearly into light. * * *

It may then be said that nature irresistibly wills that right shall at last obtain the supremacy.