

By Mr. MARTIN:

H. R. 9397. A bill for the relief of the William T. Manning Co., Inc., of Fall River, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H. R. 9398. A bill for the relief of Luis H. Trevino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 9399. A bill for the relief of Aemar Donkian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 9400. A bill for the relief of Angelina Materdomini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 9401. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna (Anita) Verber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 9402. A bill for the relief of John Telber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 9403. A bill for the relief of Ester Revidi Peretz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H. R. 9404. A bill for the relief of Kornel Laszlo Huvos, Mrs. Anna Huvos, and son,

Christopher Huvos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. R. 9405. A bill for the relief of Dr. Antonio Valbuena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

334. Mr. MARTIN presented a petition of Miss Glennie Scott and sundry citizens of Durham, N. C., opposing jury-trial amendment to civil-rights legislation; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### St. Stephen, Symbol of Hungarian Freedom

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1957

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, in the days before the Communist occupation, August 20, St. Stephen's Day, was a happy feast day in Hungary. On this occasion the Hungarian people with great pomp and religious ceremony celebrated the feast of the saint who brought them out of the darkness of paganism into the light of Christianity.

Although the Hungarians today will not be celebrating this holy day with jubilation, they nevertheless will observe it with solemn prayer. They still piously and graciously cherish the memory of Saint Stephen. They remember that during his reign, Hungary was a free nation ruled by Christian laws rather than by fear, as it is today.

St. Stephen was a deeply religious monarch. It has been said that all his life he had Christ on his lips, Christ in his heart, and Christ in all he did. When he became King in 1000 A. D. he vowed that the task of his reign would be the extension of Christianity throughout his kingdom. He accomplished this by rooting out idolatry, breaking the power of paganism, and establishing monasteries and churches throughout Hungary.

King Stephen was also a benevolent monarch. He passed good laws and saw to their execution. The King was easily approached; he listened to all his subjects no matter how minor their station in life. A large sum of his royal funds were distributed to the poor. Under his benign leadership Hungary became a great nation. He died in the year 1038. Forty-five years later he was canonized by Pope Benedict IX.

Today, the Communists will prevent any open celebration of this great feast day. Nevertheless, the day is still hallowed to his memory. The Hungarian people still refer to his holy acts, judgment and knowledge. He still is a source of inspiration to them during these troubled days. On this holy day, they will fervently pray to St. Stephen to

ask God for sustenance enabling them to endure the brutality of communism.

To all Hungarians St. Stephen is a symbol of a free Hungary where truth and justice prevailed and where the dignity of man was recognized. Consequently, on this August 20, they will be praying for the return of this freedom. All freedom-loving people will join them in their prayers.

### Congress Should Not Adjourn Until the Pay Increase Bills for Postal and Federal Employees Have Been Finally Acted Upon

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1957

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the drive for adjournment of Congress is on in full force. It is regrettable to realize that in all probability the adjournment at this time will leave the postal pay bill and the classified employee pay bill in the hands of the President without final action by Congress if the President vetoes the bills.

It is generally understood that the President will veto both bills. This in the ordinary course of events will come after Congress has adjourned and gone home. Thus, without Congress in session to pass on the vetoes it leaves them in force and effect, and the legislation is dead.

It is particularly regrettable because both bills were passed by overwhelming majorities in both Houses of Congress in both instances. There were very few votes against either of the bills. It could be truthfully said that both of them were passed almost unanimously.

It is right and just that Federal employees in the postal service and other agencies of government should receive the benefit of these increase pay bills to enable them to meet the high cost of living. Workers in industrial and commercial enterprises have in many instances received by means of negotiation or even by strikes, in some cases, the increase they were entitled to have.

We have also recently seen the wages or salaries of employees in the State, county, or municipal offices increased. This has been necessary. Why, then, should faithful Government employees be denied the increase they are in justice entitled to have?

When the necessary increase pay bills were passed, especially by such large majorities in both the House and Senate, it is not right for Congress now to deny the increases provided by an adjournment and thereby make effective a "pocket veto."

Of course, if the President signs the bills it would not be necessary for Congress to be in session as the bills would then become law, but in case the President does not sign the bills, then in my opinion the Congress should be in session to act on the vetoes, and by the votes of the Members either sustain the veto or pass the bills over the vetoes. It is not fair nor just that Congress should run away from its responsibility in this matter.

I am opposed to adjournment until this important piece of business has been decided, as it should be by the Congress, if and in the event Presidential vetoes should make such necessary.

### Let's Begin the War Against Fire Ants

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1957

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, until one has actually seen what damage the imported Argentine fire ant can do, it is hard to realize the dire necessity for immediate action to eradicate this pest. Earlier this year, I walked across Alabama farmland and saw the havoc that had been wrought by fire ants. The ravage was typical of what is happening in an ever-spreading section of our country.

In March legislation which I strongly supported was enacted, authorizing the Department of Agriculture to enter into a program to eradicate this uninvited and dangerous pest. Up until now, USDA has dragged its feet on this pro-

gram, claiming that it did not have the money to implement this project.

I am extremely happy that both Houses of Congress now have approved funds to initiate an eradication program. The \$2.4 million authorized in the supplemental appropriation budget for combating fire ants is not much, considering the vast job that must be done, but it is a start, a step in the right direction, and I am grateful. Thousands of stricken farmers and cattlemen are also grateful.

Mr. Speaker, even while there was no action taken by the Department of Agriculture to fight fire ants, some States have taken the initiative in finding products to eradicate this pest which is taking an annual toll of millions of dollars.

In Arkansas, Union County has successfully ridden itself of the fire ant. I have a report which shows how successful their program was. Using granular heptachlor at the rate of 2 pounds per acre and applying this chemical by air, ground, and hand equipment, the State's plant board covered 11,153 acres.

Mr. Carter P. Seymour, head of the department of plant pathology and entomology, Arkansas State Plant Board, reports that he has reinspected the treated area and is unable to find any fire-ant activity in mounds located within the treated area.

This, Mr. Speaker, shows that fire ants can be beaten. I submit that they must be beaten. The experiment station at Alabama Polytechnic Institute reports that fire ants are known to be in 40 or more counties in Alabama and are spreading rapidly. If left alone, the pests will multiply to such an extent that the value of land will drop and certain farming operations will become very difficult, if not impossible. In many instances, this has happened. This is typical of what is happening in a number of States.

One of the problems which has been necessary to overcome is very technical, since it involves pesticide residue in milk. The fire ant prefers open, sunny sites in pastures or uncultivated areas, but they also build their mounds in woods and cultivated areas. These mounds average in size from 10 to 12 inches high, but around posts, stumps, or bunches of grass, they sometimes reach 2 feet or more in height.

On pastures, farmers must be extremely careful since many chemicals which have been used have been found to show up in the milk of dairy cows or in the fat of meat animals. At present, one of the products cleared under the Miller pesticide residue amendment to the Federal Food and Drug Act is heptachlor. This chemical, when used as it was in Arkansas, that is, as prescribed, does not show up in milk or meat; and farmers do not have to worry about their products being seized by Food and Drug as being adulterated.

In short, Mr. Speaker, we have a chemical—heptachlor—which can safely and effectively kill fire ants; and we have funds—\$2.4 million—to initiate an eradication program. I see no reason why the Federal Government, through the Department of Agriculture, should not begin immediately full-scale war against fire ants.

**Address by Hon. Basil L. Whitener to Adelphotis Arahoviton Karyae Annual Greek-American Reunion**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. HUGH Q. ALEXANDER**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1957

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 18, 1957, our colleague, Congressman BASIL L. WHITENER, of the 11th District of North Carolina, delivered an excellent address to the Greek-American Society known as Adelphotis Arahoviton Karyae at its annual reunion in Gastonia, N. C.

This assemblage of approximately a thousand Americans of Greek descent is an annual occasion in Piedmont, North Carolina. It brings to that area citizens from all parts of the United States.

The sentiments expressed by Congressman WHITENER as to the worth and value of our citizens of Greek descent conforms to the high regard which I have for those splendid citizens. It is, therefore, a pleasure for me to bring to the attention of our colleagues in the House the splendid address made by our colleague, Mr. WHITENER.

ADDRESS BY HON. BASIL L. WHITENER TO ADELPHOTIS ARAHOVITON KARYAE ANNUAL GREEK-AMERICAN REUNION

I consider it an honor and a great privilege to have the opportunity to meet with you this afternoon. Of course, I always feel at home among my friends of Greek ancestry.

For many years it has been my great pleasure to attend your annual reunion held here at Karyae Park. Each of these events has been most enjoyable and informative. The bringing together of your friends and relatives from every section of the United States is of great value to you in keeping the ties of kinship and friendship more tightly bound.

This convocation of distinguished and splendid citizens also constitutes a great compliment to the people in our section of North Carolina. All of us appreciate your selection of this beautiful property at the foot of Crowders Mountain as a permanent park and recreational facility for the ingathering of your families and friends for a week each year.

And may I say to you that the churches of all faiths, the civic clubs, and the citizens generally appreciate the generosity of your society in making these excellent recreational facilities available to them for public gatherings and events. This is a further evidence of the type of unselfish citizenship which is exercised by you from day to day.

And, I will say to you that I personally am deeply appreciative of the warm friendship which I have had through the years with so many of you. In the professional, political, and social activities in which I have participated you have been most helpful and generous toward me.

Your devotion to the principles upon which our great Nation is founded and your glorious heritage of enlightened civilization stretching back through 3,000 years of history have always been an inspiration to me. Free people everywhere have been fascinated and thrilled by the magnificent history of Greece. One never tires of reading and studying of the land of Aristotle, Socrates, Hippocrates, and Demosthenes.

Greece has given so much beauty to the world. The art galleries in every land reflect her glory. The mind of man from early antiquity has been enriched and disciplined by Greek philosophy, and Spartan courage has thrilled all ages and given hope to mankind in its unceasing struggle for liberty.

No country on earth can boast of a more glorious, constructive, or romantic history than Greece.

Our Nation's Capital is full of Greek temples. I remember the first time I saw the United States Capitol. This beautiful shrine of representative government is supported by countless columns whose very names reflect the glory of ancient Greek cities and islands. The fluted and delicate columns of beautiful Corinth support the wing where I sit as a Member of the House of Representatives. Throughout our magnificent Capitol Building are many stately Ionic and Doric columns of polished marble. To walk among the Government buildings in Washington actually is to take a journey into the distant past and stroll over the slopes of the majestic Acropolis.

The civilized world owes a debt to Greece impossible to repay in material things. Wherever you find men who love freedom and cherish the forms and modes of representative government, you will find friends of Greece. She gave the first representative government to the world, and it was her blood and treasure that was first sacrificed in order that civilization might not perish from the earth.

Had there not been a Greece the world would not have successfully struggled forth from the savage bondage of antiquity. Had there not been a Greece our Christian faith would not have flourished so soon after the crucifixion of the Man of Galilee.

Greece has been a defender of the Christian faith for nearly 2,000 years. Her devotion to the teachings of Christ has been and is reflected in the character of her people. The very name of Christ—Christos—is Greek. The New Testament was written in the Greek language and for many centuries even the Old Testament was preserved in the Greek language.

It was to the Athenians that Paul preached his great sermon that has come down in ringing tones through the ages to comfort mankind.

Greece is the cradle of democracy, the lover of liberty. She is the mother of philosophy and creator of the drama; the patron of medicine, philosophy, mathematics, astronomy, and oratory.

The bonds between the United States and Greece have been strong and enduring for many years. The American people, ever mindful of the price paid for their own liberty, have been quick to support and cultivate the friendship of other nations devoted to democratic principles and representative government. No one can deny that this mutual friendship has been of inestimable value to both nations.

When the heroic Greek struggle for independence broke out in 1821 the United States rallied to the side of the Greeks. The American people sympathized with the Greek patriots in their effort to throw off the tyrannical yoke of foreign despotism. Our great statesmen, Henry Clay and Daniel Webster, lifted their eloquent voices in support of Greece. President Monroe in a message to Congress paid special tribute to the Greek patriots fighting for their liberty. Greek independence became a reality, and the spirit of freedom in the hearts of her people remains alive and vigorous unto this day.

Greece has known great tragedy in her march through history. She has been trampled upon by barbarians of old and frequently threatened by totalitarian foes in modern times. All too well we remember the yoke of Turkish domination that strangled Greece until the early 1920's, and

we shall never forget Greece's heroic defense against the German and Italian invaders in World War II.

Conquered after stiff resistance, the Greek nation continued to harass the invader and keep large numbers of Italian and German troops immobilized.

After the defeat of the Axis powers Greece again faced a grave problem that threatened her free existence. International communism decided to make Greece a testing ground for Marxist ideology. The memory of Greek resistance to that menace is fresh in our minds.

As she had resisted other forms of tyranny over the mind of man during 3,000 years of history the Greek nation successfully threw off the yoke of Communist domination. Today she stands as a stalwart sentinel in the front line of the defense of the free world.

America is proud of Greece and her unsurpassed contribution to civilization. America is proud also of the many thousands of her citizens of Greek ancestry.

Our great Nation is made up of people of many lands. Here they have been assembled, and in our wonderful climate of freedom they have been welded into a common Nation.

Some of our American citizens of foreign birth have found it difficult to become assimilated into American life. They have held on to their ancient customs and allegiances, and as a result they have been accused by some as not being first-class American citizens.

Such has not been the case of the Americans of Greek descent. Wherever Greek immigrants have gone in the United States they have become active and patriotic American citizens. They have bought homes, established businesses, and assumed an active part in the social, educational, and religious life of their communities. They have been proud to call themselves Americans and anxious to fulfill their obligations of citizenship.

When one reads the list of persons of Greek origin who have become leaders in the business and professional life of the Nation, one realizes how completely our people of Greek ancestry have become a part of America.

In every phase of American life we find outstanding examples of your contribution to our society. The story of men like Spyros Skouras, head of the giant 20th Century Film Corp., is in keeping with the best American business tradition. A poor immigrant boy, he rose to be a giant in his industry, and his many philanthropic activities have done much to help his fellow Americans.

In the entertainment world we also have of Greek ancestry the famous Elia Kazan, noted for his production and direction of such films as *On the Waterfront*. Of Greek origin is Dimitri Mitropoulos, conductor of the New York Philharmonic Orchestra. And in the popular music field the Andrew sisters, who are of Greek ancestry, are internationally known.

In the field of government and politics, we find that Americans of Greek ancestry have been honored by election to public office in every part of the country. San Francisco has the able and popular George Christopher as mayor. Just below us in South Carolina, Peter Lempsis is serving as the mayor pro tempore of Charleston. And you and I are all proud of our mutual good friend, Ernest Kerhulas, who has served with such distinction as mayor pro tempore of the lovely resort city of Tryon, N. C., in my own congressional district. Then, too, one of your sons, young George Miller, is making a great contribution to good government in Charlotte, the metropolis of the two Carolinas, as he daily serves as prosecuting attorney in the Charlotte municipal court.

I do not want to overlook another great man whose tireless efforts have contributed immeasurably to the spiritual life of the

United States. I refer, of course, to the great Archbishop Michael, head of the Greek Orthodox Church in North and South America. Archbishop Michael's tireless efforts in behalf of his great church and of Americans of every creed is an example of the highest type of religious leadership.

Yes, the roll of distinguished Americans of Greek origin is a long and honorable one. There are countless other examples of their accomplishments which time limitation will not permit us to discuss.

Your people have a record of patriotic citizenship that is admired and respected by all America. Here in the Carolinas your splendid contributions toward the betterment of your individual communities has endeared you to all of our citizens of whatever national origin, or religious persuasion. You are thought of as proud and honorable Carolinians. I know of no greater tribute that can be paid to any segment of our society.

In conclusion, I would like to say that your community and Nation as a whole is appreciative of your leadership in the area of good citizenship.

Ours is a great freedom-loving country. The blood of many lands and many races flows in our veins. No finer blood is to be found than that of the Hellenic race.

I salute you for your many past accomplishments and envision for you an even greater role in the life of this great Nation of ours as she marches forward to a more glorious future.

### Sportsmen, Dealers Oppose Unwarranted Restrictions on Firearms, Ammunition

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LEROY H. ANDERSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1957

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, we Members in Congress from Montana are deeply concerned about a proposed Internal Revenue Service administrative action to place sharp restrictions on firearms and ammunition. A hearing on this matter has been scheduled by the Revenue Service here in Washington, August 27.

I should like to present the views of our Montana delegation and also the views of our western sportsmen and equipment dealers, which I believe are very well expressed in a letter I have just received from an eminent physician and sportsman, Dr. Alexander C. Johnson, of Great Falls.

The Montana delegation has directed the following letter to Mr. Dwight E. Avis, Director, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division, Internal Revenue Service:

DEAR MR. AVIS: In the opinion of the Montana Congressional delegation, the proposed regulations pertaining to interstate traffic in firearms and ammunition appearing in the May 3, 1957, Federal Register, represent an invasion of the rights and privileges of the sportsmen in our State as well as those throughout the Nation. Furthermore, the procedures that would be established would work a hardship and an inconvenience upon manufacturers and dealers in sporting arms and ammunition.

The idea of firearms registration by owner is not new. In application, however, it is associated with attempts to suppress crime and amounts to no more than a penalty on

the millions of law abiding sportsmen and gun owners in the hopes of frustrating those few individuals who would use firearms for illegal purposes.

It is conjectural whether the authority for the proposed regulations is contained in the Federal Firearms Act. In fact, it appears that the Internal Revenue Service is going beyond the implications of that act with the proposed regulations.

We object to the adoption of the proposed regulations in that they impose unreasonable and unwarranted restrictions on millions of sportsmen and other gun owners, on dealers and the manufacturers and importers of firearms and ammunition.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,  
United States Senator.  
MIKE MANSFIELD,  
United States Senator.  
LEE METCALF,  
Member of Congress.  
LEROY ANDERSON,  
Member of Congress.

A BUREAUCRATIC EDICT

The letter from Dr. Alexander C. Johnson is as follows:

GREAT FALLS, MONT., August 13, 1957.

The Honorable LEROY ANDERSON,  
Representative From Montana,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am taking this opportunity to add my voice to the numerous protests you have undoubtedly already received concerning proposed revisions of the Internal Revenue Service regulations pertaining to the Federal Firearms Act.

Hearings on this are scheduled for 10 a. m., August 27, room 3313, Internal Revenue Building, Washington, D. C. These hearings are in reference to proposals on the part of the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division of the Internal Revenue Service which would impose a multitude of new regulations concerning the identifications of firearms, firearms records by manufacturers, and to add absurdity to the ridiculous even the requirement that complete and detailed records be kept of over the counter ammunition sales. I venture in regard to this latter item alone it would take a 10-story building of bureaucrats (heaven forbid) to keep the files and records alone during an average hunting season in Montana.

A particular item that is particularly dangerous is the proposal that the Internal Revenue Service would have the authority to examine records, etc., of arms and ammunition dealers at any time during business hours. This alone would appear to violate the constitutional provisions concerned with search and seizure.

All of these proposals constitute a usurpation of legislative action since various proposals encompassing the matters under consideration have been many times introduced as bills in State legislatures throughout the country and by and large have been rejected through the education and efforts by the honest law abiding sportsman of the country who use and enjoy firearms for hunting and marksmanship competition. There is no need for the proposals of the Internal Revenue Department and the only excuse that I can conceive for these matters even being considered is the desire of the Internal Revenue Department to enhance its own bureaucratic stature.

The history of all restrictive firearms legislation shows that the proponents of such action fall into two categories: The largest group are merely misguided individuals who feel that registration and control of firearms and ammunition will have beneficial effects from the standpoint of law enforcement. This is manifestly not so since some areas of the most rigid statutes and attempted control such as New York City are among the

highest in crimes of violence involving firearms. The criminal can always get firearms. Restrictive legislation only disarms the honest sportsman. The second and possibly more dangerous group are the subversive elements who are aware of the value of a disarmed American public should there ever be an invasion or a war in which internal sabotage or turmoil would be much more easily carried out by armed subversive groups in the face of a disarmed public. This was the experience in numerous invaded countries during World War II where the invading army simply confiscated registration books and either collected the weapons or executed those who did not have the weapons listed in their name. The recent disclosures of active espionage networks in the United States suggests that this is not an idle supposition or fear.

I urgently commend to you that you exert all efforts to suppress this reprehensible attempt of the Internal Revenue Department to usurp the legislative prerogatives of the Congress by mere bureaucratic edict.

ALEXANDER C. JOHNSON, M. D.,  
Commissioner Great Falls Police Department,  
Life Member National Rifle Association.

## A Report to the Farmers

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1957

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, today I want to make a brief report to the farmers discussing important legislation considered in this session which affects agriculture.

There has been so much discussion over the Federal budget. I feel what we have done in reducing it will be of interest to the farmers.

#### BUDGET REDUCED

Some will claim greater reductions and some may claim less; however, as nearly as I can determine, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, it appears that the Congress, with the help of the President from the latest estimate, has reduced the budget request by about \$3.5 billion, in real cuts that can and will be sustained.

Budget cutting is not new to me, as I have been voting to reduce Federal budgets for the past 15 years. I helped to cut the last Truman budget of \$78 billion several billions, which he said could not be reduced.

Politics should have no consideration in trying to reduce cost of Government. I have made my greatest effort to reduce the present budget request of \$71.8 billion in this session.

As the ranking Republican member of the Independent Offices Subcommittee on Appropriations, I helped to reduce the budget of 18 agencies of Government coming before us by \$537,993,300—the largest reduction of those agencies ever made by this committee.

On another subcommittee on which I served, we reduced that budget by \$272,556,860—making a total reduction in my two subcommittees of \$810½ million. In

addition, I helped reduce every budget that came before us.

There has been so much criticism of what the press terms "The President's Budget." I believe we should admit that those who are largely responsible for the present budget are the Members of Congress who pass the laws, and they generally pass them under pressure from the people.

#### DEMOCRATS CONTROL CONGRESS

In discussing the budget, we must keep in mind that President Eisenhower has had a majority of his own party in the Congress only the first 2 years; that the Democratic Party has controlled Congress by a majority of over 30 in the House, and a majority in the Senate throughout 1955, 1956, 1957.

We must realize that more laws mean more Federal employees, more office space, more equipment, more supplies, more salaries, more pension funds and more benefits, which add up to bigger budgets and higher taxes. In fact, no money can be spent by the President unless it is appropriated or authorized by Congress.

#### SPENDERS WHO BUILT UP BUREAUCRACY NOW SHOUT ECONOMY

Since the budget of \$71.8 billion is about \$2.4 billion more than the \$69.4 billion spent last year to operate the Government, the people became concerned about this sharp increase in the cost of Government. I think the people should have the facts as to where the responsibility lies for the \$2.4 billion increase in Government expense.

Unfortunately, there is a large group in Congress that for years has been liberal in spending the taxpayers' money, which has helped to expand and build up the present bureaucracy and cost of Government—largely resulting in this big budget.

These same spenders are now branding it as "the Eisenhower budget." The people should know that in many instances these Members in the last two Congresses have passed new laws which greatly added to the cost of Government, and passed them over the opposition of the President—which expense is reflected in the \$71.8 billion budget. Yet, they shout about economy in Government.

#### A FEW OF MANY INSTANCES WHERE BUDGET WAS INCREASED ABOVE THE PRESIDENT'S REQUEST

First. Last year Senate Democratic leaders insisted upon increasing the Air Force budget over \$900,000,000. Secretary of Defense Wilson and other officials opposed it. Nevertheless, they increased the budget by that amount.

Second. That same Congress, with a heavy Democratic vote, passed a flood-insurance indemnity bill, which put the Government into the flood-insurance business obligating the Government to insure risks along the rivers and streams that regular insurance agencies would not insure, which could have cost the Government \$5 billion. To get this program started, they asked for \$50 million in this session.

As the ranking Member of a Subcommittee on Appropriations, I, along with others, refused to approve the \$50 million, and we were sustained by a House vote.

The legislation went to the Senate where this amount, \$50 million, was written in, and came back to the House on a conference committee vote. We beat it again, saving \$50 million, and I think we have killed the 10-year program in this legislation, which would ultimately cost \$500 million plus insurance risks that could run to \$5 billion.

Third. Last year, the same Democratic-controlled Congress, by a heavy vote of that body, over the opposition of myself and others, voted to spend \$500 million in 10 years—in giveaway—to help communities build sewage-disposal plants.

I led the fight to help cut out the \$50 million in this budget required to put the program into effect. We were defeated, as the record will show, by a heavy Democrat majority while a majority of Republicans voted against it.

Fourth. The Congress, last year, by amending the Social Security Act increased the Government's part of participation by \$108 million above the President's recommendation.

Fifth. Last year, the Congress added appropriations for more than 50 new reinstated flood-control projects, which involved direct and future expenditures in excess of \$700 million. This figure would have been over \$1 billion had the President not vetoed H. R. 12080, another flood-control bill which saved the taxpayers, by his veto, \$530 million.

I point out these few of many instances where the budget was increased over the President's requests by over \$2 billion.

#### ONE BILLION IN PUBLIC HOUSING PASSED OVER PRESIDENT'S OBJECTION

The following table will show where over \$1 billion should have been saved by the Congress in housing authorizations when legislation was passed in this session:

The President requested \$975 million. The House bill increased it to \$2,475,000,000.

The Senate bill reduced it to \$1,350,000,000.

The House and Senate report of the conferees authorized \$1,990,000,000 which is \$1,015,000,000 more than the President requested.

I made an earnest fight to reduce these expenditures when the bill was before the House. It would have been greatly reduced had it not been for the opposition of the Democratic majority in the House and Senate. Members of this same party over the years in supporting this legislation have wasted billions of the people's tax money.

Fortunately, outside of such instances to which I have referred, I am glad to say we have had the support of many of the Democrats in this session in reducing appropriations.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, June 3, 1957, contains a speech in which I pointed out that millions, yes, billions, have been and are still being given away in grants of tax money collected from all of the people which was taken out of the Treasury under the urban renewal and public housing bill for the purpose of rebuilding the large cities.

I showed that there had been allocated to New York City \$92 million; to Chicago, \$74 million; Philadelphia, \$54 million; and large amounts to many cities throughout the Nation; that there was being allocated in the bill before the House a total of \$1¼ billion in grant money, or gifts, to do a facelifting job, so to speak, improving large cities at the expense of every taxpayer in every Congressional district in the United States. Of course, I voted against the bill.

#### REA INTEREST RATES

On May 14 I spoke against an amendment which would raise REA loan interest rates.

I will quote a couple of paragraphs of my talk:

The REA is organized by farmers at the grassroots, who put in millions of dollars worth of extra time without any cost. They have managed this great organization so well there are only 3 or 4 small cooperatives that are in financial trouble.

May I say further the Treasury has had a cushion for the last 2 or 3 years of about \$40 million in total paid by the cooperatives in advance of the due date which the Government has been able to use.

The REA at 2 percent interest with the low money rates of the past years, and with their advance payments, has made the Government a profit even at the present 2 percent rate. The best financial brains in this country say we cannot increase these rates as provided in this amendment without destroying the financial structure and the services of REA in the future.

We defeated the amendment.

#### REA LOANS

For REA light and power, we approved budget estimate of \$179 million for REA loans, and \$60 million for telephone loans in addition to the \$200 million loan authorization contained in the Second Deficiency Appropriations Act of 1957.

#### OTHER FARM LEGISLATION

I supported the soil-bank legislation, and when the bill came before the House to carry out the mandate of the farmers' vote for increased corn acreage, I supported the legislation.

May I quote a paragraph or two from my remarks on March 13, appearing on page 3593 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

We can give the farmers in the Harrison bill, which has been endorsed by the Farm Bureau Federation of 1,500,000 farmers, and by the Illinois Agricultural Association of my State with 200,000 members, what they voted for. The passage of this bill will make an effective attack to reduce surpluses that have been depressing all phases of agriculture. It, I repeat, will give the farmers either plan they voted for in the corn referendum last December.

This legislation was defeated by the representatives of the cotton farmers and the wheat farmers led by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], vice chairman of that committee—both Democrats.

#### SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

We provided \$100 million in cash payment to the school lunch program, and for the use of farm commodities in the amount of \$185 million—making a total contribution of about \$285 million.

#### PUBLIC LAW 480

We extended Public Law 480 which has been so effective in helping to reduce surpluses and to increase our farm exports to the highest volume in our history without which the economic condition of the farmers would be much worse than they are today.

#### SOIL CONSERVATION

We provided ample appropriations for the small watershed conservation program, and for every phase of soil conservation including \$250 million for the ASC programs.

We increased appropriations for the eradication of brucellosis—great progress is being made against this disease nationwide.

#### H. R. 7244

We defeated House Resolution 7244, a bill to check off a certain amount from the proceeds of sales of livestock. This bill was opposed by the American Farm Bureau and the Illinois Agricultural Association. I spoke against the bill and took an active part in bringing about its defeat.

#### FEDERAL SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

I spoke in opposition to the Federal school construction bill which was also opposed by the Illinois Agricultural Association, and helped to bring about its defeat.

#### FARM PRICES

The drop in farm prices which began in 1948 was stopped in December 1955. Since then, prices have gradually gone up 7 percent. Figures for the first 5 months indicate the income of farmers in Illinois for 1957 will be \$200 million greater than in 1956.

Current cattle prices from \$20 to \$27 as compared with \$17 to \$23 last year; hog prices from \$18 to \$21 as compared to \$15 or \$16 last year help to increase the gross and net farm income.

The regaining of our farm export trade—now the highest in the history of the Nation—is a stimulating factor in holding up farm commodity prices.

I regret the farmers have not received their full share of the unprecedented prosperity during the past 4 years largely due to the tremendous accumulation of surpluses that depressed all farm prices.

I believe that the passage of Public Law 480 and other legislation, and our constant efforts to remove farm surpluses offer a more optimistic future for the farmers.

#### BALANCED BUDGETS, NATIONAL DEBT REDUCED, TAXES CUT

Deficit financing has been stopped. Three budgets will be balanced in succession for the first time in 25 years.

A \$3.8 billion reduction in the public debt was made during fiscal years 1956 and 1957. We will balance the budget again next year, with a substantial surplus to be applied to either a tax reduction, or another payment on the public debt.

These balanced budgets and public-debt reductions came about after a Republican Congress in 1953 voted tax reductions which have saved American taxpayers in 4 years \$29.6 billion. Not one tax reduction by the Federal Govern-

ment has been restored. If taxes are higher, it is the result of higher State and local rates. Cuts of about \$800 million per year were made in Federal excise taxes.

You cannot put a price on freedom. To modernize and build our strongest military power for peace in our history has required billions of dollars which are reflected in this budget. We all appreciate that we have had peace since President Eisenhower ended the Korean war.

Our diplomacy and military force have kept Russia from starting another war. We must keep the pressure on her because with the cooperation of the free nations of the world which contain our airbases surrounding her, she is being forced constantly toward world peace. Nothing is of greater importance to the American people.

### The Jenkins-Keogh Bill

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1957

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I dare say that every Member of the House has received letters with reference to the Jenkins-Keogh bills. Many of you have received dozens of letters, many of you have spoken to me about these bills. I want to say at the outset that many of the intelligent people of the country favor the passage of one of these bills.

Our existing tax structure contains a regrettable discrimination against self-employed taxpayers in that they are denied the tax benefits accorded to employees generally for their retirement. Under existing law a general employee is not taxed on amounts paid by a corporation for the establishment of a retirement fund with respect to the employee. The employee does not become subject to tax until he begins to draw his retirement benefits. A self-employed person does not have a similar opportunity to defer his tax liability on amounts set aside for his retirement. The doctors and the lawyers and thousands of other self-employed are interested.

There are several disadvantages in this discriminatory aspect of our Federal tax structure. The first of these is the fact that this discrimination results in an inequitable apportionment of the total tax burden among our citizens. A second disadvantage is found in the fact that existing law with its onerous schedule of tax rates virtually precludes the self-employed individual from making any realistic provision for his years of retirement. A third disadvantage of the present law treatment of self-employment income is that it prevents the accumulation of investment savings that is vital to the industrial and technological development of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, there is legislation pending before the Congress that would remove the discrimination I have referred

to. I refer to "The Self-Employed Individuals' Retirement Act of 1957", H. R. 9 and H. R. 10, introduced by my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. KEOGH] and myself. In commenting on this legislation, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is appropriate that I first make brief reference to the outstanding work on this matter by my distinguished cosponsor. The gentleman from New York as a member of the House Committee on Ways and Means, has worked conscientiously and effectively in behalf of this legislation. Mr. KEOGH has worked with diligence and with dignity to have this meritorious legislation made a part of our Federal tax structure and I express the unequivocal conviction that in the not too distant future our efforts will meet with success.

Mr. Speaker, simply stated this legislation would allow self-employed individuals to exclude amounts up to 10 percent of their otherwise taxable income in computing their tax liability, provided such amounts are invested in prescribed types of retirement funds, annuities, and insurance contracts. These bills would provide an annual maximum deduction of \$5,000 and a lifetime maximum deduction of \$100,000. Appropriately the bills would allow a somewhat larger annual deduction for individuals who are age 50 or over at the time the legislation becomes effective. The amounts excluded from tax would become subject to tax as they are withdrawn after the taxpayer reaches 65 and retires.

From this brief description of the legislation it is evident self-employed individuals from all walks of life would receive deserved benefit from the enactment of this legislation. Examples of specific economic groups that would be benefited are farmers, self-employed businessmen, physicians, lawyers, and other self-employed individuals.

The principle embodied in the so-called Jenkins-Keogh proposal has been pending before the Congress of the United States for years. I believe it is proper to state that there is general agreement that the principle is sound but objection has been raised to the legislation on the grounds that its enactment would entail a revenue loss. The Treasury has felt obligated to oppose the legislation under both Democrat and Republican administrations. However, with the modest improvement in the fiscal affairs of our Nation that has occurred in recent years I believe that the time is at hand when the Congress can and should take favorable action on the Jenkins-Keogh proposal. It is my hope that this prospect will become reality during the 85th Congress and will be made possible through substantially reduced Federal expenditures and enlargement of the budgetary surplus. It is my hope that across-the-board tax reduction fairly granted to all our taxpayers will be possible and that an important part of such a tax reduction program will include the provisions of the Jenkins-Keogh bills.

It is a matter of simple justice for the 10 million American citizens who are the victims of this discrimination in our present tax structure that this result

should be realized without delay. That is not to say that the enactment of the Jenkins-Keogh bill will remove all the tax discriminations against the self-employed. Existing law would retain special benefits for corporate employees not available to self-employed individuals such as stock options and accident and health benefit programs.

Mr. Speaker, as one of the coauthors of this legislation I have been gratified by the public response that I have received in support of the Jenkins-Keogh bill. This support has been expressed by responsible citizens across the Nation, from my Congressional district and from virtually every Congressional district, from individuals who would personally receive equity under the bill and from individuals who have no economic interest in its enactment but who recognize the merit in its objective.

My distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. KEOGH] and I have worked hard during this 1st session of the 85th Congress to bring about favorable consideration of the bill. The fact that the legislation has not become a part of our Federal tax structure does not imply that our efforts have been to no avail. I believe that a great deal has been accomplished that will be reflected in results in the foreseeable future. This legislative proposal will undoubtedly play an important part in the revenue revision hearings scheduled by the Committee on Ways and Means to begin January 7, 1958. I am confident that when the legislation is presented to the House of Representatives for a vote that it will receive the overwhelming support of the distinguished membership of this great legislative body. If the employees of the country are taken care of in this respect why should not the men who employ them be given some protection?

Mr. Speaker, this legislation represents tax fairness and tax equity. It represents principles that are consistent with our American way of life. It represents in my judgment must legislation for favorable action during the 85th Congress.

### Segregation in the Field of Sports

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. JAMES G. FULTON**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1957

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting the enclosed letter, two articles, and my reply for the consideration of Congress and the American people:

SUN-TELEGRAPH,  
Pittsburgh, Pa., August 28, 1957.  
Representative JAMES G. FULTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

Mr. FULTON: I am enclosing a couple articles I've written on a situation I find annoying. If it annoys you as it does me, you may be able to get the Defense Department to advise the United States Military Academy to withdraw from this football game.

It is my feeling that the United States Military Academy should represent all the people, that the United States Military Academy has no business participating in a segregated sports event.

I concede that the contract for this game was signed 4 years ago, but other northern colleges have canceled contracted games since Louisiana last year passed its distasteful Jim Crow sports law (Negroes and whites cannot compete together or sit together at public events). Unofficially, a boycott exists. The United States Military Academy is about to break that boycott and become the first northern college to go into Louisiana since the law went into effect.

GEORGE J. P. KISEDÄ.

[From the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of Saturday, August 24, 1957]

#### ARMY DEFIES THE BOYCOTT

(By George Kiseda)

The United States Military Academy is going ahead with plans to play a segregated football game with Tulane University in New Orleans November 16. Lt. Gen. Garrison H. Davidson, Superintendent at West Point, told the Sun-Telegraph yesterday that "we made our contract 4 years ago and we're going to honor it."

It will be the first breakthrough in an unofficial boycott that has existed among northern colleges since the Louisiana State Legislature last year passed a law barring interracial sports competition and integrated seating. No northern colleges have sent their football and basketball teams into Louisiana since then.

The University of Pittsburgh was the first to announce its position, withdrawing as a possible candidate for the Sugar Bowl football game. Then the University of Wisconsin canceled a 2-year football contract with Louisiana State University.

Subsequently, Notre Dame, Dayton, and St. Louis asked to be relieved of their contracts to appear in the Sugar Bowl basketball tournament. In some cases there were no Negroes on the college teams involved, but the colleges withdrew on principle and also because they had Negro students and alumni who would not be able to sit with white students and alumni.

There are no Negroes on the Army football team, but there are seven Negroes in the Academy.

According to General Davidson, himself, an old Army football star and coach, the Tulane game was scheduled 4 years ago by Col. Earl Blaik, who is coach and athletic director at West Point. A telephone interview with General Davidson went like this:

"Question. Are you going ahead with plans to play Tulane in New Orleans?"

"Answer. Sure.

"Question. Are you aware of the year-old Louisiana law barring interracial competition and requiring segregated seating?"

"Answer. Yes. We entered this contract 4 years ago, you know.

"Question. Are you aware that no northern college has played down there since the law went into effect, that, in other words, there has been a boycott?"

"Answer. Well, we made our contract 4 years ago and we're going to honor it.

"Question. Some of the northern schools have broken contracts since the law went into effect.

"Answer. Our responsibility is to play the game. Our policies, insofar as the corps of cadets is concerned, are equal opportunity for everybody.

"Question. Suppose 1 of the 7 Negroes in the academy wants to go to the game. What will you do?"

"Answer. Nobody from the corps of cadets is going. It's too far—it's a matter of economy.

"Question. What about Negro alumni? What if they want to go to the game?"

"Answer. I wouldn't guess at a proposition like that. I'd have to wait and see what develops.

"Question. How will you sell your allotment of tickets?"

"Answer. We won't place restrictions on our tickets.

"Question. But Negroes won't be admitted to white sections.

"Answer. I'm not so sure about that. I don't know.

"Question. What is your position on the United States Military Academy participating in segregated sports events?"

"Answer. Our laws are the national laws. We follow a policy of equality of opportunity for everybody in the corps of cadets.

"Question. But what is your policy on the United States Military Academy participating in a segregated sports event such as this?"

"Answer. I don't think I'd want to comment on a hypothetical question that hasn't arisen yet. I just know that we're going through with the game. I think that should answer it.

"Question. Aren't you embarrassed somewhat that the United States Military Academy will be the first northern college to play there since the law went into effect?"

"Answer. Oh, no. Not a bit. We contracted this game with the university and we're going to honor our contract."

[From the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of August 26, 1957]

#### SPEAKING OUT ON SPORTS

(By George Kiseda)

When Louisiana's odious Jim Crow sports law passed in the State legislature last year, there was some speculation that it would hurt New Orleans' Sugar Bowl promotion. But the lowercase democrat who introduced the bill into the legislature assured everybody that no such thing would happen.

"Sugar Bowl teams," said Louisiana State Representative Lawrence Gibbs, "will put first things first when they get an opportunity to play in the annual classic. They get \$120,000 (sic) for appearing in the Sugar Bowl and don't think they overlook the prestige either."

Northern colleges did put first things first but not the way Representative Gibbs expected. Putting principle before principal, Pitt said it wants no part of the Sugar Bowl until Louisiana decides to rejoin the Union. Notre Dame, Dayton, and St. Louis pulled out of the Sugar Bowl basketball tournament, Wisconsin canceled a 2-year football contract with LSU.

Since Gibbs' gibberish became law, no northern colleges have sent their football or basketball teams into Louisiana. Now, though, the boycott is about to be broken in the last place you would expect it to be broken—West Point.

Lt. Gen. Garrison H. Davidson, Superintendent of the United States Military Academy, told the Sun-Telegraph last week that Army will play Tulane in New Orleans November 16 as scheduled.

General Davidson's explanation was that the game was contracted 4 years ago and Army was dutybound to honor its contract. Other colleges have felt differently.

General Davidson was cordial throughout the telephone interview but seemed not to be aware of the significance of the United States Military Academy participating in a segregated sports event.

The United States Military Academy presumably represents all the people. It seems to me that the Academy is under no obligation to honor a contract that was legally conceived but now can be honored only by violating the Constitution.

The last thing I asked General Davidson was, "Aren't you embarrassed that the United

States Military Academy will be the first northern college to play there since the law went into effect?"

"Oh, no," he replied. "Not a bit. We contracted this game with the university and we're going to honor our contract."

I, for one, am embarrassed that General Davidson is not embarrassed.

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 29, 1957.

Mr. GEORGE KISEDA,  
The Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph,  
Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR GEORGE: Received your articles. Certainly admire your courage and think they are wonderful. Am placing them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today and will send you copies. Am also contacting White House immediately protesting football game in New Orleans on November 16, and strongly urging its cancellation. What is use of civil-rights law by Congress if Army disregards civil-rights and cooperates in their repression. Will be glad to follow up on this matter strongly. Count on my full cooperation.

Congressman JIM FULTON.

### Address of Hon. Melvin Price, Democrat, of Illinois, Member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the House Committee on Armed Services, at the Jefferson-Jackson Day Banquet Held by the Scioto County, Ohio, Democratic Central-Executive Committee in Portsmouth, Ohio, May 25, 1957

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JAMES G. POLK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1957

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, some time back, Hon. MELVIN PRICE delivered a very thought-provoking and constructive address at the Jefferson-Jackson Day banquet in Portsmouth, Ohio. His statements and observations are of such importance that I want the Members of the House of Representatives to have the opportunity of reading his message on this occasion.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Democratic Party, it seems to me a good thing for us to be celebrating the Jefferson-Jackson era together. I think the party of Jefferson and Jackson, the party of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, has a very good chance to win the Congress again next year and to regain the White House in 1960.

We must not minimize the difficulties of the 3½ years ahead. As good Americans we must recognize that we live in a world of danger, that Soviet aggression is a factor we cannot ignore, that we must pay the price of security and freedom.

It is still fair to point out that it is we Democrats who have forced the Eisenhower administration to recognize the facts of modern life and to spend the necessary money to be sure that we have enough muscle in our Armed Forces to defend our way of life.

Some remarkable things have happened to the Eisenhower "Great Crusade" in the six months since the President was re-elected

on promises and pledges which most of his own party did not believe in.

We have had the spectacle of a \$72 billion budget which the President's own Secretary of the Treasury violently attacked.

We have had the spectacle of the President saying that the budget could not possibly be cut as much as \$2 billion—and the President himself then sending a letter to Speaker SAM RAYBURN saying that he had discovered, after all, that budget reductions of \$1.8 billion were tolerable.

The Republicans' one authentic so-called egghead, Mr. Arthur Larson, has a habit of calling us Democrats a "divided" party.

What in the world does he think of his own Republican Party?

Larson's personally proposed budget for the United States Information Agency was slashed sharply because he couldn't find any words, despite his brains, to defend it properly. He got precious little support from his own Republicans.

The senior Senator of the Republicans, Senator BRIDGES of New Hampshire, wants Eisenhower's budget cut by \$5 billion.

The GOP official floor leader, Senator KNOWLAND of California, is withdrawing from Congress at the conclusion of his present term because apparently he can't endure Mr. Eisenhower's "modern Republicanism."

It is commonly believed that Senator KNOWLAND, for whose personal integrity every Member of Congress has respect, intends to run next year for the governorship of California. He wants to re-establish a base, apparently, from which to challenge Eisenhower's "modern Republicanism."

Our Republican friends are split so sharply, so fundamentally, that not more than a third or a fourth of the Republican Members of Congress can be counted as Eisenhower people.

We Democrats have our differences. These differences are sometimes earnest and are warmly argued.

But the differences haven't kept us from mapping out and enacting all the legislative and social progress in our democracy for the past quarter of a century.

Let's ignore for a moment the historic contributions of the early New Deal, the depression era, when the country was paralyzed by the excesses and abuses of Wall Street control and the refusal of Herbert Hoover to use Federal power to meet the needs of the people.

Let's talk about recent history.

The first Republican Congress in 18 years—the 80th Congress—passed the Taft-Hartley Act and a few other laws intended to repeal or modify the New Deal.

The country got tired of that very quickly and elected the Democratic 81st Congress that raised the minimum wage from 40 cents to 75 cents an hour—and did something to help the farmers, too.

We got another Republican Congress in 1952—the 83d Congress—and a tax bill was adopted that gave most of the tax relief to corporations and large personal taxpayers.

There wasn't any social reform, though. There was no school-aid bill, no social security change of major importance that plowed new ground.

Under the leadership of Eisenhower—the Eisenhower who called himself, at that moment, a dynamic conservative or a moderate progressive or a middle-of-the-roader—we got, instead, the Dixon-Yates scheme to torpedo the Tennessee Valley Authority and inject politics in the Atomic Energy Commission.

We got farmers sold down the river. We got drought districts denied Federal assistance except in belated and stingy amounts. We got the late Martin P. Durkin resigning, angrily, from the President's Cabinet because he thought he had been sold down the river on Taft-Hartley law changes.

The proposed Hells Canyon high dam on the Snake River in the northwest was sold down the river by Sherman Adams in the White House—and Democrats have been winning Congressional and local elections in the northwest ever since.

The country got tired of the Republicans again.

It takes the country only about 2 years to get tired of Republican control of Congress, no matter how befuddled the voters may be by the legend and fame of a general.

In 1954 the people elected a Democratic Congress again—and once again we got progress.

The Democratic Congress checked the plans of Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson to push farm price supports lower and lower.

The Democratic Congress pushed through a minimum wage bill of \$1 an hour—although Eisenhower's Secretary of Labor, Mr. Mitchell, pretended that anything more than 90 cents might prove terribly inflationary and harmful to the economy.

It was not until this year—a full 18 months after we Democrats insisted on \$1 an hour—that Secretary Mitchell acknowledged that \$1, instead of 90 cents, had not produced unemployment and business bankruptcies and all the other horrid things he worried about in 1955.

The Democratic Congress elected in 1954 pushed through basic Social Security Act changes granting benefits to women workers and widows at age 62 instead of age 65.

It pushed through disability benefits at age 50, giving a disabled worker the right to start collecting insurance for himself and his family at that age instead of forcing the family on charity by a rigid rule that nothing could ever be paid before age 65.

President Eisenhower, the self-proclaimed "modern Republican," wasn't in favor of these changes in 1955 and 1956. He signed the Democratic bills because he didn't dare veto them.

And finally last year, when he was running for reelection, he decided to join us—since he couldn't lick us.

He became "modern." His Republican party was perfectly willing to pretend to be modern in order to capitalize again upon the personal popularity of its general.

But his Republican Party didn't really mean it. Once the President was reelected, and all the coattail riders were taken care of, the Republicans began to do what came naturally.

Senator BRIDGES spoke with contempt of "modern Republicanism." Senator KNOWLAND, Mr. Eisenhower's Senate leader, came out against the school-aid bill. JOE MARTIN, the voice of the Republicans in the House, became absolutely certain that Eisenhower's budget could be cut—and cut sharply.

I say to you solemnly, the President today does not lead his own party.

The President cannot count on his own party for support of the programs he says are significant and even vital.

Do you know why the school-aid bill failed last year? It is because about 75 Republicans first voted to load down the bill with amendments, and then voted against it.

Do you know why a civil-rights bill failed last year? It is because the Republicans in the House delayed the bill until the last week of the session, when there wasn't time for the Senate to act.

Do you know why civil-rights legislation has been delayed this year? It is because Republicans in key committees of the House and Senate refused to attend sessions and vote to expedite a civil-rights bill.

If all the Republicans on the House Rules Committee and Senate Judiciary Committee claiming to favor civil-rights laws actually

attended and voted that way, the fight would already be over.

The only rollcall votes in the House of Representatives on appropriation bills this year came on the bill to finance the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Let us see what the record shows.

The bill was handled on the floor by Representative JOHN FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, a Democrat. FOGARTY's subcommittee had made some careful reductions in the money the two departments asked, but it cut carefully rather than with a meat ax. This didn't satisfy Eisenhower's Republicans.

An amendment was filed to slash an additional \$204,000 from the Labor Department's Office of Solicitor. This is an important job, because the Solicitor makes the investigations necessary for minimum-wage decisions on Government contracts under the Walsh-Healey and Davis-Bacon laws. To protect workers from chiseling contractors on Government work, the Solicitor must have enough money to do his job.

The Secretary of Labor, James P. Mitchell, is a Republican—but Republicans in the House voted 153 to 42 to cut down his Solicitor's operations. Democrats voted 129 to 88 against the reduction.

Another Republican amendment proposed a slash of \$136,000 from the Labor Department bureau protecting the reemployment rights of veterans. Republicans in the House voted 107 to 88 in favor of the slash. Democrats voted 118 to 30 against it.

An amendment was filed to cut \$346,000 from funds for the Bureau of Labor Statistics. This Bureau gathers and publishes statistics of employment, labor disputes, and the cost of living. Its Consumer Price Index is of vital importance because the wages of millions of workers are tied to the index and go up or down as it rises or falls.

Secretary Mitchell, a Republican, begged Congress not to impose the cut, but Republicans in the House voted 134 to 62 in favor of the reduction, while Democrats voted 139 to 83 against it.

All of us in Congress are mindful of the need for economy and careful spending. But when it is a matter of a few hundreds of thousands of dollars for the Department of Labor—the smallest department of Government—it is not true economy to knock out vital functions.

The President can get Democrats to understand this. He can't get his nonmodern Republicans to understand it.

The manner in which the Republicans have dealt with the public power issue is a failure of President Eisenhower personally.

He plays golf with so many private-utility executives that he believes they are telling him the solemn truth when all they are feeding him is private-utility propaganda.

So he calls the Tennessee Valley Authority "creeping socialism" and he sells out the proposed big Federal dam in Hells Canyon. He refuses to support the Gore-Holifield bill to let the Government itself build atomic reactors for industrial electricity—although he is perfectly willing to sign bills giving the private-utility industry subsidies for building reactors based on the people's investment of billions in atomic energy.

He was stopped cold in the Dixon-Yates raid on the TVA, and I predict he will eventually be stopped cold in the raid of a private utility on the Hells Canyon site.

I am even hopeful that if we can get a few more Democrats in Congress next session—or maybe this session—we can at last pass the Gore-Holifield bill for Government-built reactors and begin the process of bringing the blessings of peacetime uses of atomic energy to all our people.

It is a terribly dangerous thing for this country to sit idle, siphoning money to private industry in the atomic field, while both

Great Britain and the Soviet Union surpass us in the development of industrial reactors. Yet, I tell you this is exactly what is happening—and that this kind of program is the only Eisenhower type of program that his own Republicans will support.

Take a look at the Eisenhower record on Federal aid to the schools. He was totally against it in 1953 and 1954. In 1955 he grudgingly came up with a proposal for \$225 million in Federal funds spread across 3 years. Finally—last year—he proposed \$1.225 billion in 5 years. And when his own Republicans killed that program, he blamed the Democrats.

I suggest to you, in all seriousness, that in 20 years of frustrated defeat in the New Deal-Fair Deal era the so-called modern Republican Party became incapable of governing our country.

It became so accustomed to blind opposition that it cannot recover the habit of affirmation, of constructive action.

I do not question the integrity or patriotism of our opposition—as they questioned and slurred ours. There is a genuine possibility, however, that the Republican Party has been made obsolete by history.

Republicans came reluctantly to the acceptance of the necessity of internationalism, the necessity of acting as if we know we live in a world of peril, and that we need allies.

They came reluctantly or never at all to acceptance of the social responsibilities of government. What have they contributed, really, in what is now nearly 25 long years? Nothing in the domestic field except a grudging concession that they will tolerate what they are compelled to tolerate.

They twice elect a President, with a shining name, and the bloom is scarcely off his second election before they hasten to repudiate him.

The President himself belatedly acknowledges that the Democrats were right all along—on the budget, on foreign policy, on domestic policy—and his horrified Republicans in Congress refuse to make the compromises necessary to survival.

There is no head, no tail, no backbone in the Executive leadership of this administration—and the members of the general's own party in Congress are striving with each other for ways to denounce him.

Mr. Eisenhower's press secretary, James C. Hagerty, has been suggesting that lots of other Presidents took more time away from the job than Ike himself.

I may suggest, in turn, that when Roosevelt and Truman were in the White House, nobody ever doubted who was the country's Chief Executive, in or out of Washington.

The history of the past quarter century proves that with a bold and brave President in the White House, a Democratic President who understands and accepts his job, the country can make progress.

It can make progress providing the people give that President enough Democratic Members of the House and Senate to overbalance the inevitable individual defections on some issues.

It isn't enough to give the President a Democratic margin of maybe 20 in the House and of only 2 in the Senate.

Give us 20 more Democrats in the House and half a dozen more Democrats in the Senate—and the country can look forward again to progress that will keep us up with history.

We'll be able to pass the good programs that Eisenhower requests in his last 2 years and to force through some other good programs that he doesn't request.

This is the task of our party in the year and a half leading to the November 1958 Congressional elections. Let's elect some more Democrats—and then in 1960 we will elect a Democratic President to lead the country.

**Commencement Address Delivered by  
Representative Albert Thomas, of  
Texas, at Stephen F. Austin State Col-  
lege, Nacogdoches, Tex., August 22,  
1957**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. HOMER THORNBERRY**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, August 21, 1957*

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a commencement address made by my colleague, ALBERT THOMAS, to the graduates of the Stephen F. Austin State College, Nacogdoches, Tex., August 22, 1957:

**THE IMPORTANCE OF ESTABLISHING OPEN LINES  
OF COMMUNICATION BETWEEN SOCIETY AND  
SCIENCE**

Many of you have been the captured audiences of commencement speakers on other occasions, and some of you are now seated here for your first college commencement address. I sympathize with your entrapped dilemma because I have been caught in it myself. I recall some few years ago when I attended my own commencement exercises, the distinguished speaker's subject was Einstein's Theory of Relativity. He labored for some 30 to 40 minutes making one of the most scholarly speeches I have ever heard. But, when he finished, I had a small idea that he didn't know too much about his subject and, as far as I was concerned, I knew nothing about the subject before or after the speech.

Let me exhort you, as you move away from this happy and tranquil campus into a comparatively unhappy world of tranquilizers, to do all you can to improve the channels of communication between society and science.

I respectfully suggest that one of the big reasons why you have progressed thus far in acquiring knowledge is because it was conveyed to you simply, imaginatively, and clearly, and you did some digging, too. Let you too quickly judge that observation a platitude, I cordially invite you to spend a few hours with me in my office in Washington trying to dig out the meaning of letters, official documents, and statements, from and by responsible officers of Government, and some from my good voters. Nor can I escape from my own charge—maybe you would appreciate more clarity now.

Understanding precedes learning. If we don't understand what is written or said, we don't begin to learn, do we? For example, here in Stephen F. Austin earlier this summer was concluded a 6 weeks' institute in the natural sciences for secondary-school teachers designed to help increase the numbers of scientists through improved science teaching. The significant phrase there is "through improved science teaching." Science teachers today face tremendous tasks in keeping up with the furious pace set by advances in science. In order to help them understand these new advances in science, including nuclear physics, the National Science Foundation undertook a small program 4 years ago to enable high-school teachers, without cost to them, to return to college during the summer and study under scientists trained in the subject matter. The American Association for the Advancement of Science called it "one of the most significant developments in teacher education in the past 20 years."

I know something about the program because, as an independent agency of the United States Government, the National Science Foundation appears before the Appropriations Subcommittee, which I am privileged to head, to defend its budget proposals. I considered it to be one of the finest programs developed by the Foundation because it reaches the heart of the problem—the motivation of young men and women toward careers in science. From an early beginning of two summer institutes in 1953, the project has grown until during this summer there were 96 institutes supported by the Foundation in all parts of the Nation. Naturally, I was delighted that the Stephen F. Austin State College, whose genial, able, and distinguished president, Dr. Paul Boynton, is my friend, was chosen one of the institutions qualified to help carry forward this important job. Your record is excellent.

The job is indeed important. Our principal competitor for the minds and hearts of men is the Soviet Union. Since World War II, the Soviets have so far progressed in training scientists and engineers that one of our foremost physicists has stated that he believes the United States has already been surpassed in the race for numbers of graduates in the sciences and that it is now too late for us to catch up in the near future.

My doubt arises when I consider kinds of graduates. We cherish the freedom we enjoy to pursue careers of our own choosing.

No such freedom exists in Russia where careers are selected for Soviet youth by the State. We may have been surpassed in quantity during the last 5-year period, but I seriously question whether we have been outrun in quality, or total numbers. I recognize that this may be myopic rationalization, but so long as we are able to convey facts clearly to our young people about the danger of Russia outstripping us in scientific manpower, I am confident your students will, in adequate numbers, choose careers which will sustain our economy and our defense. Having chosen careers by their own designation, our youth will be more productive than youth coerced into directed careers.

The problem may be resolved by keeping open our lines of communication. Let us underscore to our youth the opportunities presented to them by our sturdy economy. Let us not build our Nation on fear. Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, expressed the point of view I wish to emphasize. Dr. Killian said, and I quote:

"The last thing we should do is to engage in an academic numbers race with the Russians. We need, instead, to concentrate on those qualitative aims which will keep our science and engineering always ahead. \* \* \* This policy and objective, if followed, will require us to set quality and creativeness at the highest achievable level."

How does one go about setting quality and creativeness at the highest achievable level? Certainly not through coercion. It seems to me, achievement of quality and creativeness is attained through the inspiration which arises from the kind of rapport which exists between the good teacher and his student. Teacher-student harmony is keyed to clear communication which supports understanding which, in turn, fans the flame of inspiration. In this connection, I am convinced, we who have chosen careers in the social sciences—as lawyer, writers, teachers, artists, have much to give to our fellow men who have chosen careers in the natural sciences—engineers, mathematicians, physicists, chemists, others.

The scientist and engineer are frequently not good communicators. Would you agree, then, that we, who are supposed to be good communicators, ought to help them? If science is, as I believe it is, no less a part of our culture than law, literature, and art, each of us is mutually obligated to under-

stand the other. For example, would it not be possible for you, as teachers of English, history, or geography to develop course content, which pointed up the significance of scientific advances as you prepare your curricula? Similarly, is it not possible for the mathematics teacher to underscore the importance of his subject matter as a factor in music—yes, even in history? I think there is vast room for a constructive interchange of knowledges here, and I am persuaded that such interchange is quite necessary in order for society to catch up with science.

I am not quite sure that I have said that just right. Who's catching up with whom? Should society catch up with science, or science with society? In a large sense, both concepts are wrong. Science and society are not mutually exclusive—science is as much a part of society as literature. Science itself is much concerned with this problem. The American Association for the Advancement of Science last winter stated that "in marked contrast to other associations, scientific societies seldom consider the social and economic position of their group." In all fairness, I think the Triple-A S could as well have stated that "in marked contrast with older civilizations, United States society has not seriously enough considered the place of science and teachers within itself or within its economy."

To train more teachers and scientists we must first elevate the teacher to that high position of leadership and prominence in the community that he or she so richly deserves. And we must pay them in accordance with that high position. One good way to expedite the training of teachers and scientists is to put a premium pay on both professions. Premium pay is long overdue and will be helpful.

I have worked very closely over the past years with several scientific organizations of the United States Government in handling their finances. In doing so, I have come to know many men of science. These men do not wear long white coats, nor do they have long beards or long hair. They are long on brains, however, but as they themselves point out, they are short on the know-how of public affairs. Their business is too important, however, for you or me to be indifferent about their status in our society. Society and science have a long road to travel before they meet in complete understanding, and I'm reasonably sure that science has already traveled more than half the distance to set up the meeting. Society must be willing now to travel the rest of the way.

Most of you, I believe, are, or soon will be, teachers. Whether you teach the sciences or the arts, there is not a more worthwhile, more rewarding job in the world. To an extent possibly greater than any other group, you can do more to help young people understand the importance of the role of science in our society. In the final analysis, you teachers must do it. We in Washington can help by directing the resources of Government into constructive uses, but we have no business whatsoever in directing you or your schools.

The world in which you are to venture is as new and strange to my generation as to yours. Perhaps you are better equipped to meet it than we older ones. My generation has been forced to change as the times in which we lived, changed. Your education has been tailored to meet the new conditions. In spite of that apparent advantage, which you may have, your generation faces a terrible dilemma. It is how can you exist with an incompatible system of government such as Russia and her satellites have, without succumbing to it or becoming engaged in an all-out war, from which there could easily be no survival. The answer is to stay ahead of Russia in the arts and sciences. In my judgment, Russia today is behind us

in total numbers and quality of engineers, teachers, and scientists. But if she continues to produce in numbers for the next 10 years what she is doing today; and we do not step up our production, then Russia will be ahead of us. The day she outstrips us in number and quality of professions is the day we become a second-rate power to Russia.

Let me leave this last thought with you. It is your duty, as college graduates, to see to it that Russia never surpasses this country in the annual training of engineers, teachers, and scientists. As you pass through these portals of learning, see to it that others take your place.

I wish Godspeed to each of you as you leave this friendly, pine-scented campus and move into a troubled world which, in my judgment, will be less troubled if you do what you can to keep open channels of communication between society and science.

## Record of Italians in the United States

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 21, 1957

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement I have prepared paying a well deserved tribute to loyal Americans of Italian descent.

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

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR BEALL

I wish today to offer a strong protest against a vicious insult which has been directed against all loyal Americans of Italian descent, against the good citizens of Italy itself, and, in fact, against every person who believes in the principles of truth and fairness.

This insult was delivered recently by one of our retired admirals during testimony on proposed changes in the Immigration and Naturalization Act.

These changes, incidentally, were ones offered by the Eisenhower Administration to wipe out the injustices and hardships which have arisen as a result of certain sections of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

I shall not dignify the unfortunate statement made by the retired admiral by repeating it at this time but, as a cosponsor of immigration legislation which would eliminate the type of petty prejudice which he supported, I should like to make a few comments of my own.

It is only natural that we deplore slurs against our fine Italian-American citizens because each such lie insults a culture which is 3,000 years old and which has contributed immensely to the progress of civilization in every corner of the world.

Some idea of the advancements and glories which have flowed in unceasing torrents from the shores of Italy to other lands and climes can be gained from a visit to the Albert Memorial in Kensington Garden, London. There it will be found that of the 169 statues representing benefactors of our humanity, more than half pay honor to Italians.

In Italy was cradled and nourished the poetry of antiquity, and in Italy was found a group of historians who would preserve and continue the registry of civilization.

When one thinks of literature, the theater, architecture, sculpture, art, navigation, science, music, or religion, it is impossible not to think of the men and women of Italian

blood who were primary contributors to their development.

Ovid, Horace, Michelangelo, Verdi—I could go on and on and on. With each name, though, I think of a dozen more, and with each of the dozen comes the memory of the renowned accomplishments of still another dozen. It is not necessary that I call this honor roll.

Suffice it to say that in age after age Italy has enriched civilization through her thought, talent and work, so that all the world can join with Macaulay, the English historian, in the tribute he offered when he wrote:

"Italian civilization, nearly 3,000 years old, has never faded out.

"The nights which have descended on Italy have been nights of Arctic summer, the dawn always reappearing before the reflection of the preceding sunset has faded from the horizon."

I have commented in a very general way on the contributions which Italy has made to the entire world, and now I should like to discuss some of her gifts to our United States.

Any schoolboy will tell us, of course, that Christopher Columbus discovered America, and that the very name "America" is derived from that of an Italian mapmaker and navigator, Amerigo Vespucci.

In addition, there have been such men as Cabot, who laid the foundation for English settlements in this country; Verrazzano, discoverer of New York Bay, and Malespina, who explored the West. Nor can we forget that Paolo Busti founded Buffalo; Father Cataldo, Spokane; Henry DiTontl, Detroit.

In 1773, Philip Mazzei, a physician of Tuscany, became a companion and adviser to Thomas Jefferson. The most interesting fact about Mazzei, however, is that he was the first writer to present the cause of the colonies to Europe and to encourage support from many Europeans of culture and refinement who had been deprived of liberty in their own homelands.

One of the greatest of the Italian heroes of the Revolution was Col. Francis Vigo. In Vincennes, Vigo County, Ind., an immense boulder placed over his grave by the Francis Vigo Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution bears this inscription:

"Francis Vigo—Patriot—Whose devotion to the cause of American Liberty made possible the capture of Fort Sackett, February 25, 1779. Born in Mondovi, Piedmont, Italy, 1744. Died, Vincennes, Ind., 1836."

Another, Cosmo de Medici, a Florentine captain, organized the first troop of light dragoons in the Revolution and fought with distinction throughout the war, many times under the direct command of Washington.

Now we come to the present day, which also brings us face to face with the pros and cons of the Italian immigration issue.

If immigration from Italy were a detriment to the United States, as some misguided persons have claimed, we would not have in this body such a man as our worthy colleague from Rhode Island, Senator PASTORE.

If immigration from Italy were a detriment to the United States, as some misguided persons have tried in vain to prove, we would not have in the other House of this Congress such men as Representatives ADDONIZIO, ANFUSO, CRETELLA, FASCELL, DEL-LAY, FINO, MORANO, RODINO, and SANTANGELO.

These men are representative of the thousands of Italian-Americans who are serving America faithfully and loyally in the executive, the judicial, and the legislative branches of the government, on the national, state, and local levels.

At this time I would like to pay a very special tribute to the Marylanders in public and semipublic positions who can point with just pride to their Italian background.

Again, it would be impossible to name them all.

I will mention, however, that in Baltimore alone we have such men as Mayor Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., a former Member of the House of Representatives; Judge Anself Sodaro, of the Supreme Bench, who formerly served as State's Attorney; State Senators Joseph A. Bertorelli and Anthony F. DiDomenico; State Delegate Samuel A. Cullotta, who is also a counsel to the Senate Judiciary Committee and Venerable of the Lord Baltimore Lodge of the Order of Sons of Italy in America; Joseph F. DiDomenico, Commissioner of the Maryland Department of Labor and Industry; Mrs. Agnes L. Giordano, Chairman of the State Board of Hairdressers and Beauty Culturists; and Dr. Frank C. Marino, member of numerous State boards and commissions, civic leader, and philanthropist.

I would like to mention hundreds more—for instance, the great Metropolitan Opera diva Rosa Ponselle—but time forbids.

Instead, I will turn once again to the national picture to pay tribute to a very special group of Italian-Americans, and I will then conclude my remarks.

The men to whom I wish to direct my special praise are the ones whose patriotism is reflected, in part, in the rollcalls which echo throughout our land each Memorial Day and whose names are etched in the Defense Department's records of wearers of Purple Hearts and other decorations.

Now I should like to end my statement by quoting the words of Charles E. Russell, the historian. Mr. Russell wrote: "From the southern shore of Europe projects a peninsula of no great size, partially filled with mountains and with stretches of land no better than any other terrain, and yet out of that strip of land has emerged a great flaming dynamic force that has influenced the entire Western World and made that world what it is, in its anatomy, in its essence and function, purely Italian."

## Fantastic Federal Aid to Dallas County Revealed

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1957

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Dallas, Tex., Mr. ALGER, has placed his newsletter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD each week. These statements have told at great length what a statesman is the gentleman from Dallas, and he has been modest enough to admit that he is apparently the only Member of Congress interested in economy in government.

I have nothing against newsletters, and believe they often are useful in informing the people of governmental actions. But the gentleman from Dallas is unusual in that he is one of the few, and perhaps the only, Member of Congress who places his newsletter in the RECORD each week, at a cost of some \$200 per week to the taxpayers, for the purpose of saying he is opposed to spending Government funds.

In Dallas, Mr. Speaker, it is chic in some circles these days to be a Republican, and in those same circles it is popular to condemn Federal grants, loans,

or any form of Federal assistance. The gentleman from Dallas, who apparently represents a very vocal oligarchy in his city, does not deviate from the norm in this respect, with relation to his public utterances and literary efforts.

But the idea that Dallas does not want, and does not accept, Federal funds is so false and misleading I am almost willing to ask the Federal Trade Commission to investigate it as unfair advertising. While the gentleman from Dallas, Mr. ALGER, and the Dallas Chamber of Commerce board of directors flay Federal aid in all forms, that aid pours into Dallas County in great abundance. It is a well-known fact that Dallas has two full-time paid lobbyists in Washington for the purpose of obtaining Federal projects, and furnishes them with an almost unlimited expense account, a suite of rooms at a swank hotel, and a modern office in downtown Washington.

I do not condemn the programs, for the most part, that are made available to the good people of Dallas. But I do think this House should be informed as to the true amount of Federal funds and projects going into this conservative stronghold, Dallas County, Tex., United States of America. For the facts are not consistent with Mr. ALGER's public statements.

Let me say at this point I believe I am privileged to make these remarks for two reasons: first, I am Texas born, and although I hold the State of California near and dear to my heart, I am not anti-Texas nor anti-Dallas. As a matter of fact, I have been in Dallas many times, and I found it to be a beautiful city populated by many very cordial, friendly, fair people. Second, the fact that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] spends tax money in reproducing remarks showing him to be economy minded is a direct invitation for the full facts to be brought out.

I believe at this point I should relate that while the gentleman from Dallas was in his district recently, telling the people how he opposes foreign aid and other spending programs, a huge foreign-aid program was then under House consideration. On August 15, 1957, a foreign-aid bill came up in which the House trimmed more than \$800 million from the measure. Mr. ALGER was not present in this Chamber to vote either way on the measure. I submit that Mr. ALGER can fight programs to which he is opposed much more effectively in Washington, D. C., than he can in Dallas.

I have said that many of the Federal projects in Dallas are good ones. That is true. But it is not true of a proposed Federal building there, which is billed as a \$24 million building, but which will actually cost much more. According to General Services Administration, this huge Federal building is apparently for the sole purpose of consolidating agencies from their present widely scattered locations. The GSA admits the Federal Government already owns one enormous building in Dallas at 1114 Commerce Street, but says it is not quite nice enough for their purpose.

Now it would cost only \$870,000 to renovate the present building in Dallas. But apparently the administration

had rather spend a great deal more money. This proposed new building would be financed at 4 percent interest rates, and during the first 25 years the Government would pay out \$2,361,000 annually. At the end of that time, there would still be an annual custodial and maintenance upkeep cost of approximately \$746,000 annually. The upkeep on the new building would be almost double the present \$428,000 total rent the Federal Government pays annually to provide space for these widely scattered agencies that will be brought into this costly new building. Average cost to the Federal Government for this building will be \$1,553,800 annually for a period of 50 years.

It would appear that if the gentleman from Dallas is really as economy minded as he would have us believe, he would protest the construction of this building. I am sure that, being a member of the Republican Party, which controls the executive branch, he could convince the Government this is an extravagant spending proposal. But I have searched the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in vain for an objection to this construction by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER]. I point out, too, that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] was a member of the committee to which such construction matters are assigned for the necessary legislative action, and that he cannot, therefore, logically plead ignorance of this proposed building. Yet, within his committee he has not opposed this costly proposal. Now, he is either for economy or he is either for construction of this Federal building at great expense to the taxpayers. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] cannot be for both. How will he declare himself on this matter?

Dallas is a prosperous city. It is a city of wealth and great abundance. Yet, according to the Texas Education Agency in a report dated August 1, 1957, Dallas County last year received Federal funds in the amount of \$135,437.93 for its school-lunch program. And the Government gave Dallas County a total of \$613,276 in Federal subsidy for its lunch program since 1952, and an additional \$96,941.08 for its school-milk program. In addition to this, the Federal Government has reserved approximately \$654,000 for Dallas County schools under the Federal-aid-to-impacted-areas program. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] says he is against Federal aid to education. Does it not follow, then, that he wants the benefits herein described withdrawn from the school-children of Dallas? And yet, I have not heard him make such a suggestion.

Dallas County last year received \$249,617 from the Federal Government for medical research, and another \$53,899 for dental research. In fact, the Federal Government has sent almost \$847,000 into Dallas County for this research during the last 10 years, and put up \$1,500,000 in Federal funds to help construct a fine hospital completed there in 1955. It would appear that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] and his conservative physician friends would have objected to the Federal Government's helping the sick folks of Dallas.

According to Charles R. Grant, budget officer of the Department of Agriculture, Dallas County, during fiscal years 1955 through 1957, received \$916,000 in Federal money from the Agriculture Department. I believe the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] has been in Congress during that period, and, although he has said he is opposed to farm subsidies, the records do not show that he has protested 1 penny of the money sent into Dallas County.

During the year ending June 25, 1957, the Small Business Administration granted 52 loans in Dallas totaling \$1,849,913 of Federal money, and additional \$69,420 in disaster loans. No protests are filed.

Mr. ALGER hates Federal contributions, social security, and what he calls Government handouts if we can believe his newsletters. Then how does he feel about the people of Dallas County who receive \$1,641,281 per month—or almost \$20 million per year—in connection with the old-age and survivor's insurance program? Some 31,582 Dallas residents receive such checks every month. Does the gentleman from Dallas wish these checks to be discontinued? If he does, why does he not say so? And if he does not, then why does he insist upon verbally flaying that program that assists so many of his constituents?

According to the Veterans' Administration, for the year ending June 25, 1957, some 3,523 Dallas residents obtained GI home loans totaling more than \$41 million, with a Government guaranty of \$22,945,706. Since the end of World War II, veterans in Dallas County have received loans on 45,575 GI homes for a total of almost \$350 million, with a Federal guaranty of more than \$194 million. Would Mr. ALGER have these more than 45,000 Dallas families move out of their homes because a Government program is involved? No telling how many of these veterans and many others received \$75 monthly Government checks for some time while attending Southern Methodist University in Dallas under veterans' educational program. Would the gentleman from Dallas have these veterans surrender their diplomas from SMU because they are trained by Federal assistance?

I do not have the figures, but I am certain that much money from the Federal Government goes to thousands of Dallas County veterans in connection with pensions and disability compensation. Mr. ALGER says he is opposed to the veterans' program. Does he mean the Dallas County veterans should turn back their checks to the Government?

Another example of these terrible Federal funds is found in connection with Love Field, a commercial airport located in a heavily populated section of Dallas. Then entire project at Love Field was created and constructed outright by the Federal Government at a cost of \$3,412,000, and all told the Government has given \$5,832,109 to Love Field construction, expansion and renovation. And even this does not account for all Federal funds going into Dallas County for the use of airports there. The total figure for all Dallas County airports is \$7,-

465,866. Why does not Mr. ALGER protest this encroachment by the Federal Government upon Dallas' commercial air industry?

Mr. ALGER recently attacked a flood-control project passed in the district of one of his Texas colleagues, shortly after the area for which it had been passed had suffered a damaging flood. He issued press releases and wrote in his newsletter that he could not in good faith vote to spend Federal money on the project. Where was Mr. ALGER's good faith when the Government was considering a project known as the Dallas floodway? I did not see him rise to object to the fact that the Federal Government is putting up \$8,996,000 in Federal funds for this project, while the Dallas local government will put up only \$1,400,000.

In addition to the federally financed Dallas floodway, Dallas directly gets the benefit of three other dams, located in adjoining counties, costing a total of 36,123,000 Federal dollars for construction, maintenance, studies, and general operation. The dams were constructed for the primary purpose of helping Dallas citizens. Would Mr. ALGER say to the Government: "Remove these dams, they are not needed nor wanted by the people I represent, because they were constructed by tax funds"?

And how about those socialistic military payrolls? In Hensley Field, Dallas, the Federal Government last year paid out \$1,462,000 to civilian employees, and another \$1,526,000 to military personnel stationed there. Grand Prairie Naval Air Station in Dallas County got \$581,415 for the civilian payroll and another \$2,104,000 for the military payroll, during the past year. Should the merchants of Dallas reject these "evil" Federal dollars, I ask the gentleman from Dallas?

Even those payrolls pale when compared with the Federal contracts given Temco Aircraft Corp. and Chance Vought Aircraft in Dallas County. According to the Department of Defense, the Government contracts at Temco total \$33 million, and at Chance Vought the total Government contracts amount to \$463 million. Yes, these plants are free enterprise in name, but who will dispute the fact that money from the Federal Government provides employment for thousands of Dallas citizens and brings food to their tables? Should these plants be moved from Dallas County, Mr. ALGER, or should the Government cancel its contracts because you say you are opposed to Government in business?

There are many Government employees in Dallas, and they receive a great deal of Federal money with which they pay their local taxes, buy their cars, their food, their clothes, their entertainment, and other items from Dallas businessmen. Mr. ALGER apparently has not protested any of the fine buildings and projects constructed by Federal money in Dallas, nor the excellent equipment placed in these buildings by Federal funds. But how has Mr. ALGER reacted to the workers who are employed in these buildings and on these projects? Why, he has voted against pay raises in

Congress that would give these many Dallas employees added compensation, and allow their purchasing power in Dallas to increase for the benefit of the local economy.

Dallas Post employees number 2,505, and in a single year, fiscal 1957, their payroll amounted to \$11,431,000. Would Mr. ALGER have mail service in Dallas discontinued because it costs some Federal funds to provide service? Would he toss the faithful Dallas postal workers out of jobs? Or, does he feel he is being big hearted because he has not asked for their jobs, but "only" opposed their recent pay raise, designed to bring up their standard of living?

There are numerous other Federal offices of regional and district importance in Dallas, including the District Internal Revenue Office, the Immigration Service, Customs, General Services Administration, Regional Post Office Department, Small Business Administration, Department of Labor, and so on. I don't have the figures for all these agencies, but let us consider one as an example.

Let's look, for instance, at the Regional Veteran's Administration office in Dallas. The Government constructed a hospital there at an original cost of \$11,397,652. The Government has since invested more than \$2 million in additional equipment, and the payroll at the Dallas VA office is almost \$5 million—to be exact, \$4,899,804 per year.

How about the Commodity Credit Corporation? Well, one man, the epitome of conservatism," received more than \$8 million from this agency for storing Government wheat, then became outraged when the Government insisted he make good on most of the wheat because he allowed it to spoil and ruin from faulty storage. And that is only one case of Federal money being released in Dallas through this agency.

Dallas County has some excellent roads and highways. Some 109.9 miles of this was constructed by Federal funds totaling \$19,128,800 through fiscal 1957, from fiscal 1953. I will bet Mr. ALGER drives on those roads, and I know many of his constituents do. Shall we rip the roads up, I ask the gentleman from Dallas, who loves economy and hates Federal money?

Why, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe there is a field in which Dallas citizens have failed to receive some Federal aid. At Seagoville, Tex., in Dallas County, the Government spent a great deal of money constructing a Federal Correctional Institute. During fiscal 1957, the Federal Government spent \$752,919 operating this correctional institute. Would Mr. ALGER say open the gates, turn the inmates loose on Dallas County's law-abiding citizens and never mind the danger, because, after all, we'll save the Government some money?

Now the figures I have recited to you certainly do not account for all Federal money in Dallas County. Think of the untold dollars that could be added to this total if one but had the time to figure them out. This does not include construction and upkeep of many regional and district offices, salaries for each of these agencies' employees, and many, many other items. The best I can fig-

ure, the total amount of Government expenditures revealed here today, counting grants, loans, gifts, subsidies, guarantees, and other programs, is \$885,167,334, and that is only a drop in the bucket, as I only hit the high spots.

So let the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER], and the Dallas Chamber of Commerce directors, and others of this high oligarchy which prides itself in "controlling" Dallas County, cease from their verbal spoutings against Federal aid, while they enjoy the fruits of Federal aid in so many, many ways. Let us dispel the idea that Dallas County is so conservative it stands alone without any Federal assistance. Let the Dallas Morning News, which gleefully chronicles the statements of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER], to all and sundry, reflect for a moment on the good the Federal Government has done for Dallas County. Let this newspaper and the chamber board of directors and its Congressman realize, for once, that the Federal Government is here to help, not hurt, our people.

I am sure the great majority of the thinking people of Dallas already know these facts. I am sure the average Dallas resident loves his city, loves his State, loves his Nation, and the Government that works for the benefit of the people. Most thinking Dallas people, I am sure, are fully aware of the bountiful blessings they enjoy, and will no longer be fooled by the utterances of the gentleman from Dallas [Mr. ALGER], who wants to pretend Dallas gets no Federal aid, who wants to speak against Federal aid, but who knows within his heart that the good people of Dallas benefit from almost every Federal program known to the mind of man.

Either the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] is opposed to these programs, and is, therefore, against the benefits his city and its people get, or he is not opposed to them. And if it is the latter, Mr. Speaker, then he should change his speeches to fit his views accordingly.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, this has set the RECORD straight with relation to "conservative Dallas and its Federal-aid-hating leaders."

#### Appearance of Representative Charles O. Porter on Meet the Press

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

#### HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 21, 1957

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on August 4, 1957, a most unusual honor came to Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, of the Fourth Oregon District. It is comparatively rare for a freshman Member of the House of Representatives to be interviewed on the National Broadcasting Co. network program, Meet the Press. On that occasion, Representative PORTER was interrogated by four veteran interviewers and newspapermen. They were Luke P. Carroll, New York Herald

Tribune; Marquis Childs, St. Louis Post-Dispatch; Richard Wilson, Cowles publications, and Lawrence E. Spivak, regular panel member.

Incidentally, one of these outstanding journalists has told me that he thought Representative PORTER was one of the most adroit and effective public figures yet to appear on Meet the Press.

Representative PORTER has taken a particular interest in the entire controversy surrounding the Government of the Dominican Republic because Gerald Murphy has tragically disappeared in that country. Mr. Murphy is an outstanding airplane pilot, 23 years old, and a resident of Eugene, Oreg., where his parents live. Eugene is located within the Fourth Oregon Congressional District.

So that Members of the Senate may learn of the questions put to Representative PORTER and his answers, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Meet the Press program of Sunday, August 4, 1957, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

MEET THE PRESS—AMERICA'S PRESS CONFERENCE OF THE AIR

(Produced by Lawrence E. Spivak; guest, Representative Charles O. Porter, Democrat, of Oregon; panel, Luke P. Carroll (New York Herald Tribune), Marquis Childs (St. Louis Post-Dispatch), Richard Wilson (Cowles publications), Lawrence E. Spivak (regular panel member); moderator, Frank Blair)

ANNOUNCER. Now, Meet the Press, the prizewinning program produced by Lawrence E. Spivak. Ready for this spontaneous, unrehearsed conference are four of America's top reporters. Please remember, their questions do not necessarily reflect their point of view; it is their way of getting a story for you. While Ned Brooks is on vacation, here is our guest moderator of Meet the Press, Mr. Frank Blair.

Mr. BLAIR. Good evening and welcome once again to Meet the Press. Our guest this evening is Congressman CHARLES O. PORTER, Democrat from Oregon. Most freshman Congressmen are seen and not heard, but Mr. PORTER in his first 7 months in office has been involved in a sensational cloak and dagger tale of international intrigue. His speeches in Congress on the subject have been widely reported. He has been the hero of Calypso ballads in Latin American countries. He has been attacked as a self-appointed international revolutionary by fellow Congressmen, and he has been advised by police authorities to carry a gun for protection in our Nation's Capital.

The facts in the case are these: Dr. Jesus de Galindez, a Columbia University teacher and a critic of Generalissimo Trujillo, the dictator of the Dominican Republic, disappeared from New York City without trace on March 12, 1956. Gerald Murphy, a young airplane pilot from Congressman PORTER's home town in Oregon, told friends he had flown an invalid believed to be De Galindez from the United States to the Dominican Republic on that date. Then on December 4, 1956, Gerald Murphy himself disappeared in the Dominican Republic. Congressman PORTER insisted there is a direct link between the three events and persistently demanded an investigation. Congressman PORTER's one-man crusade, and an aroused public opinion, forced State Department action, and as a result the Dominican Republic has taken an extraordinary step in international affairs.

It hired an American public relations man, Sidney Baron, who hired the American lawyer, Morris Ernst, to investigate the Murphy-Galindez mystery. This investigation is soon to begin. And now seated at the press table, ready to interview Congressman PORTER, are, Marquis Childs of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Richard Wilson of Cowles Publications, Luke P. Carroll of the New York Herald Tribune, and Lawrence E. Spivak, our regular member of the Meet the Press panel. Now Congressman PORTER, if you are ready, we will start the questioning with Mr. Spivak.

Mr. SPIVAK. Congressman PORTER, in Coronet magazine recently you were quoted as saying this: "The shocking fact is that a highly paid organization of killers is at large in our country, operating chiefly in New York City and Miami, whose job it is to assassinate or intimidate the enemies of Trujillo in the United States. They don't draw the line at expatriate Dominicans. They will murder Americans, too." That is a serious charge against a man who has long been considered a friend of this country, Generalissimo Trujillo. You are a lawyer; have you evidence that will stand up in court to prove these sweeping statements?

Representative PORTER. Yes; I have such evidence. Of course, this charge didn't originate with me, and I wouldn't say that Generalissimo Trujillo has long been regarded as a friend of the United States by many people who have facts similar to this. We can cite all sorts of cases; we can start with people like Bencomse and Requena. We can name cases that are very familiar in New York. But we can come down to date, if you want evidence of this network of terror. You can recall a radio show that Ed Murrow had not long ago and how 50 of the 130 people he talked to didn't want to say anything or have their names used. In answer to your question, yes, I do have.

Mr. SPIVAK. You say that, as a lawyer, you have evidence to make out a case on which a jury would convict the people you mention.

Representative PORTER. The crime of murder in the Murphy case; yes. I suppose it is no crime to have a network of terror, specifically, although it is something that we don't want to have here.

Mr. SPIVAK. Are you prepared to furnish this evidence to Morris Ernst, who is now carrying on the investigation of the charges?

Representative PORTER. No; I am not, and that represents a change in my point of view. I have given all this evidence as I have gotten it to the FBI, because they are the ones conducting the investigation. I told Mr. Ernst just last week when he called me that I was going to give him full access to my files. I have thought the matter over, and even before I received telephone calls from people who said, "Don't show him letters I wrote to you because if they get back to Trujillo—" I decided I would not make this material available to Mr. Ernst. He, in effect, is working for Trujillo, and I would be turning over information to him which would mean trouble for these people who are helping our Government to solve the case.

Mr. SPIVAK. You say you have given this evidence to the FBI?

Representative PORTER. Yes; I have.

Mr. SPIVAK. I take it you have great confidence in the FBI as an organization?

Representative PORTER. I have great confidence.

Mr. SPIVAK. Do they know what you know—that there is a network of spies here—and are they letting these people get away with murder?

Representative PORTER. No; I wouldn't say that; I would say the FBI is working hard on this case. I am not one of those who thinks the FBI is infallible. I think they are fallible like the rest of us.

Mr. CARROLL. To go back to Mr. Ernst for a moment, Mr. Porter, do you think it is impossible for him to make an objective study of this crime?

Representative PORTER. I don't know Mr. Ernst. I know him by reputation. I know people who like him and respect him. The circumstances, I think, just make it impossible for him to come up with a conclusion that the public will accept, because he is paid by the man who is charged with the murder.

Mr. SPIVAK. But he has said that if he is handicapped in any way he will get out of the investigation.

Representative PORTER. Then, I think he should get out now, because I think he is handicapped by the way he has gotten into the investigation.

Mr. SPIVAK. It is impossible for some of our authorities to question some of the people in the Dominican Republic who may or may not be involved—the former consul general in New York. Why would you not allow Mr. Ernst to question him and then to turn over his material to the proper authorities? Wouldn't you be one step ahead that way?

Representative PORTER. I am not saying there are not advantages in it, but I think the disadvantages outweigh the advantages because it will make people think because a man like Ernst is in this, those who do know him, that we are going to come up with something that we can rely on. It won't be anything that will be generally acceptable because it can't be. But Espallat, the man you are talking about, could come up here and be questioned as we have asked, twice, officially, of the Dominican Government. They want to cooperate. If they want to clear the record, let them send General Espallat up here. Why have their client, or their attorney, go down to the Dominican Republic to question him there? To me, that doesn't seem in accordance with the usual processes of investigation.

Mr. CHILDS. You and others have repeatedly made charges in the Galindez and Murphy cases, but there has never been anything more than circumstantial evidence in these cases, isn't that correct?

Representative PORTER. Many people, Mr. Childs, go to prison, to death, on what is called circumstantial evidence. Actually there is also real evidence—the forged note.

Mr. CHILDS. That is not proof of murder in itself.

Representative PORTER. But to show that someone who is accused of murder would make up a purposeful lie, as in this case the Dominicans did when they presented us an explanation of Jerry Murphy's death. Circumstantial evidence and real evidence—those are the two classes of evidence, if you want to make the legal distinction, but circumstantial evidence when it is powerful, when it convinces a lot of juries, every day—

Mr. CHILDS. But you, as a lawyer, would hesitate to send a man to death on circumstantial evidence?

Representative PORTER. It is done all the time. I hesitate to send any man to his death, but—

Mr. CHILDS. Let me ask you this further question. The murderer or murderers are obviously in the Dominican Republic, won't you say?

Representative PORTER. I would say the murderer or murderers, the actual ones are dead, but they were in the Dominican Republic.

Mr. CHILDS. Or those who ordered the murder?

Representative PORTER. Yes.

Mr. CHILDS. Then, do you see any point in this grand jury investigation that is now going on? Do you think this is a complete dead end, Congressman?

Representative PORTER. No, we can't reach Trujillo himself, because of international

law. He is the man, I believe, who ordered the murders. Getting his minions like John Frank, who has been indicted for being an agent and having a part in this—and I am told by high State Department officials that much of the evidence which has to do with connecting the Dominican Government will come out in the course of the trial of John Frank, and, I assume, any other trials that result from the present grand jury's indictments.

Mr. CHILDS. You think the administration moved quickly enough and vigorously enough in this case?

Representative PORTER. No, indeed.

Mr. CHILDS. Do you think anything more than the indictment of an incidental person such as Mr. Frank will come out of this grand jury investigation?

Representative PORTER. After they began to move they got Mr. Frank, but not in the very first, last December and January when they wanted to slough this thing off, and when Trujillo had every reason to think they would slough it off because he had always gotten such fine treatment by our Government, many of whose personnel treat him as though he is respectable when he is not.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Porter, some of your critics speak of the anti-Trujillo script writers as being responsible for building up what they say is this fanciful tale of kidnaping and murder. Your insertions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on this subject are quite comprehensive and even journalistic in tone. Did you write all of those, or did you get any help in writing them?

Representative PORTER. I had help from the Library of Congress experts in this matter, but every word that went in there could have been based on fact, much of it was based on facts by people who know more about historical matters and current matters than I do, but they are my words, and nobody writes my script.

Mr. WILSON. You got no help from anybody except the Legislative Reference people?

Representative PORTER. That is correct.

Mr. WILSON. You state that you have evidence that a crime was committed here. What evidence do you have that either de Galindez or Murphy is dead?

Representative PORTER. This is the old problem of the corpus delicti which many people think mean the dead body, but, of course, it is the body of the wrong in crime. Murphy disappeared in December, and he is gone. De Galindez disappeared. We have a great deal of circumstantial but very strong and legally acceptable evidence to show that they were murdered because they crossed Mr. Trujillo.

Mr. WILSON. What evidence, sir?

Representative PORTER. Starting at the first we know that de Galindez worked for Trujillo for some time. He went there and was there during the war. He learned about Trujillo's methods, he went to Columbia to write his thesis about Trujillo, a thesis which was very detailed with regard to Trujillo's wrongs and the kind of government he had. Trujillo didn't want that published. We have evidence that he especially didn't want it published because it showed how his own bloodline was not exactly pure, in his own terms. It showed things which he didn't like, at all. Shortly, after it was finished, before it was published, he disappeared. After there had been threats, which had been reported to the FBI, from people we know were working for Trujillo. The circumstances of his disappearance pointed a finger at Trujillo. Of course, there was this blind alley. The evidence is very complete. I couldn't go into all of it. There is a good deal of it.

Mr. WILSON. You haven't cited any evidence that would impress me, as a curbstone lawyer, but let me pass that. The Dominican Ambassador de Moya asserts that the answer to de Galindez' death—he was a Span-

ish Basque, as we all know—he says, "The answer is to be found in Manhattan's Spanish-speaking colony, and I have a feeling that the final solution is not far distant." What is your reaction?

Representative PORTER. Like so many of Ambassador de Moya's statements, it isn't supported. As a matter of fact, one of your panel members knows that de Moya is a liar, because he lied to him and was found out. The Ambassador made statements like that in San Francisco about this Murphy-de Galindez operation being a Communist plot. Going back to your question about evidence, our State Department, based on FBI findings, has already said there is a connection between Murphy and de Galindez.

Mr. WILSON. I want to ask you about this note which was found in de Galindez' apartment. Much has been made of the note as being a substantial piece of evidence. In this note it was stated that his kidnapers—he apparently assumed he might be kidnaped—should be looked for in the Dominican Republic. Is it true that this note was not found until the third search of the de Galindez apartment, although when it was found it was lying in plain sight on top of a desk and that two previous searches had failed to disclose it?

Representative PORTER. I have heard those allegations. I do not regard the note as the most important item of evidence in hooking de Galindez to the Dominican Republic. I do not know whether it is true.

Mr. SPIVAK. You yourself and others have said that Trujillo knows how to get rid of a man in this country. Why would he kidnap him and take him over there to get rid of him when you can buy somebody in this country to "bump a man off" for a good deal less?

Representative PORTER. I think there are two answers to that. One is that he wanted to stop publication of the book, which he would do, if he just disappeared. If he dies, it goes to his heirs. The other explanation, which is probably more credible, is that in this book he had written, "The Era of Trujillo," he had criticized the Generalissimo, said he had part Negro blood, pointed out the illegitimacy both above him, and below him, something about his children being born at embarrassing times and by two different marriages. That sort of thing, we are informed, made the Generalissimo very angry, and he said he was going to have de Galindez eat this article; he wanted personal revenge.

Mr. SPIVAK. But you yourself said in that Coronet article, "Only one thing could successfully silence the work. De Galindez must disappear." He hasn't silenced the work. Some of these things appeared in Mexico, they appeared in Chile, and chapters have appeared already here. He hasn't been successful, at all, has he?

Representative PORTER. He hasn't always accomplished what he wanted to accomplish.

Mr. SPIVAK. Congressman Reece recently charged you appear to have used your office "for the purpose of advocating the violent overthrow of the Dominican Government." Would you like to see that Government overthrown by revolution?

Representative PORTER. I would.

Mr. SPIVAK. Do you think such overthrow would be in the interest of this country in view of what is happening in all of Latin America?

Representative PORTER. I favor people any place, whether in Hungary or Poland or any other country where there is a dictator, overthrowing that dictator. I would not take any personal part in it, but I sympathize with people who want to overthrow dictators.

Mr. SPIVAK. And you would take chaos at this time in that country rather than a strong dictator who has been a friend of ours?

Representative PORTER. Chaos, Mr. Spivak, does not come from an emerging democracy; it comes from the death pains of a dictatorship. I would say the chaos, at least, is leading to something which means freedom and justice, and the dictatorship is not.

Mr. SPIVAK. What do you want to get out of all this thing? Do you want to send Marines over there, to bring Trujillo back here and try him?

Representative PORTER. No; some of my critics have said that that is what I have in mind, but I have never advocated that. We know that that wouldn't work. All that I want our country to do is to differentiate between the dictators and the democracies and frame our policies accordingly. If we just publicly said which are the dictators and which are the democracies, we would be a big step ahead.

Mr. SPIVAK. Don't you think our President and Secretary of State have said that? You are not the only man who said that.

Representative PORTER. A high State Department official told me the other day that the reason President Eisenhower had never said "Bravo, Colombia" after Colombia came out on May 10 from 8 years of dictatorship—the President said nothing because he thought he would make Venezuela which is a dictatorship, of course, mad.

Mr. SPIVAK. At one point you called for an investigation by the Organization of American States. You felt that was the only way to get anywhere with this. But you also said "Again and again Latin Americans tell me they have no faith in the OAS, because it is controlled by the dictators with the tacit approval of the United States." Why would you want an organization which you yourself have condemned to do the investigating?

Representative PORTER. I have been told by some responsible Latin Americans that the reason they believe that is because the United States has been treating these dictatorships as though they were respectable. If we change our attitude, the OAS would change its attitude and could be effective in promoting inter-American relations.

Mr. CARROLL. To go back to the former Dominican Republic Consul General in New York, General Espallat, you have suggested that he come to the United States and subject himself to our juridical system. Would you apply this in reverse, if a representative of the United States was involved in some questionable matter, or if the Government wanted to investigate to make inquiry of a representative of the United States and if that government was a backward, primitive, even Communist country, would you say "Yes, our representative should be turned over to that country?"

Representative PORTER. I would say, yes, if the circumstances were exactly the same as in the case of Mr. Espallat.

Mr. CARROLL. Who would determine those circumstances?

Representative PORTER. The circumstances in this case are very plain.

Mr. CARROLL. They are plain to you.

Representative PORTER. They are plain to everybody in New York, or everybody who has followed this case. He said time and again, "I want to cooperate to the fullest extent. My country is innocent; we are much wronged." And then what happened? Two days after the State Department sent a note to his Government saying, "We want Espallat available, amenable to the usual processes of investigation and trial," he packed up on the fourth and went back to the Dominican Republic and refuses to come out. In other words, he turned tail and ran.

Mr. CARROLL. Wouldn't this be a precedent in diplomatic relations? Has it ever been done before?

Representative PORTER. We had no way to demand it. We have no way to require it. I don't know whether it has or not.

Mr. CARROLL. I think not. Let me ask you one question about Generalissimo Trujillo's holdings in the United States: You have asked that these be investigated. Have you any evidence at all to indicate what the result of that investigation might be?

Representative PORTER. The evidence I have is that he owns considerable real estate in Florida, in New York, and some Middle Western cities—that he has very considerable holdings in the United States.

Mr. CARROLL. What would that prove one way or the other?

Representative PORTER. It would prove for one thing we shouldn't send him \$250,000 a year point 4 aid, and we shouldn't as Look magazine says in an issue coming out this week, give him \$6 million in military aid.

Mr. CARROLL. Do you think all this money is going to Trujillo?

Representative PORTER. I know it is. There is nobody familiar with the setup down there who doesn't know he controls the economy of the country. It is his plantation, and then we give him aid.

Mr. CHILDS. While advocating we stop our aid to four Latin American dictatorships, you have gone along with the administration in urging or continuing aid to Tito in Yugoslavia because you said we would get some benefit out of this. Isn't it true that now that Tito has made his peace with Moscow, there is no point in this?

Representative PORTER. And, the aid to Yugoslavia is conditioned on that. If we consider him lost to the other side, we don't

give him aid. That is the way it should be done. If we see a military advantage in terms of security to the American people, sure, we "sup with the Devil with a long-handled spoon," but we don't do it when there is no military reason for it.

Mr. CARROLL. It is a pretty risky policy, though, isn't it? Do you make a distinction between a dictatorship of the left and the right?

Representative PORTER. No; I say they are the same, but where we have a military advantage to gain—I don't say we are close to them or show we like them or think they are respectable, but we have bases in Spain because it is going to mean our protection. Then we deal with the government, and we spend \$400 million there.

Mr. CARROLL. Our new Ambassador in Cuba, Mr. Smith, has just spoken out apparently against the Batista dictatorship. Do you think this is right, or do you think it was a blunder?

Representative PORTER. I think it was very right, indeed. I think, Mr. Smith is to be congratulated for speaking up as an American would. He didn't speak up against the regime; he spoke out against the terroristics or the police methods, turning the fire hose on some defenseless women who were protesting a treaty that had been violated namely, that American arms were being used to kill their boys. The Ambassador simply said, "I'll give this my serious consideration," which he should do, because those arms were given to Cuba on the basis they would not be

used internally. I say, Mr. Smith is acting as a good American and not as his predecessor did, who was so close to Batista that everybody, all the oppressed people in Cuba—and there are some oppressed people there—thought that the American Government was on the side of the dictator.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. PORTER, you mentioned the article in Look magazine which charges that a half dozen very well known people in this country, including a son-in-law of Secretary Dulles and several other prominent people—a relative by marriage to the President's wife have received large sums of money, some of them as high as \$270,000. Are they a part of all this scheme of Trujillo's to spread a network of terror?

Representative PORTER. He works in two ways, Mr. Wilson, generally, cold cash or cold terror. He gets what he wants either by spending his money, or he gets it by sending his boys to do it another way. So it is part of his way of exercising his influence for his own profit, his own power.

Mr. WILSON. Does he get his money's worth out of these highly placed people?

Representative PORTER. I don't know. Some of them I suppose he does, and some he doesn't.

Mr. BLAIR. There is one question I would like to ask you before we conclude: Do you carry a gun?

Representative PORTER. Whenever I think it is reasonably necessary. The Washington police have so advised me, and when I think it is necessary I carry it.