

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 9256. A bill for the relief of the Park National Bank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 9257. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Hatteras Girls Club, Inc., of Hatteras, N. C.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 9258. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Minnie Ferreira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 9259. A bill for the relief of Lee Young Kil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 9260. A bill for the relief of Aram Fayda and his wife, Elena Fayda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 9261. A bill for the relief of Maglorina Furlan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa:

H. R. 9262. A bill for the relief of A. A. Alexander; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 9263. A bill for the relief of the Smith Canning Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 9264. A bill for the relief of George Kubota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 9265. A bill for the relief of Sarina L. DeTrabout, Luna D. L. Trabout, Ester Trabout; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 9266. A bill for the relief of Sirvart Cark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 9267. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Doudy Bakallian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 9268. A bill for the relief of Linda Diane Hunt (Chun Sun Nam); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 9269. A bill for the relief of Stephen Volpe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 9270. A bill for the relief of Katina Soteriou Roumeliotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 9271. A bill to authorize the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution to use certain real estate in the District of Columbia as the national headquarters of such society; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 9272. A bill for the relief of Eliezer Elhanan Schalit, born Eliezer Schreibman, also known as Ely Schalit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 9273. A bill for the relief of Fahrudin Nushi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

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

327. By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Petition of Pope County Peach Growers Cooperative Association, expressing approval of H. R. 8362 introduced by Congressman TRIMBLE which proposes an amendment to the present laws regulating the making of agricultural loans by the Farmers' Home Administration; to the Committee on Agriculture.

328. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Grace E. McCracken and others, Steubenville, Ohio, requesting veto of the civil-rights bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

329. Also, petition of Eric E. Glass, San Antonio, Tex., requesting a thorough Congressional investigation of the activities of Judge Albert L. Watson, of the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, and more specifically concerning his direct and indirect activities with the criminal trial of Adolphus Hohen-see, No. 12529; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

330. Also, petition of Charles F. Jordan, secretary-treasurer, International Brotherhood of Operative Potters, East Liverpool, Ohio, relative to condemning severely the administration of our trade and tariff laws under State Department domination; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Aviation Corporation of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

## HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1957

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, 1,200 workers employed by the Aviation Corporation of America—Avco—at its New Idea division plant have been on strike more than 16 weeks. It has meant great sacrifice for the workers and for their union. But the union is as solid today as it was when the strike began.

The union has continued because the workers involved are fully convinced of the justice of their demands. The New Idea division has always brought a substantial profit to Avco and there is no doubt that the company can afford to meet the wage standards generally prevailing in the steel industry.

Avco is listed by Fortune magazine as the 121st largest manufacturing company in America. It had sales of \$350 million in 1956. Its assets total \$181 million. Yet, this firm pays a standard wage at its struck plant at Coldwater, Ohio—a wage more than 50 cents an hour below that paid by other organized companies in the industry.

This is the basis for the strike and the reason it has gained solid support from the workers at Coldwater—this, and the medieval policy of Avco. Despite the

fact that a pension plan generally is recognized as a standard working condition by America's large industrial companies, there is none at Avco's Coldwater plant and the company refuses to grant one. Although the idea of supplemental unemployment benefits has been accepted by major steel-fabricating companies, this idea is too advanced for Avco.

A decisive part of big industry has recognized the justice of cost-of-living clauses guarding the buying power of their employees. This has not been the case at Avco, which even today offers what is at best only an inferior clause making a mockery of the whole idea of worker protection against inflation.

The union shop had existed at Avco for years, but now, in retaliation against the strikers, the company is seeking to destroy all union security at its New Idea plant. Avco wants a long-term contract. The union is agreeable to a 3-year contract to insure stability for all. The company offers a package increase over that period worth only slightly more than half the gains accepted by other major fabricating firms as fair and reasonable.

In a telegram sent to Mr. H. W. Lacey, industrial relations director for Avco at the struck Coldwater plant a week before he died, Red Davis informed the company that when "Avco manufacturing decides to agree to a fair wage structure, a seniority provision in the contract that actually gives Avco employees protection against your sharp-shooting tactics, and grievance proce-

dures that we have always had at New Idea, and that protects the incentive employee, then you can have a new contract in a matter of hours."

These facts involve a matter of economic and social justice for these citizens of Ohio, and the Nation, but they also involve an important matter of public policy.

Avco manufacturing retains its advantageous position in American industry today largely because of Government contracts. Despite the strike and the company's refusal to pay wages equal to those of its competitors, Avco has been guaranteed a profitable operation by the taxpayers, millions of whom are union members.

During the current negotiations at Coldwater, Avco management there informed United Steelworker negotiators that its workers have no need for the prevailing industry wage or pensions because they are, after all, little more than country bumpkins who will only spend the money foolishly. Yet this company which views American citizens with contempt has had no hesitancy in accepting the defense business of those same citizens.

On July 2, the New York Times announced that Avco had been awarded a \$111 million contract for the development of a nose cone for the Air Force's hydrogen bomb carrying ballistic missile. The Wall Street Journal's account of this transaction pointed out that it was the largest peacetime Government contract awarded to this company and that it is in

addition to more than \$8 million of previous research and facilities contracts.

An enlightened social policy is as much a part of the defense of our free America as the H-bomb and possibly more so. It will do us little good to defend ourselves with H-bomb development if, in the process, we permit the destruction of free collective bargaining by antiunion employers emboldened and supported by Government subsidy coming in the form of negotiated defense contracts.

It is time for the agencies that let out our defense contracts to recognize that an enlightened labor policy by employers should be as much a requirement as efficient engineering. Certainly employers who persist in paying substandard wages or in maintaining poor working conditions in any part of their operation have no right to Government contracts on the same terms as fair employers. Certainly, Government money should not be used to subsidize employers seeking to impose substandard contracts upon workers, as in the case of Avco.

Government policy in this whole area will benefit if this situation is carefully examined. It may well be that the provisions of the Bacon-Davis law are being disregarded by permitting Government contracts to be given to employers paying less than the prevailing wage to their employees.

### Questionnaire to 11th District of Missouri

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1957

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, I submitted a questionnaire to the rural, star route, post-office box-holders and to all persons listed in the telephone directories in all cities and towns of the 11th Congressional District of Missouri. I am pleased to report that 14,414 people have answered the questionnaire to date. I appreciate the fine response to the questionnaire and I am gratified to say that the people of the 11th District of Missouri are intensely interested in their Government and are willing to take the time to participate in it by expressing their opinions and advice to their Representative in the Congress.

The following is the questionnaire and the results, first in the actual figures and second in percentages:

1. Would you rather balance the budget and reduce the national debt than cut taxes? Yes, 9,565 (67.2 percent); no, 3,518 (24.7 percent); no opinion, 1,160 (8.1 percent).

2. Do you favor Federal aid for school construction? Yes, 7,584 (53.4 percent); no, 5,771 (40.7 percent); no opinion, 843 (5.9 percent).

3. Do you favor extending the Federal minimum wage and overtime hour laws—\$1 an hour minimum—to retail stores and service establishments? Yes, 7,595 (53.4 percent); no, 5,093 (35.8 percent); no opinion, 1,541 (10.8 percent).

4. In the operation of the Post Office Department there is presently an annual deficit of approximately \$464 million. Do you favor an increase in all classes of postal rates to: (a) Make the Post Office Department self-supporting? Yes, 7,418 (52.8 percent); no, 3,555 (25.3 percent); no opinion, 3,085 (21.9 percent). (b) Make a substantial reduction in the deficit? Yes, 5,633 (39.9 percent); no, 1,937 (13.8 percent); no opinion, 6,517 (46.3 percent).

5. If it requires a social-security tax increase, should the social-security retirement age for men be lowered to 62 (as now provided for women)? Yes, 6,945 (45.2 percent); no, 6,420 (45.4 percent); no opinion, 768 (5.4 percent).

6. Do you favor an increase of old-age assistance benefits? Yes, 8,549 (60.4 percent); no, 4,232 (29.9 percent); no opinion, 1,369 (9.7 percent).

7. Last year we adopted the farm soil-bank plan (costing \$1.2 billion annually) to pay farmers for taking certain farmlands out of production to reduce farm product surpluses. (a) Do you favor this program? Yes, 3,371 (24 percent); no, 8,656 (61.6 percent); no opinion, 2,015 (14.4 percent).

(b) Do you favor the Eisenhower administration of this program? Yes, 3,045 (21.1 percent); no, 7,586 (52.6 percent); no opinion, 3,783 (26.3 percent).

8. Do you favor Federal regulation of labor union welfare funds? Yes, 9,767 (68.2 percent); no, 2,546 (17.8 percent); no opinion, 2,001 (14 percent).

9. Do you favor right-to-work laws which provide that a worker does not have to join a union to hold a job? Yes, 10,600 (75.1 percent); no, 2,954 (20.9 percent); no opinion, 564 (4 percent).

10. The President's annual budget asks for \$4.4 billion for foreign military and economic aid (\$2.6 billion for military aid and \$1.8 billion for economic aid) for and during the next fiscal year. Do you favor this? Yes, 4,215 (30.9 percent); no, 7,133 (52.4 percent); no opinion, 2,278 (16.7 percent).

11. Do you approve President Eisenhower's general foreign policy? Yes, 4,951 (36.6 percent); no, 6,353 (47 percent); no opinion, 2,219 (16.4 percent).

12. Do you favor admitting more immigrants, including refugees from Communist-dominated countries, as permanent residents? Yes, 2,548 (18 percent); no, 10,094 (71.4 percent); no opinion, 1,504 (10.6 percent).

13. Do you favor the admission of Alaska and Hawaii as States? Yes, 10,861 (79.6 percent); no, 1,370 (10.1 percent); no opinion, 1,406 (10.3 percent).

### A Bill To Allow School Teachers an Income Tax Exemption on the First \$3,000 of Their Salary

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. SID SIMPSON**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1957

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would allow all accredited schoolteachers an income-tax exemption on the first \$3,000 of their salary. It seems to me teachers and instructors, because of low salaries, are harder to obtain than classrooms.

This exemption, which is equivalent to a salary increase, can well be the contribution of Federal aid to education,

and without any Federal control. It would relieve local taxing bodies of any tax increase in order to obtain teachers at higher salaries. Some States have a minimum teacher's salary, which in Illinois is \$3,200.

The estimated number of teachers in the United States for 1956-57 is as follows: Elementary schools, 751,490; high schools, 426,560; college instructors, 1955, 293,910; almost 1½ million.

In introducing this bill this late in the session, I am hopeful the Ways and Means Committee will consider some such proposal when that committee holds hearings this fall on next year's tax bill.

There is a precedent for this kind of legislation in the additional exemption for all over 65.

### Taxes, Trujillo, Jr., and Training for Tyranny

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. CHARLES O. PORTER**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1957

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Members particularly concerned with the prudent spending of the taxpayers' money in the interest of national defense may be interested in the following correspondence between myself and the Defense Department:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D. C., July 25, 1957.

HON. WILBER M. BUCKER,

Secretary of the Army,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: An item appearing in a New Orleans newspaper on July 19, 1957, reports that Rafael L. Trujillo, Jr., the son of the Dominican dictator, left New Orleans on that day to attend the Army's Command and General Staff School at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.

I should like to know if this information is true, and if it is, the explanation for General Trujillo's admission there.

Furthermore, I should greatly appreciate having a list of those individuals from Cuba, Nicaragua, Venezuela, and the Dominican Republic who are in the same class with General Trujillo, and a list of such nationals who have been in previous classes within the last 5 years.

I must say that I find it hard to rationalize making this wonderful training available to men who will use it to oppress their own peoples and who will never be able to contribute anything substantial to American defense. Your comments on this aspect are invited.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES O. PORTER,

Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY,

Washington, D. C., August 13, 1957.

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER,

House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. PORTER: This letter is in further reply to your inquiry concerning the attendance of Gen. Rafael L. Trujillo, Jr., and other foreign nationals at the Command and

General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kans.

General Trujillo, who assumed the rank of colonel while at school, and Lt. Col. Fernando A. Sanchez, members of the armed forces, Dominican Republic, are students at the Command and General Staff College. Enrolled in the same class are two students from Venezuela, Lt. Col. Benjamin Maldonado and Maj. Carlos Oscar Mendez Cardenas. Cuba and Nicaragua do not have students enrolled in the present class.

Under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, the Dominican Republic is eligible to receive military assistance. The Dominican Republic requested and was allocated two spaces at the Command and General Staff College.

The following students from Cuba, Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, and Venezuela have attended the Command and General Staff College during the past 5 years:

Cuba: Maj. Benjamin Camino y Gomendia, 1955.

Dominican Republic: No students have attended prior to fiscal year 1958.

Nicaragua: No students have attended to date.

Venezuela: Lt. Col. Jose V. Zambrano, 1952; Lt. Comdr. Carlos Bacalao-Lora, 1952; Maj. Raul Antonio Groce-Roa, 1955; Maj. Lulio Salgado Ayala, 1955.

The Department of the Army provides training at United States Army service schools only to those countries which have been declared eligible for such training under Presidential directives, the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and Department of Defense policy directives.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated. Sincerely,

J. E. BASTION, JR.,  
Brigadier General, GS., Deputy Chief  
of Legislative Liaison.

### Jewish War Veterans Question Constitutionality of Discriminatory Dhahran Airbase Agreement

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. LUDWIG TELLER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1957

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, we fight for vindication of a profound American tradition when our efforts are directed to combating all forms of discrimination, whether based on religion, color, creed, or belief. This American tradition is not only an internal source of strength but a beacon of hope for all the world, and substantially accounts for our international prestige.

The present administration has sullied this glorious tradition in recently confirming an agreement with Saudi Arabia by which soldiers of the Jewish faith are excluded from the airbase at Dhahran. As usual, the Jewish people are not alone in this disgraceful episode of discrimination. Chaplains representing all faiths are obliged to perform their religious services surreptitiously. Insignia and other identification of the clergy of all faiths may not be worn or displayed at the Dhahran Airbase.

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States adopted a resolution in May 1957 in which the Dhahran Airbase

agreement was condemned as an unwholesome departure from American instincts and traditions, and the constitutionality of this oil-motivated agreement was questioned.

On Tuesday, September 17, 1957, Constitution Day, the New York State Jewish War Veterans will hold a conference at the Wall Street Synagogue from 6 p. m. to 8:30 p. m. at which Department Commander Hyman Bravin will preside. The main purpose of the conference will be given over to questioning the constitutionality of the Dhahran Airbase agreement. The discussion will be led by one of our most active figures in Jewish, fraternal, civic, and political affairs, Jacob Padawer, department judge advocate of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States. Mr. Padawer, a noted lawyer, will dissect the constitutional infirmities of the Dhahran Airbase agreement, and he will also expose its violation of basic American principles and traditions.

The September 17 meeting of the Jewish war veterans at the Wall Street Synagogue has large current significance, and Mr. Padawer's presentation will be of great public interest, because its celebration of Constitution Day will be accompanied by warnings that we must practice what we preach if our ideals are to be respected at home and abroad.

**M. Sgt. Thomas F. Bell**

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. FRANK IKARD**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1957

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the privilege of visiting in my office with a very distinguished constituent of mine, M. Sgt. Thomas F. Bell, from Vernon, Tex. Sergeant Bell entered the military service in 1942 as an infantryman and transferred to the Air Force in 1943. He was with the 15th Air Force in Italy during the early part of 1944 as a flight engineer and gunner in the 781st Bomber Squadron and flew 56 combat missions in B-24 heavy bombers. His missions included bombings over Ploesti, Munich, and Frankfurt, and during one of his missions he was wounded over Bologna, Italy. Since the war he has served as line chief in B-26, test engineer at Frederick Air Force Base, Okla., and later sent to Sheppard Air Force Base as a liaison sergeant for the Air Force Reserve and returned to flying status when he was transferred to Walker Air Force Base, N. Mex., where he also served as a flight engineer on B-29 and B-50 aircraft.

Sergeant Bell was in Korea with the 27th Fighter Bomber Wing and served for 9 months as a line chief on F-84 thunder jets. In 1951, Sergeant Bell returned to the United States and took his discharge from the Air Force. He returned to Vernon, Tex., as a civilian and served as chief of police in Vernon from 1952 to 1955 when he decided to go back

into the Air Force. He was voluntarily recalled to active duty in 1955 and became a line chief for F-86 Sabrejets while stationed at Perrin Air Force Base, Tex. He went overseas to Naha Air Force Base, Okinawa, and served as line chief in the 16th Fighter Interceptor Squadron.

The occasion of Sergeant Bell's visit to Washington was for the purpose of attending the golden anniversary of the United States Air Force as the representative of the Pacific Air Force. He was chosen for this honor in competition with other Pacific Air Force noncommissioned airmen and was 1 of 21 outstanding noncommissioned airmen selected for this honor. Sergeant Bell is married and has three sons. He is presently serving with the Air Force in Okinawa.

I consider it a privilege to call attention to the splendid record of Sergeant Bell, and to publicly commend him for his distinguished service to his country, both in time of war and in time of peace.

### Save Grange Headquarters

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1957

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to prohibit any Government agency from acquiring or using the National Grange Headquarters site here in Washington without specific Congressional approval.

The bill is a companion to a number of bills introduced in the House and to S. 2696, introduced in the Senate by Senator PORTER. The bill would require the Administrator of the General Services Administration to withdraw the declaration, heretofore filed in United States district court, taking title to the Grange Building and lot, and would require him to take such other action as may be necessary to restore title to the National Grange of the Patrons of Husbandry.

Title was taken by the Government to the entire block known as Jackson Square, in which the Grange lot is situated, with the notable exception of the Decatur House which surrounds on the west and north the relatively small rectangle—50 by 70 feet—occupied by the 7-story Grange Building.

I have tried to view this matter objectively. Based upon information which has come to my attention, I believe Grange Master Herschel D. Newsom has justification for saying that because of its juxtaposition with Decatur House, destruction of the Grange Headquarters Building is not necessary in order to permit erection of the planned Federal Office Building.

Furthermore, present plans for the proposed new office building to be erected in Jackson Square indicate that the new building will not occupy any of the land now owned by the Grange. It appears that the Grange site will only

serve as lawn area for the new building. In light of the important economy drive now in force, I do not think taxpayers would approve an expenditure of \$150 to \$200 a square foot to provide for grass and flowers.

Certainly the National Grange property, purchased in 1941 with funds raised through the activities of more than 7,000 local Grange organizations, should not be sacrificed merely to provide lawn space.

I believe that the Members of Congress should keep in mind also that the Grange Building, in addition to its own national offices, houses the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the American Institute of Cooperation, National Agricultural Research, Inc., Farm Roads Foundation, and Washington offices for more than 30 farm publications.

Certainly, this building is now serving very important and worthwhile public purposes which are in the interest of agriculture, the American farmer, and the Nation generally. I therefore urge my colleagues to give all possible support to proposed legislation which would save the National Grange Headquarters Building from destruction.

### Washington Report, August 10, 1957

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1957

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Washington Report of August 10, 1957, my weekly newsletter to constituents:

The supplemental appropriation bill, 1958, was passed with many misgivings. Why—only weeks after a new fiscal year starts, for which period every Government agency appropriation had been previously passed—should more money be needed? Eleven departments received additional funds. Also, with logic known only to the Appropriations Committee's leadership, the \$1.5 billion military construction expenses were included instead of comprising the usual separate bill.

Of the State Department appropriation of \$6 million the greatest furor came over \$3.5 million to Israel for club premises, ceramics kiln, and studio building equipment, one-floor addition to a museum's art gallery, completion of a cultural center, a revolving scholarship fund, financing of a postgraduate college building, completion of hostel construction, choir assembly support, construction of a museum, library, music conservatory, concert hall, and Boy Scout camp development, financing archaeological expeditions, construction and equipment of a nursery, summer camp for underprivileged children, a YMCA building, and many others. Some may question if all these are even the function of a local charity like the Community Chest, much less the role of one government providing for another. Many of these projects we do not permit our Federal Government to provide for our own people. So who's looking after our taxpayers' money and for economy and "cut the budget"?

Only 82 of us voted to trim out some of the questionable projects.

No other Texan joined me to eliminate \$10 million from the \$13.5 million additional appropriation to the TVA for more socialized power production, and we lost 158 to 244. Here's an excellent example of the mutual back-scratching—anyone having a Federal project in the works feels it necessary to vote for the other fellow's project. The alleged Southern States righters voted for this greatest boondoggle of all time. It just isn't right for all taxpayers to foot the bill for the favored few to get Government-subsidized cheaper electricity. This in addition to the violence done to the Constitution and States' rights by this big Federal bureaucratic empire of lakes, dams, powerplants, and numerous Government business enterprises like fertilizer manufacture, etc.

Civil rights, now watered down to a Federal right-to-vote law, poses an interesting question and violation of States rights. What happens now to individual States' varied voting standards, property ownership, residence, and the like? Decentralized voting by States has been one of the greatest protections against complete Federal domination.

The Atomic Energy Commission appropriation bill to appropriate \$259 million passed overwhelmingly, but only after a spirited debate over the issue of whether Government (public) or private enterprise should build atomic reactors to develop electric power. Happily, the private enterprise amendments won out by a close vote of 211 to 188 and 213 to 185. It was almost a party line vote—Democrats for Government development, Republicans for private. Only 3 and 4 Texans joined me in these votes to reduce Government participation in this program.

The Federal employees' salary bill averaged an 11 percent increase. In view of the 5 percent cost-of-living rise since the last pay boost, the 11 percent seemed high to me, considering also that retirement benefits have been increased by 25 percent in the last year. I voted to increase the pay 7½ percent because I believe a pay increase is warranted at this time. Of course, it's easy to spend the taxpayers' money. In fact, to some there's a little reason to oppose Government spending at any time, particularly when votes back home are at stake. This pay increase becomes particularly objectionable in view of the already huge Government expenditures. First, we must cut out some Government spending before we hastily spend more; otherwise, we must increase taxes or increase the national debt by borrowing and thus, through inflation, further reduce everyone's buying power. This bill increases the Federal payroll \$532 million per year. It passed 329 to 58.

This newsletter will be the last regular weekly—with possibly a summary just at or after adjournment. Remember, you have two Senators to inform how you feel. Congress' adjournment is still most uncertain and most political.

### What Do Minneapolis People Think on Major Issues?

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1957

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, in recent years I have annually prepared and sent

to each resident of my Congressional district whose name was listed in the telephone directory, a questionnaire dealing with some of the major controversial issues facing Congress and the Nation. The response to this year's questionnaire, totaling almost 9,000 replies, has been most gratifying and informative.

It was my plan to report a compilation of the replies earlier in the present session. In fact, May 1 was established as a cutoff date and complete tabulations were made. But when hundreds of additional replies continued to come in, it seemed advisable to retabulate. This has considerably delayed the public report, but the trends in the thinking of the people of my district were quite plain by last April.

At least a third of those replying took the trouble to add constructive comments. Many said that on certain questions a straight "yes" or "no" answer was not fully descriptive of their view. I recognize fully that on a complicated issue it is not possible to phrase a short question in such a way that a "yes" or "no" answer will express exactly what one believes. But even so, the person's reaction of approval or disapproval "in general," tells me a lot and is very useful.

This is the same problem a Congressman has to resolve when he votes on a complicated bill. How often I wish I could vote, say, 70 percent for and 30 percent against a bill. But I can vote only "yes" or "no" as if it were all good or all bad. The decision has to be made on whether I think the good features are sufficiently good to justify accepting the bad along with them.

Highly significant is the consistency with which residents of the Fifth Minnesota District, regardless of party affiliation, are in fairly close agreement on most issues. This is particularly true with respect to foreign policy questions, but carries over to a surprisingly high degree on most major domestic issues. For example, a large majority of the members of both parties as well as of independents believe that postal rates should be increased to pay more of the costs of operating the postal service, and that Government aid to farmers should not be increased.

Considering the recent magazine articles and radio and TV programs emphasizing waste or failure in our foreign aid programs, it is important to note overwhelming support in all groups for the basic objectives of our mutual security programs to assist friendly nations in the struggle against world communism. The rank and file are properly concerned about the trees, but they do not lose sight of the forest.

The replies show clearly that the two uppermost concerns of our people today are our national security and our economic stability. They recognize that the menace of world communism is the No. 1 issue of the 20th century. National defense—the threat from without—ranks first in concern. Communism in Government—the threat from within—ranks second. The economic stability of our Nation is next, as shown by the fact that reducing taxes, reducing

the Federal budget, and reducing the national debt rank third, fourth, and fifth.

The replies make plain the desire of the people for greater economy in governmental expenditures. And, I might add, this desire has brought results. I have received much less mail this year urging new spending than in any of my 15 years in the Congress.

Yet, by no means do people desire to abolish or curtail established assistance programs, such as social security. They show, however, a growing awareness of the costs of these programs and ask that a real justification be made before we further extend or expand them.

What the people want now, the replies demonstrate, is a thorough reappraisal of our social security system in terms of today's conditions. Many failed to realize, when social security was begun in the depression years, that it was not designed primarily to provide for employed persons the income necessary to an adequate living standard in their later years, but rather to get older persons out of the labor market and thereby spread the number of jobs. To accomplish that end the original law provided that a retired person would lose his benefits if he earned more than \$14.99 a month. But now there is no such need to save jobs for younger people. The economy needs the skills of all, including the elderly. There is no need to penalize them for the good American virtue of industry. They are happier as well as better off if they can work a few years longer.

Furthermore, they need the additional income because they find that they cannot live on the retirement benefits they receive. Many had been led to believe that social security would take care of their retirement needs and they did not save as formerly or make other provision for their old age. Their payments into the fund were never adequate to provide annuities of the size they need—especially now when continued inflation has reduced so drastically the purchasing power of those annuities. Much clear thinking and numerous adjustments are necessary in this area if the confidence of our people is to be retained.

Distinctly evident in the replies is the tendency of rank-and-file people to have less confidence than some officials have in their ability to make any lasting and beneficial arrangements with the leaders of Communist nations—be they Russian, Chinese, or Titoists. The people can tell the difference between right and wrong; they put principle ahead of expediency. They know that the Communist form and philosophy of government is incompatible with human freedom and with our own way of life; therefore they are not too optimistic about negotiations with leaders of Communist governments. They put more trust in sticking to our principles than in deals with oppressors. My own conviction is that history will prove the people more realistic in their appraisal than many supposed experts have been.

It is interesting to note the overwhelming and bipartisan support for increased postal rates to pay the cost of the postal service, and yet the great diffi-

culty in getting the Congress to pass this type of legislation.

Civil rights is of greater concern to the people of the Fifth Minnesota District this year than it was in last year's questionnaire, as would be expected in view of recent public discussion of this issue in Congress, and in the news.

Low farm prices are of less concern than they were last year. Probably this is accounted for by the leveling off in farm price decline, and in many instances, substantial increases in farm prices under present long-range farm programs.

May I also say that I am personally very grateful for the appreciative remarks a good many added about my work as their representative in the Congress. Naturally I like to hear that, but I also value and welcome the criticisms expressed by some. Wherever there is dissatisfaction it is helpful to know it, so that my views or actions, if in error, can be corrected; or if the criticism results from misunderstanding of my position, it can be better explained.

Mr. Speaker, these are but a few of the observations and reflections suggested by the response to my questionnaire this year. The replies indicate careful consideration and thought. They deserve equally careful and serious study.

The survey follows:

OPINION SURVEY—FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., 1957

Do you consider yourself:

	Number of replies	Percent of total
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	737	8
Republican.....	4,956	57
Independent.....	3,015	35
Total returned.....	8,708	100

FOREIGN POLICY

1. In general, do you approve the way the Eisenhower administration is handling our foreign relations?

	Yes	No	No opinion
In Europe?			
All.....	75.5	16.9	7.6
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	47.4	42.9	9.7
Republican.....	86.3	8.5	5.2
Independent.....	68.0	24.6	7.4
In the Middle East?			
All.....	63.3	28.1	8.6
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	29.0	60.8	10.2
Republican.....	74.9	17.2	7.9
Independent.....	52.7	38.1	9.2
In the Far East?			
All.....	68.8	21.9	9.3
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	38.5	49.7	11.8
Republican.....	79.3	12.6	8.1
Independent.....	68.9	30.6	10.5

2. In general, do you favor continued United States assistance to other countries in the Free World's struggle against Communist aggression and subversion?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	79.5	13.8	6.7
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	75.9	17.2	6.9
Republican.....	82.0	11.7	6.3
Independent.....	76.2	16.4	7.4

3. Do you favor such assistance to:

	Yes	No	No opinion
Egypt?			
All.....	30.7	55.7	13.6
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	30.4	58.3	11.3
Republican.....	31.4	54.2	14.4
Independent.....	29.7	57.5	12.8
Israel?			
All.....	50.6	36.4	13.0
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	56.2	34.3	9.5
Republican.....	50.3	35.9	13.8
Independent.....	49.9	37.5	12.6
Poland?			
All.....	52.1	34.8	13.1
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	54.3	34.6	11.1
Republican.....	53.2	33.4	13.4
Independent.....	49.2	37.2	13.6
Yugoslavia?			
All.....	43.0	42.1	14.9
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	46.5	40.9	12.6
Republican.....	43.6	41.1	15.3
Independent.....	41.1	44.2	14.7

4. Do you favor changing our laws to permit barter of farm surpluses to Communist nations?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	42.1	49.5	8.4
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	39.3	52.9	7.8
Republican.....	40.3	50.9	8.8
Independent.....	45.7	46.3	8.0

5. Do you think Congress should authorize admission of a greater number of refugees from Communist-dominated countries?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	30.8	62.7	6.5
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	29.1	66.4	4.5
Republican.....	30.9	62.4	6.7
Independent.....	31.1	62.1	6.8

DOMESTIC POLICY

6. Do you favor Federal financial aid for construction of public schools:

(a) If the amount of aid to a State is determined only by the number of school-age children in that State?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	29.9	56.6	13.5
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	45.0	40.3	14.7
Republican.....	26.1	60.7	13.2
Independent.....	32.7	53.7	13.6

(b) If the amount of aid takes into consideration also a State's resources and the effort it is making with those resources? (A "no" answer to both (a) and (b) will indicate you are opposed to Federal aid.)

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	59.6	31.9	8.5
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	73.7	17.1	9.2
Republican.....	56.4	35.9	7.7
Independent.....	61.3	29.2	9.5

7. If you approve Federal aid for public school construction, do you favor inclusion of a provision barring aid to States that maintain segregated school systems?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	37.0	40.0	23.0
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	47.1	44.8	8.1
Republican.....	33.5	39.7	26.8
Independent.....	40.4	39.3	20.3

8. Welfare programs such as social security, old-age assistance, unemployment

and disability compensation, etc., have been expanded substantially during recent years, with corresponding increase in costs. Do you favor further expansion of these programs?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	55.2	38.9	5.9
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	84.0	13.0	3.0
Republican.....	47.1	46.9	6.0
Independent.....	61.5	32.1	6.4

9. In general, do you believe the Congress should provide greater financial assistance to farmers than they are now receiving?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	15.1	78.5	6.4
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	39.3	53.7	7.0
Republican.....	9.8	84.5	5.7
Independent.....	17.9	74.6	7.5

10. Do you think Congress should increase postal rates to reduce the estimated Post Office deficit of \$650 million instead of paying the annual deficit by taxes as at present?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	75.4	19.9	4.7
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	72.9	23.7	3.4
Republican.....	75.5	19.9	4.6
Independent.....	75.7	19.2	5.1

11. Do you think Congress should repeal the provision under which some States have banned compulsory union membership clauses in labor-management contracts?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	21.7	68.1	10.2
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	50.5	38.4	11.1
Republican.....	14.7	75.7	9.6
Independent.....	26.1	62.7	11.2

12. Do you think Congress should pass legislation requiring Federal registration and regulation of labor union pension and welfare funds?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	85.3	9.3	5.4
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	77.7	16.7	5.6
Republican.....	88.1	7.1	4.8
Independent.....	82.2	11.5	6.3

13. Do you think Congress should increase substantially the limitation of \$1,200 which a person receiving social security benefits can earn without losing those benefits, even though such increase would require larger payroll deductions for social security?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	56.4	35.8	7.8
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	65.7	27.8	6.5
Republican.....	55.3	37.2	7.5
Independent.....	56.0	35.5	8.5

14. Do you favor continued development of Wold-Chamberlain Field as the major airport for commercial flying in the Twin City area?

	Yes	No	No opinion
All.....	78.9	15.4	5.7
Democrat-Farmer-Labor.....	78.4	17.8	3.8
Republican.....	80.3	14.1	5.6
Independent.....	76.8	17.0	6.2

15. Please number (1, 2, 3, 4, 5) in order of their importance the five domestic issues which cause you greatest concern today:

	All	Democrat-Farmer-Labor	Republican	Independent
National defense.....	16,683	1,243	9,767	5,673
Communist influence in United States.....	12,256	850	7,739	3,667
Reducing taxes.....	11,834	840	7,178	3,816
Reducing the Federal budget.....	11,778	444	7,815	3,519
Reducing the national debt.....	10,199	463	6,717	3,019
Civil rights.....	8,314	945	4,065	3,304
Corruption in Government.....	8,041	729	4,234	3,078
Federal bureaucracy.....	7,900	207	5,253	2,440
Cost of medical care.....	7,824	828	3,783	3,214
Provision for elderly people.....	7,294	801	3,774	2,719
School construction.....	7,188	935	3,421	2,832
Labor-management relations.....	7,043	416	4,459	2,168
Slum clearance.....	3,627	493	1,573	1,561
Low farm prices.....	3,561	545	1,757	1,259

NOTE.—Above ratings arrived at by figuring 5 points for issues numbered 1, 4 points for issues numbered 2, 3 points for those numbered 3, 2 points for those numbered 4, and 1 point for those numbered 5.

Col. John R. Donovan, Jr., a Tragic Loss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1957

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, many people in Massachusetts and throughout the country were greatly saddened recently to learn of the untimely passing of Col. John L. Donovan, Jr., United States Air Force, retired, who for some years had resided at Quincy, Mass. He was a close friend, and I am deeply grieved by his demise.

Colonel Donovan had a distinguished, inspiring career. A graduate of Harvard College, where he stood out for his brilliant scholarship and his athletic prowess as an outstanding football star, John Donovan was a man of many parts and many interests.

At the time of his death, he was a high and very capable official of the General Services Administration at Boston, and previously served with the Veterans Administration in that city. His government service was conspicuous for great ability, efficiency and devotion to duty. Yet it was only one facet of the busy life of this most striking personality, who moved in many spheres of life.

The interests of John Donovan covered the widest range. He was active in a host of societies and organizations. To each, he brought unbounded enthusiasm, commanding mental powers and tireless energy.

John Donovan was a natural leader who inspired the confidence and trust of the people. He was brilliant in his conceptions, and once he decided upon a course of action he vigorously pursued it until it was successfully completed. He was a born organizer and his activi-

ties covered unceasing efforts and contributions in religious, patriotic, charitable, civic, military, and political programs.

He was intensely interested in the problems of youth and from early in life took effective leadership in the guidance, assistance, and counseling of innumerable young people. He worked wholeheartedly under the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in activities to better and improve the lot of the disabled, the handicapped, and less fortunate brothers.

Devoutly religious, he rendered unselfish service and furnished superb direction to a number of laudable, organized groups of his own religious faith—a faith which he embraced with unflinching love, devotion, and loyalty throughout his life.

Prior to his association with the Government, he was prominently identified with political affairs in the city of Boston and the State of Massachusetts, and his advice, counsel, and help were eagerly sought by many candidates, who rose to high public stations. I can recall and acknowledge from a very grateful heart the magnanimous support and effective assistance which he rendered to me early in my political career and which was so helpful in enabling me to advance in the public service.

John Donovan was a dedicated and zealous patriot. When World War II came, he immediately rallied to the great cause of country and served with rare distinction in our great Air Force. At the time our American forces invaded France, Colonel Donovan was assigned with our expeditionary units and had the great honor of raising the American flag above the towers of the city hall at Paris.

One of Colonel Donovan's most brilliant accomplishments was his work in organizing and leading the Air Force Reserve unit at Boston following the war up to the time he became physically disabled not long ago.

I had the privilege at one time of visiting with and addressing this very remarkable unit. I was profoundly impressed by its personnel and esprit de corps. I came away convinced that it was the finest Reserve unit I had ever seen. Its roster read like a list of Who's Who in the business and professional life of New England. This was one of Colonel Donovan's greatest prides and greatest achievements. He was heartbroken when his physical condition required him to withdraw from its activities, because it was so dear to his heart. And well it may have been. I doubt there is another Reserve unit like it in the country. It is a monument largely to the vision, ability, and hard work of John Donovan.

Colonel Donovan has passed to his heavenly reward at the very crest of his powers. He leaves a rich legacy of devoted service to his country and his fellow man. He will long be remembered for his amiable personality and his constructive achievements, high character, and purpose.

Loving husband and brother, warm-hearted, generous and devoted friend, public benefactor in many fields, loyal servant of his country in war and peace,

Colonel Donovan leaves a deep void in the lives of many that can never be filled. His memory will long remain green to bring inspiration, hope and faith for those who strive for a better nation.

I join in mourning the loss of a dear, admired friend and an able, generous counselor, and extend to his bereaved family, his gracious wife, who did so much to encourage, help and sustain him, and his loyal sisters who were ever a source of encouragement and assistance, most heartfelt sympathy. May they be comforted by the Almighty to bear their irreparable loss with true Christian reconciliation.

And may he find peace and rest in his eternal reward.

## When the Next Satellite Revolts

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 13, 1957

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, many of us have been sorely concerned by what happened in Hungary, and our consciences have been disturbed. The Special Committee of the United Nations, composed of representatives of five nations, in a unanimous report has detailed the ruthless manner in which the revolt was crushed by the Soviet Union, and a legal government, popularly supported by the people of Hungary, was deposed. I think that the peoples of the Free World should be now discussing and adopting policies to deal with such future revolts. There is little we can do to repair what has happened in the past. We can prepare for the future. I ask unanimous consent to print an article which I wrote on this subject and which appeared in *Western World* for August 1957.

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

#### WHEN THE NEXT SOVIET SATELLITE REVOLTS

(By Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Senator KEFAUVER served in the House of Representatives from 1939 until 1949, when he was elected to the Senate where he has served since that time. He is a member of the Judiciary and Armed Services Committees. He was the Democratic candidate for Vice President last year.)

There is an ominous silence over Eastern Europe. How long will the calm last?

In Hungary, Soviet repression continues and the trials of the rebels seem about to begin.

Red Poland is balancing on a tightrope. Gomulka, whose antipathy to Moscow has been greatly exaggerated, has relaxed the tension somewhat by loosening the peoples' shackles. He can hardly retighten the screws without provoking a popular revolt that would bring a worse repression. Yet, allowing his restless Poles full freedom (sure to include secession from the Kremlin) would have the same tragic result. How long can his act continue?

Another satellite outbreak anywhere seems almost sure to ignite a rebellion among the East Germans of the so-called People's Democratic Republic.

Already exiled Hungarian leaders are predicting a new revolt in the near future. It could hardly be otherwise. For the Hungarian revolt revealed unmistakably what the West should never have doubted—namely, that the East European peoples reject all forms of communism, national or Soviet, and will settle for nothing less than real freedom. Certainly not all of Mao Tse-tung's promises of a "hundred flowers blooming, a hundred schools of thought contending," will placate the dissatisfied if the condition is that all must be red.

Since the political barometer points to storm, elementary statesmanship would seem to require the governments of the free countries to face this possibility, and singly and collectively decide what, under such circumstances, they are prepared to do when the tempest breaks. Doing nothing could be excused in the case of Hungary on the grounds of surprise. For Westerners to stand idly by and once more wring their hands while brave men (and women and 12-year-olds) die in a cause we claim is ours, would discredit the West entirely. Henceforth no uncommitted people would be tempted to rely upon us for anything.

How, some will ask, can we be sure of anything behind the Iron Curtain? Would we not risk going off half-cocked, and plunging the world through ignorance into the world's worst war?

Let's look at Hungary.

Within the past few months that country has disgorged 190,000 refugees. And we have heard the sounds of that historic uprising, from the wild shouts of a short-lived triumph to the shrieks of terror that died out in a thin radio cry for help.

Now, to eliminate the last uncertainty, a United Nations report indicting the Soviets before the world and its fellow nations in the strongest denunciatory language gives the complete story.

On January 10, 1957, almost 3 months after the initial October revolt began in Hungary, the General Assembly of the United Nations appointed a Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary, composed of Mongi Slim, of Tunisia; Aising Andersen, of Denmark; K. C. O. Shann, of Australia; R. S. S. Gunewardene, of Ceylon; and Enrique Rodriguez, of Fabregat, of Uruguay.

The Assembly asked the committee to carry out a full and objective investigation of all aspects of Soviet intervention in Hungary by armed force and by other means, and of the effects of such intervention in Hungary by armed force and by other means, and of the effects of such intervention on the political development of Hungary.

In its report, the committee stated that in carrying out the mandate, it studied "a rich documentation supplied by governments and obtained from other sources, while it closely questioned more than a hundred witnesses, representing every stratum of Hungarian society, whose testimony filled 2,000 pages in the verbatim record."

The committee also pointed out that the General Assembly had asked that the investigation be pursued in Hungary also, but the attitude of the Hungarian Government did not allow the committee to carry out this part of its mandate.

The five United Nations delegates saw fit to delete the more gruesome details of Soviet cruelty and barbarism. Yet the report is shocking enough in its blow-by-blow account of the heroic but fruitless uprising of an entire people and its subsequent bloody and illegal repression by the Russians. Even in its unexpurgated edition, free peoples wince to remember how they looked on passively while this was going on, and the United Nations—so prompt and brave in its reaction to Suez—did nothing but vote a series of academic resolutions, which Soviet Russia systematically and insolently flouted.

The essence of the committee's conclusions are:

1. The entire population, excluding only the political police, and including women and 12-year-olds, participated in the revolt.

2. The rebels established a legal government popularly supported by the people of Hungary.

3. Russia intervened, and removed this popular government formed by a spontaneous national movement, and neither aided nor abetted from the outside.

4. The government put into power by the Soviet did not at the time, and does not now, have the support of the people of Hungary.

5. The situation in Hungary today is as bad or even worse than at the time of the revolt. The people have no personal freedom and are completely under the yoke of the Soviet communistic dictatorship.

#### A CONGRESSIONAL VIEW

A previous special report on the subject of Hungary by the House of Representatives' Committee on Foreign Affairs gave the world additional background information about what happens when a satellite nation defies Soviet Russia.

Here is a summary of some of its observations and impressions:

The catastrophic Hungarian revolution of October 23 caught the Free World totally unprepared, and subsequent events clearly show the Soviet Union is determined to go to any and all lengths to maintain its empire of enslaved peoples by the most brutal forms of armed subjugation and repression, when permitted to do so. Its policy toward the satellite nations is one of ruthless colonialism and overlordship of both human and natural resources without parallel in modern history. Because of this knowledge now broadcast without equivocation or doubt to the world, it might be difficult if not impossible to prevent Free World volunteers from moving in to counter Soviet aggression should another satellite nation revolt.

A third detailed report made by the International Commission of Jurists in The Hague in April of this year has this to say in summary:

Soviet intervention in Hungary clearly constituted aggression, if it took place without Hungarian permission, according to the Soviet definition of the word aggression, the relevant part of which (art. I) reads as follows:

"In an international conflict that state shall be declared the attacker which first commits one of the following acts: Invasion by its armed forces, even without a declaration of war, of the territory of another state; bombardment by its land, sea, or air forces of the territory of another state or the carrying out of a deliberate attack on the ships or aircraft of the latter; the landing or leading of its land, sea, or air forces inside the boundaries of another state without the permission, particularly as regards the length of their stay or the extent of the area in which they may stay."

Permission to station Soviet troops in Hungary is given by the Warsaw Pact of May 14, 1955, provided it is "by agreement among the states, in accordance with the requirements of their (the signatories of the Warsaw Pact) mutual defense."

So the world now has proof positive and authentic background information on how the Soviets acted when a satellite nation revolts. It also has the dismal evidence of how the rest of the world behaved in the face of such action as a direct result of lack of foresight in planning a policy of action in the wake of such a revolution.

The revolt of Hungary may have been a dangerous crisis wherein extreme prudence can be understood if not approved.

But it was nonetheless what the House of Representatives subcommittee called "the lost opportunity of our generation." For

the United States administration, which had for years emphasized the need for the "liberation of East Europe," to fall back on "reliance on moral pressures" was a retreat that verged on a surrender. But neither the American nor his European colleague showed any stomach for positive action.

Nor did the United Nations.

In fact, the double failure of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the United Nations to give positive help to the Hungarians was one of two things. Either it was the acknowledgment of Russia's right to dominate the Warsaw Pact area (a revival of the 1944-45 American alibi that the U. S. S. R. could properly claim "friendly neighbors"), or it was a confession that Western devotion to freedom is a punier thing than Western fear of being involved in another major war.

Give the Western peoples credit. They wanted to help. I have never seen my own fellow Americans or Members of the United States Congress so universally disturbed by any world crisis as they were by the Hungarian revolt. I trust in this world of the stiff upper lip that it would not be melodramatic to say I heard women weep and saw usually cheerful men walk around with a stunned solemnity in those days immediately following the Hungarian revolt. I have never seen shame and horror so universally written on the faces of my countrymen.

And I heard them ask over and over \* \* \* what can we do?

The thing is, they didn't know what to do. Many were ready to spring into action as volunteers along with the Hungarians.

And the United States administration, preoccupied with the events around Suez, gave no lead. For 4 days, October 23 to 27, it did nothing. Then, having summoned the United Nations, it limited itself to strictly verbal condemnation of Soviet aggression. To all of which the Kremlin paid not the slightest attention. Indeed, to underline their contempt for world opinion, Russian leaders suddenly threatened to obliterate Paris and London with guided missiles.

President Eisenhower later announced that Americans cannot have one law for their friends and another for their enemies. Indeed, it would have been enough if he had treated our enemies, the Red Russians, with the same severity he showed toward our much-provoked friends—France, Britain, and Israel. Instead, some suspect the administration of whistling in the dark. While talking bravely, it was actually preoccupied with preventing the revolt from spreading from Hungary to other captive peoples. This might have made liberation a fact, but it would not have contributed to that relaxation of tensions with communism which the President had steadfastly pursued. And it would have made a caricature of the previous American policy of urging the captive peoples to settle for some form of national communism, rather than demanding the same amount of freedom as Americans consider their own birthright.

Ninety percent of the Americans would, in my judgment, have been prepared to follow wherever the administration led. But the Hungarian crisis came at a peculiarly awkward moment. With a national election less than 2 weeks off, the people were absorbed in domestic politics. They were also understandably confused by the simultaneous Suez affair. And finally, one must admit, they shared the administration's fear of provoking the U. S. S. R. into starting a major war. These reasons were obvious at the time, and contributed to the general atmosphere of impotence.

Yet, looking back, I am convinced the main cause of the West's paralysis was quite simple—lack of a united plan of action by the NATO powers.

For years these countries had simply ignored paragraph 2 of the NATO treaty urg-

ing amplification into economic and political fields. Yet the recent recommendations for strengthening NATO by the Three Wise Men were almost insignificant.

#### KEFAUVER'S RESOLUTION

As far back as 1949, I introduced a resolution requesting the American President \* \* \* "to invite the other democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates, including members of their principal political parties, to meet in a convention with similarly appointed delegates from the United States and from other democracies as the convention may invite, to explore and report to what extent their peoples might further unite within the framework of the United Nations, and agree to form, federally or otherwise, a defense, economic and political union."

This my colleagues never allowed to get out of committee, but it has been discussed in various sessions of Congress and, at one time or another, has had the support of about 40 percent of the Senators and House Members.

Without going nearly so far, the NATO governments could easily have amplified and deepened their understanding. On the basis thereof, they could have made appropriate plans for dealing with crises of almost any type, in any part of the world.

Instead, nothing.

Or rather \* \* \* nothing but the Hungarian debacle, with its frustration and subsequent dangers. For, in my opinion, the dangers of not intervening on behalf of freedom may in the long run outstrip the danger of intervention.

Now in my judgment, the time has come to end the period of Western equivocation and find out just how far the American and other governments are willing and able to agree upon a policy for action both now and when the next satellite revolts. Here is what I propose:

First, immediate measures.

The tragedy of the Hungarian revolution, and what it has meant in the crushing of human beings and their love of liberty, should be kept alive continually before the people of the world. Its horror should remain a constant reminder of what is behind the facade of the Soviet Union. It should not be forgotten in the confusion of various statements from various representatives of the United States Government and the governments of other nations.

The three reports to which we have already referred, especially the UN report, should be circulated as widely as possible. These reports should be continually and persistently referred to for the next 5 years in the United Nations.

When the United Nations General Assembly reconvenes, it should demand that the Soviet Union explain why it should not be expelled if it continues to violate the resolutions of that body.

The Kadar government, by virtue of the United Nations own report, does not represent the Hungarian people, and should therefore be immediately expelled from the world organization.

#### STOP EXECUTIONS

The U. N. should take immediate steps to stop the execution of 2,000 Hungarian patriots who have been sentenced to death. A resolution unanimously passed by a conference of lawyers organized by the International Commission of Jurists at The Hague, March 2, 1957, reports as follows:

"This conference \* \* \* is of the opinion that the laws and decrees of the authorities in Hungary violate human rights in failing to provide the minimum safeguards of justice in criminal trials which are recognized by civilized nations, particularly for offenses punishable with death, in that they fail to provide in every case for an impartial tribunal; define offenses in vague terms open to

abuse in interpretation; give the accused no proper notice of the charge preferred; do not allow adequate time and facilities for the accused to prepare his defense, to call witnesses, and to instruct counsel on his behalf; do not always provide an effective right of appeal or effective procedure for clemency.

"Deplores the secrecy in which almost all the criminal trials in Hungary have been conducted since November 4, 1956, and regrets the refusal of the authorities in Hungary to allow impartial legal observers to trials which are of concern to lawyers of all nations."

The United Nations should immediately create a permanent military force ready for action in all future cases of naked aggression.

And what should NATO do?

First, at their next meeting, the NATO parliamentarians should urge their respective governments to negotiate immediately a common plan of concerted action when the next satellite country revolts. We—for I am one of them—should set up a watchdog committee to see that our several governments get busy immediately and do not stall for fear of provoking the U. S. S. R. For unless there is such a common policy, a repetition of the Hungarian debacle is inevitable—with even worse consequences. Action by some, inaction by other NATO governments, will not do. Nothing could be worse than, say, positive action by Britain and France, inaction by the United States and West Germany—or the other way around. Once NATO as NATO has accepted such a common policy, it should broadcast it to the world, thus letting everybody know that the U. S. S. R. cannot expect to commit rape a second time with impunity.

#### A 6-POINT PROGRAM

Now my suggestion for the planks of such a policy.

To begin with, monetary and physical help for the refugees of the last time is mere salve on a deep wound. The gaping sore of peoples condemned to slavery is a festering wound and its healing must include disinfection and, if necessary, surgery.

1. The NATO countries should seek to have the U. N. Assembly instruct the Secretary General in advance to issue in the Assembly's name to an aggressor country whose troops cross an established frontier an immediate warning to desist.

2. The Secretary General, in case of non-compliance within 24 hours, and without further authorization, should send into the attacked countries U. N. civilian observers with their own transport, regardless of any protests by the aggressor.

3. The NATO countries should immediately summon the U. N. Assembly and when it convenes, consider the opportunity of sending a previously constituted U. N. military force—if any—to assist the country attacked.

4. At the same time, the NATO countries should ask the Assembly to recommend that the members take complete economic and political sanctions against the aggressor, including an embargo on all shipments and future trade and the breaking of diplomatic relations. In case the Assembly refuses, the NATO countries should undertake these sanctions independently.

5. The NATO countries should publicly reserve the right as nations to come to the accumulative defense of any sovereign people that invites assistance against attack.

6. The NATO countries should move quickly to grant diplomatic recognition to any government that manages to achieve the start of a success in an armed uprising against Communist tyranny. They should not wait—as in the case of Hungary—and then merely refuse to recognize somebody's stooge.

Such measures would be legal insofar as they would be either in defense of the U. N. Charter or justified by other international laws. They would not, under these, be acts

of war. However, they might cause a war if the Kremlin decided it would prefer its own total destruction to any relinquishment of territories or victim peoples.

The East European satellites are of value to the Kremlin in two ways: as cows to be milked for the benefit of the U. S. S. R. and as a glacis lying before the Soviet fortress (militarily and ideologically). They are of little value as a source of military contingents since the peoples would leap at the first opportunity to desert. In case of war, satellite manpower would doubtless be shanghaied into Soviet factories or put to guard remote stretches of railroad track in central Asia.

Short of an attack upon them, it is extremely unlikely that the Kremlin beneficiaries of a spoils regime will risk their own position and the total destruction of world communism rather than lose control over rebellious peoples whom it cannot hope to keep forever unless the West disintegrates or surrenders. But against the risk of war, the West must weight the risk of any further nonintervention in defense of its principles. For these are the most precious capital on earth.

### Rejection of the Ainsworth and Farwell Irrigation Districts

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. A. L. MILLER**

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1957

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it is a great personal disappointment not only to me but to the folks living in the Ainsworth and Farwell areas of Nebraska to learn that the conference committee on the public works appropriations bill failed to include funds to get two worthy reclamation projects under way—the Ainsworth Irrigation District and the Farwell Irrigation District.

These projects, fully approved by the Department of Interior and Bureau of the Budget, were stricken from the bill by the House committee. They were put back into the bill by a Senate committee and approved on the floor of the Senate. The conference committee then struck them out.

These are sound projects. They are feasible projects. They are needed projects. They would be a great investment in the future of America.

There seemed to be only two reasons advanced against their inclusion in the bill:

First. That the Bureau of Reclamation failed to make an adequate presentation of the merits of the projects;

Second. That the Nebraska Legislature had passed resolution No. 10 in which Congress was asked not to pass new grants-in-aid programs.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution had rather wide publicity. It was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Comments extended across the country relative to the action of the legislature. Some newspapers carried big headlines, Nebraska Wants No More Federal Aid. That was not the meaning of the resolution at all.

Now as to the first complaint, I want to point out that I agree the hearings

showed a very poor presentation of the case by the Department of the Interior. Some of this testimony was vacillating, not at all positive. However, I would further point out the projects do have legislative approval. They do have full approval of the Department of the Interior. The projects do have the approval of the administration and were budgeted when funds were requested. In all fairness, funds for these sound projects should have had the immediate approval of Congress.

Now as to the resolution which seemed to dampen the ardor of some of my colleagues in regard to Federal money for Nebraska, it is quite true the Nebraska Legislature passed a resolution against new grants-in-aid programs and asked that such existing projects be reexamined. Here is the potent paragraph in the resolution:

Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 68th session assembled, That the Federal Government refrain from enacting new grant-aid programs and reexamine all such existing programs and end or reduce their costs wherever possible.*

The resolution in no way referred to irrigation projects such as Ainsworth and Farwell. These are not grants-in-aid programs. They fall within an entirely different category. They follow the pattern of the wise men of vision who founded reclamation more than a half century ago.

It would seem that the resolution provided a rather flimsy excuse for removing from the appropriations bill projects that have met all legislative and Bureau of the Budget demands.

The people of the Ainsworth and Farwell areas had formed legal irrigation districts. They had signed repayment contracts. They had met all the demands of the law in their efforts to get water to their parched land.

It is a little difficult for me to understand why a single resolution by the legislature should be the governing factor in rejecting funds for projects which will repay their cost, a resolution in no way related to these projects, a resolution with which the people involved in these projects had nothing to do.

Of course, Nebraska, like other States, participates in a great many grant-aid programs. Some of these require matching by the State. Others are outright grants. I believe the record will show that Nebraska last year participated in 65 various types of Federal-aid programs. The total amount allotted to Nebraska last year was \$56,237,891. Some of these programs are fine ones. Some should probably be curtailed. Others were available in which Nebraska did not take part. But I emphasize again such programs are totally unrelated to irrigation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not always easy to find the full facts when conferees meet behind closed doors. However, I am told that when this appropriations bill was considered, tempers were rather high and it would seem that emotion dulled the senses of good, honest, reasonable men sitting in that conference. Perhaps this long and very fatiguing session of Congress had its effect in shortening the conference to such an extent that full

consideration could not possibly have been given to individual projects.

It must have been so or these men could not have avoided coming to the conclusion that the Ainsworth and Farwell projects do have merit. If they had given only casual attention to the language of the resolution against new welfare programs, that resolution could not possibly have carried enough weight to be the determining factor against the development of good, sound, feasible irrigation projects which are of vital importance to the people of the State of Nebraska.

The Ainsworth and Farwell projects are two of the best in the entire Missouri River Basin. They would pay back, over a period of years, most of the moneys invested in them. The projects carry only about 4 percent of nonreimbursable funds for flood control and fish and wild-life benefits.

The Ainsworth Irrigation District is designed to bring water to 34,000 acres of land. The Farwell Irrigation District is designed for 52,500 acres which in conjunction with the Sargent Irrigation District, now under construction, would irrigate a total of 68,700 acres. These projects would bring the glow of agricultural prosperity to areas which have been stricken with drought year after year. They would bring new hope, new ambition, new wealth to the fine people who populate the two areas.

Mr. Speaker, we are now considering a conference report. It is not possible to offer an amendment to make it concur with the bill passed by the Senate which included the two Nebraska projects. Were it possible, I would want to take that course, but the rules seem to prohibit that procedure.

I can only hope, Mr. Speaker, that when these two projects come before the committee next year for consideration that a better presentation can be made by the Bureau of Reclamation and that Congress will have placed the Nebraska resolution in its proper perspective. These projects will stand the closest scrutiny of the Appropriations or any other committee. Such scrutiny is invited. The projects will stand up.

Mr. Speaker, in a few days we will be passing a bill for foreign-aid appropriations. At this time I cannot help pointing out that in that foreign-aid bill there is probably 30 times as much money for projects all over the world as is needed for the two projects in Nebraska.

Remember, too, that money is gone forever. It will not be paid back as would be the case with Ainsworth and Farwell.

I was disturbed and dismayed a few months ago when I had a report compiled for me showing the expenditures of our money for reclamation, irrigation, flood control, and power projects overseas.

I found that in a period of about 8 years, ending last December 31, our cost for such projects was \$355.8 million for 197 projects in 46 countries. That is a lot of money to be spending all around the world at the very same time our good people at home are standing helplessly by while a burning sun in a rainless sky destroys their crops.

Mr. Speaker, I consider the Ainsworth and Farwell Irrigation Districts an investment in the great resources of a great America. The projects are sound. The people have met all the legislative and budget demands.

In a spirit of commonsense, the people should not be prevented from bringing together the two great resources that are needed to raise food for your table and mine—water and land.

Attached is a telegram which came from the directors of the Farwell Irrigation District:

GRAND ISLAND, NEBR., August 13, 1957.

HON. A. L. MILLER,

Washington, D. C.:

Understand public works appropriation bill will come up today or tomorrow for a vote in the House of Representatives. Our people are extremely disappointed that conference committee saw fit to leave out an appropriation for the Farwell unit. Surely, the determination of our people to have irrigation development, as evidenced by the formation of a reclamation district, an irrigation district, and the signing of repayment contracts, should not now be frustrated by a single resolution of our State legislature, over which they have no direct control. It is a black day for us to have had years of hard work be held for naught by actions of others who are in no way connected with us. Our people have the utmost confidence in your leadership, and, frankly, we firmly believe we are entitled to have you exert every act at your command to have this irrigation development now, not in the future. We have fulfilled every demand made on us by all Government agencies including Congress itself. The matter now rests with you and your colleagues. To be sure we feel justified, and are hopeful of your efforts on our behalf.

Peter I. Badura, President; George R. Semler, Vice President; Rudolph Manasil; Martin Sack; Ray Lewandowski; Harold Grint; Marvin Price; Alvin Christensen; Arnold Krogh; Steve Smith; Anders Nielsen; C. S. Lukaszewicz; C. P. Shaughnessy, Attorney; the Loup Basin Reclamation District, and the Farwell Irrigation District.

**Address by United States Senator Edward Martin of Pennsylvania, at the 38th Annual Encampment of the Department of Pennsylvania Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States Held at Harrisburg, Pa., July 10-14, 1957**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1957

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, at the 38th Annual Encampment of the Department of Pennsylvania Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States held at Harrisburg, Pa., July 10-14, there were several outstanding addresses delivered by prominent officials of the Federal Government in keeping with the theme of the encampment, Defense Means Freedom.

On July 12, 1957, the following address was delivered by United States Senator EDWARD MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

ADDRESS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE 38TH ANNUAL ENCAMPMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, AT HARRISBURG, PA., JULY 12, 1957

It is a great honor for an old soldier to be invited to address this outstanding organization of real Americans.

Your patriotism has been tested on foreign battlefields. You know what it means to face the enemies of our Nation in the hell-fire of war. Sustained by loyalty and devotion to American ideals you have been willing to sacrifice everything that this Nation, under God, may live in honor, peace, and freedom.

The welfare of our country is always uppermost in the hearts and minds of the veteran. For that reason I want to discuss frankly with you some of the dangers confronting our Nation.

But first, let us look back with pride at the background of the United States. Let us review the magnificent achievements which in less than 200 years have converted a savage wilderness into the world's greatest stronghold of industrial and agricultural production. Let us be thankful that we have advanced to the highest cultural and spiritual levels ever attained by any similar area in the whole world.

The history of America is a glorious story. It tells of toil, sacrifice, and heroism. It tells of victory produced by a people whose hearts and minds were aflame with the spirit of liberty and independence.

It tells of those courageous patriots who met in Philadelphia more than 180 years ago, and pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to establish a new Nation. For the first time in all the world, government recognized the Divine origin of man's inalienable right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

For the first time a government was based upon the sound principle that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

The story of America is the story of George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and all the dedicated statesmen of each generation.

It is the story of the heroes who offered their lives for independence at Lexington, Bunker Hill, Valley Forge, and Yorktown. It is the story of Gettysburg, New Orleans, the fields of Mexico, and Admiral Dewey at Manila. It is the story of Chateau Thierry, the Argonne, the Normandy Beaches, Iwo Jima, and the frozen hills of Korea.

There is no story so glorious in all world history. It should be told and retold, over and over again, in our schools and colleges from the pulpits and lecture platforms, in meetings of fraternal and patriotic organizations, in labor meetings, political rallies and every other place where Americans assemble.

Therefore, it is most appropriate, in a meeting such as this, to consider the situation confronting the United States.

The course of history has placed upon the American people the responsibility for peace and progress in the world. The United States stands as the one strong barrier against the Communist conspiracy to dominate and enslave the entire world.

We must not allow ourselves to be lulled into a false sense of security by the mask of friendliness now worn by the masters of the Kremlin.

Recently there was broadcast into millions of American homes an example of Communist propaganda more flagrant than anything ever before attempted.

It was a brazen attempt to convince American listeners that Soviet Russia has no

evil designs against the free nations of the world. We were told that the Russian dictators seek only friendship and peaceful co-existence.

Yes, my fellow Americans, the Communist boss talked of peace but real Americans were not fooled. The record denies their words.

The civilized world will long remember the ruthless slaughter of men, women and children by Communist tanks and machine guns in crushing the Hungarian revolt of 1956.

Yet those guilty of this monstrous crime—those responsible for the wholesale execution of Hungarian freedom fighters—ask us to believe that this time they are sincere when they talk of peace. The record shows that the Communists have sabotaged every effort for peace and will continue to do so.

Their fundamental objectives have not changed. They have not abandoned their unholy ambition to destroy all human freedom.

Those of you who heard that broadcast will recall the prediction that the grandchildren of Americans living today will live under a socialistic system.

That was a grim warning that must not be ignored. It calls upon us to be constantly alert to the dangers of Communist influence here at home. We must fight disloyalty with every legal weapon at our command, and if our laws are not strong enough they should be made stronger.

You are all familiar with the decision of the United States Supreme Court made about a year ago, which held that the Federal Government has exclusive jurisdiction in the field of sedition and subversion.

This decision struck down laws enacted in 42 States and Territories under which those guilty of subversion could be prosecuted and punished by the State.

I believe that each State should have the right to combat sedition within its borders. I believe each should have the right to punish not only those who seek forcible overthrow of the State but also those who would overthrow the Nation by force.

More recently several other decisions of the Supreme Court have greatly weakened the Federal Government's legal drive against Communists and subversives.

I have no criticism of the Court. We are a nation of law and under our system no individual is denied equal justice. But I repeat if existing law is not adequate to deal effectively with disloyalty it is the duty and responsibility of Congress to enact legislation strong enough to do the job. I can assure you that Congress is taking steps in that direction.

Now I would like to direct your attention to some other dangers that threaten America.

First, inflation. Since 1939, the purchasing power of the dollar has dropped to less than 50 cents.

One of the most difficult functions of a free government is to maintain a stable currency. At the same time it is one of the most important objectives of government. Inflation has the power to crush any economy upon which it fastens its grip and thus it can destroy a nation. In fact, more great nations have been destroyed by inflation than by invading armies or destructive bombs. A nation destroyed by a military force can rebuild itself, if the people have the spirit and the will to work, but a nation where incentive of the individual is destroyed has very little chance of recovery.

Inflation damages all with fixed incomes and inflicts severe hardship on millions of our people. The person who lives on a pension, social security, or interest on savings cannot escape the evils of inflation. There are now in the United States more than 16½ million on social security, corporation, and Government retirement, veterans' pensions, veterans' survivors benefits and military re-

irement pay. Many are widows and orphans. Continued inflation is a threat to the many millions of savers in the United States, the owners of bonds, owners of life insurance policies and savings accounts.

Second, big government and government doing things that we should do for ourselves. More than 7 million now work for the three levels of government, at an annual payroll of \$40 billion.

The vast expansion in the size and cost of government at all levels is leading us away from the ideals of the Founding Fathers. The people are constantly demanding more and more services and many believe that projects paid for with Federal funds do not cost them anything.

The cost of State and local government has been increasing more rapidly than the Federal Government. The tendency toward more and more expensive government by taxes and borrowing must be stopped or we will drift into creeping socialism.

It has been proposed that consideration be given to a new division of the functions of government and a new allocation of taxes to perform those functions. President Eisenhower in a speech delivered to the governors' conference at Williamsburg, Va., on June 24, called upon the governors to join in an effort to return certain responsibilities to the States.

Several years ago I suggested that national defense, foreign affairs, rivers and harbors and banking and currency be Federal functions with income taxes, import duties and liquor and tobacco taxes to furnish the Federal revenues. The States would build the roads, provide higher education, administer penal and correctional institutions and conservation with estate taxes, sales taxes and the gasoline tax to furnish them the money. Local government would provide police power, sanitation, courts and public schools and have as its tax source real estate, admissions, mercantile and wage taxes. This is just a brief outline but I am sure that such a plan would mean a big saving for the taxpayers.

Third, too much private and public debt. Never before in the history of the world have any people owed so much as we owe today. It should be a matter of deep concern to every one of us that the American people now owe a total of more than \$800 billion in gross private and public debt. This is an average of about \$4,700 for every man, woman, and child in the Nation, or about \$18,800 for the average American family of four persons.

Net corporate debt went up from \$92½ billion in 1946 to \$208 billion at the end of 1956.

People have been buying out of tomorrow's paycheck. At the end of 1945 individuals owed less than \$6 billion which in 1956 had increased to \$42 billion.

Net State and local government debt has increased from \$13½ billion in 1945 to \$42.7 billion at the end of 1956 and has greatly increased since that time.

Fourth, moral decay among the people. Great armies and great navies will not maintain a nation's strength where the moral courage and patriotic fervor of its people are permitted to decay. Every student of history knows that great nations of the past have gone down to destruction when the moral fiber of the people was undermined by greed and corruption.

Fifth, too little interest in government. Unfortunately, there are too many misguided Americans who do not understand and do not appreciate the real meaning of America.

They do not seem to realize that our system of free government places upon each citizen an equal share of responsibility for our security and our progress.

Good citizenship is the basis of patriotism. That is why I am constantly urging every

individual to take a more active, intelligent and patriotic part in government.

I bring these dangers to the attention of this great organization of veterans because your patriotic service entitles you to leadership in civic responsibility.

We pray that America may never turn away from its historic mission—to defend liberty, to oppose oppression, to stand against injustice and to support the aspiration of all men of good will for a world of peace and freedom.

We hope and pray for the day when all nations will lay down their arms and live in brotherhood under God.

But until that happy day dawns we must be prepared to defend the God-given freedom that we hold sacred.

Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty.

### Address by Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota, to the National Board of Directors of CARE

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 13, 1957

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on July 25 I spoke on the Senate floor regarding a splendid address which had been delivered by our colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], on the occasion of the annual meeting of the board of directors of CARE—Cooperative for American Remittances to Everywhere.

I felt that this address was of the type which should be given the widest possible circulation.

It came from the heart of our friend, the Senator from Minnesota; and it went straight to the hearts of his audience.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM MINNESOTA, BEFORE THE ANNUAL LUNCHEON MEETING OF THE NATIONAL BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF CARE (COOPERATIVE FOR AMERICAN REMITTANCES TO EVERYWHERE), JULY 24, 1957, HOTEL STATLER, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Ladies and gentlemen, I shall take the opportunity in a moment or two to comment on some of the information that you communicated to this audience. But in the meantime, I would like to pay my respects to my two distinguished senior colleagues who are here—Senator GREEN, who has given us such dedicated leadership in the field of foreign policy; and Senator WILEY, who likewise has given us the same devoted leadership in the field of international relations.

I want to say if I meet many more Republicans like Senator WILEY and Mr. Williams, I may have some of my partisan enthusiasm slightly diluted momentarily. [Laughter.]

I couldn't help but note, when the Secretary was commenting upon my expressions, at least alleged expressions, relating to foreign policy, and about my being a vigorous opponent of going it alone, that he then stated he found this to be strangely similar to good, old-fashioned Republican doctrine. Well, it may have such a strange similarity, but it's this modern Republican doctrine, you see, that has me worried. [Laughter.]

Now, having made my comments on political matters in jest and in good spirit, let me be more serious with you.

We are under a little duress of time today. There is a debate going on in the Senate, and I should like to participate in it before the day is through. Therefore, I shall try to eliminate extraneous material and get right down to cases.

#### UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES IN OUR FOREIGN POLICY

I am here to address a group of men and women who, to my mind, have performed a great and important patriotic service, not only for the United States of America, but for the cause of human decency and freedom all over the world. I always like to identify the overall objectives of American foreign policy beyond the confines of the territorial limits of the United States. After all, there are some universal principles which should motivate and guide us. Our foreign policy demonstrates its strength when it has a relationship to those universal principles of democratic faith; it demonstrates its weakness when it deviates from those principles of democratic faith.

Now, what is the motivating principle behind a democracy? It is service to the individual. And I say that every person who is elected to office, or holds office by appointment, in a free country under democratic institutions, should remind himself every hour of the day that his primary responsibility, duty, and purpose is to serve and not to be served. This is the Christian ethic, too. "He who would be first, let him be last." "I come to minister, not to be ministered unto."

There is much that can be said from the perspective of all religions concerning service.

#### THE FEATURE THAT DISTINGUISHES AMERICA—VOLUNTARY ACTION

I believe that our foreign policy has real importance and genuine constructive effect when we search for, find, and use the key to what we call the American way of life.

What is it that really typifies our country? Not wealth; other countries have been rich, even though we surely have great wealth compared with other nations today. Not power; other countries have had power and have used it, and sometimes used it to their destruction. It is not size, because we are not the biggest country even today.

So what is it that has exemplified and characterized what one calls an American? We Americans are not a unique breed of the human species. It is impossible to define an American from the point of view of anthropology or physiology. We are a conglomerate. So, what is it that identifies us?

It is a sense of generosity, of compassion, of kindness, of tolerance, of understanding, exemplified not only in our public institutions but in our voluntary organizations.

No country on the face of the earth has the number of voluntary organizations that we have in the United States—voluntary organizations that are so generously supported and that have such a wide scale of activities.

In France, for example—the France which cherishes her individualism, the France of *liberté, égalité* and *fraternité*—one finds a dearth of voluntarism in terms of community activity. The French people rely on the state; they rely on the government for their social welfare programs; they rely on official institutions, without voluntary help or cooperation.

#### THE MEANING OF SOVIET TOTALITARIANISM

We are engaged today, fellow Americans, in a struggle with a totalitarian force. It is unfortunate that the American people are not being educated as to what is meant by totalitarianism. All too often they assume it is a political party in control of a country; they assume it is just another political force at work. It is not; it is more than that. It is a political force, a military force, an economic force, a social force, a human force—put in one package, mobilized, directed and

energized for the purpose of the leadership of a state.

Now, our Government is only part of America. Therefore, when the Government of the United States joins the issue with the Soviet Union, a totalitarian state, we have, so to speak, one arm strapped behind our back and one leg cut off. The Government of the United States alone cannot successfully compete with a totalitarian power. But the Government of the United States plus the voluntary organizations, plus every social and political institution that we have in America, cannot only compete but can win.

I say most respectfully to my friends who are in public service, the task of American Government today in the field of foreign policy is this: How do we, on the basis of individual participation and voluntary action, mobilize, energize, and utilize the great forces of freedom which are available in the American community? If we cannot find a way to mobilize those forces, we may well lose our struggle. By its nature, a democracy is a limited instrumentality of social organization. Therefore, when a free government is compelled to compete against the combined forces of a totalitarian state, where the literature, the music, the playgrounds, the household, the factory, the books—where everything is a part of a total state policy—a democratic government is in a weak competitive position.

#### CARE REPRESENTS TOTAL HUMAN MOBILIZATION

You can understand, therefore, that CARE, representative of 26 great voluntary organizations, is a fundamental adjunct to, and part of, the total mobilization of human resources so urgently needed in this country for the fulfillment of objectives of American foreign policy and the strengthening of the spirit of democracy.

This is why I am here today. I have been a teacher in school; I always mention that because I may need a job again. [Laughter.] From observation it is clear that many of our educators and leaders have done a poor job of teaching democracy, and a worse job explaining to the American people what is involved in totalitarianism. They have some idea that it is socialism; then they argue as to whether that is good or bad. They have some idea that it is atheism. Well, it is that, plus a kind of distorted socialism, plus all kinds of other things that represent power and brutality and organization and strict discipline. Until we American understand what we are really up against, we are going to be constantly fighting an uphill battle, utilizing fewer of our resources than we should for the objectives that we seek to attain.

#### VOLUNTARY AGENCIES MUST TEAM WITH GOVERNMENT

This situation leads me to say this: We can achieve more good in terms of human welfare, in terms of human betterment, in terms of emancipation of people from their fears, from disease, illiteracy, ignorance, frustration—by voluntary groups working in the field of social welfare and voluntary groups working with other peoples in other lands, than we can through government.

Now, both are needed, don't misunderstand me. This isn't either/or, this is "and." It includes both. It means a role to be served by government and a companion, supplemental, coordinate role to be served by the voluntary agency. But at all times the voluntary agency should be truly so. It must not be dominated by government. We must keep that liberalization, that emancipation from the rigidity of official governmental policy, which comes with voluntary organization. This means that we must have trust.

If State Department officials were here today, I would say, "Don't be suspicious of our voluntary agencies; if they don't do everything that you believe ought to be done

in the field of American policy, it's possible that you are wrong, not they." The odds are that the voluntary groups may be right. What is more, one of the great attributes of a democracy is the right of people to make mistakes and admit them. The trouble with Government is it hesitates or dislikes to admit mistakes, thus decreasing the democratic appeal of our actions and decisions.

One of the privileges of a free people is the right to start something, then decide to shift gears, to go some place else, and admit it.

#### FATE OF WORLD AT STAKE

So, my friends, there is a great role for organizations such as CARE to play. You are not engaged in something now that is just doing good; you are engaged, as you and I know, in a life-and-death struggle.

This is a one-game world series. I don't know how many innings it is going to go, but you do not have 4 chances out of 7 in this one. This isn't the New York Yankees versus the Milwaukee Braves—nor is this the Chicago White Sox versus the Brooklyn Dodgers. This is a one-game world series against forces of evil, of imperialism, of totalitarianism—and we either win or lose. How long it goes on only we can tell, by what we do each day. This is where CARE is important.

#### OPENING OUR HEARTS TO OTHERS' NEEDS

What does CARE, then, represent?

It represents self-help. This is good.

What else does it represent?

It represents compassion and charity by living application. There is something noble in being charitable. I have always said that between the platforms of Santa Claus and Scrooge, I will stick with jolly Santa. Any time anyone wants to run on that platform, they can count me in. I have no desire to be the richest man in the cemetery. I desire to use the good things that the good Lord gave me. I have never made a fetish to see how many dollars can be saved; I prefer to find out how many can be well invested, and for what purpose. Many people have saved and saved only to destroy themselves and their families; countries have done exactly the same thing.

I grew up at a time when this country closed its doors to immigrants, when it closed its mind to new ideas, closed its heart to the crying suffering of other people. Finally we ended up closing our factories, our businesses, and our banks, and almost destroying the whole temple of American democracy. I remember because that was the impressionable period of my life. From 1920 to 1933 I listened attentively to those who were then the spokesmen of American ideals, and their sense of idealism was only to save, to amass money, to guard it, to protect it—don't let anybody touch it, don't let anybody use it, and don't be too good to anybody. [Laughter.] In the process, they were among the first to suffer and the first to be destroyed.

I remember when bankers were jumping out of hotel windows faster than pheasants were depleted in our South Dakota cornfields. [Laughter.] I am not saying this to be unkind; I am saying it because it is true. I am the happiest man in the world to have since lived in a time when the Government of the United States has been criticized for being overgenerous, rather than for being a tightwad.

I am happy to have lived in a time when the American people have been asked again and again through the Community Chest, through the CARE program, through the Crusade for Freedom, through all the many programs sponsored by generous-minded citizens, to contribute and contribute and contribute. And interestingly enough, my good friends, look and see what has happened. The record reveals that as contributions to voluntary agencies grow larger, the economic index indicates the prosperity of

the country is that much better. Study it sometime, and see if I am not right.

You will find that when people show a spirit of generosity, of openness, of kindness, for some peculiar reason the country itself is in a better economic, political, and social state of health.

That is why I feel the way I do about politics, and that is why I feel the way I do about these great programs.

#### PRaise OF "CARE" FROM FOREIGN OFFICIALS

Now, what is CARE doing as I witnessed it? I saw CARE in operation, and I want to be specific now. In Italy, for example, I was told that our surplus food, much of it administered through CARE, had done more than anything else to defeat the forces of communism. I was told this by our present Ambassador there, by our economic minister there, and by the former Ambassador to Italy, Mrs. Luce. I have been told by three prominent officials that our food program did more to defeat communism in Italy than the Government of the United States had been able to accomplish through any of its other agencies of aid. I happen to think the forces of religion helped immeasurably too, but if you put those two together, that is what did it. Not our military assistance, not one bit. We need that, just as sometimes we may need to remove our appendix. It isn't something planned nor longed for; yet it sometimes is necessary. But constructive aid is preferable.

I was told in Greece, for example, that without our food program and particularly without our CARE program, Greece would be fighting for her life, despite all the military assistance we poured in, despite the hundreds of millions of dollars in grants we gave to Greece. I was told by the Prime Minister, the Foreign Minister, and the present American Ambassador to Greece, that our food program was the difference between success and failure in Greece.

#### FOOD SURPLUS—A GREAT ASSET

I have gone home to Minnesota to tell a few of our farm people about this, because too often they have been criticized for producing food. I want to say to my friends of the metropolitan press, farmers have been abused daily because they produce an abundance of food. Any country or government that doesn't know what to do with food is intellectually sterile and hopelessly lost.

Can you imagine what Bulganin and Khrushchev would be doing if they had the surpluses of food and fiber that we have? Can you imagine what those "Gold Dust Twins of Disaster and Despair" would be doing? They would be tying to the Soviet one country after another economically. Yet we go around crying about our food surplus as if it was the worst thing that ever happened to a free country.

Finally, in the last year and a half to two years, it has begun to penetrate the American mind—and I am not complaining only about public officials, I am talking about the whole American mind—it has become increasingly evident to Americans that possibly food may have something to do with acceptance of America abroad. Possibly food might be the vehicle through which we can bring about agreement on other policies.

Fellow Americans, if it were not for the American food provided India, that country would be fast on her way to a Communist society at this hour. American food is doing more to keep India a part of the Free World than all the arms of the United States. Without food, India today would be hopelessly lost to the Free World. I thank God for the CARE program and the work that it is doing. Thank God for the village help program. Thank God for the Ford Foundation program. Thanks for all of these wonderful things that are being done.

Let us bear in mind also that had it not been for the wheat provided Pakistan, that

Government could never have lasted. It is about time Americans were told these things. It isn't tanks or planes that keep Pakistan alive; not at all. In a crucial hour when Pakistan was in dire trouble politically, it was food that saved the day.

#### CARE'S AID NEEDED IN EGYPT

Our influence in Egypt for a period of time was made possible through CARE. CARE made it possible for Egyptian children to go to school, and the number of schoolchildren in Egypt today is directly related, my friends, to the number of CARE feedings that take place in schools in Egypt. Now, I am not one of those people who have been deluded by Colonel Nasser. I was suspect of him in the beginning, and I have less faith in him now. Nassers will come and go, but the 30 million Egyptians—and there will be 35 million in another 10 years—will be there just like the Nile River.

The question before you, fellow Americans, is what do you want these millions of Egyptians to think about the United States?

These Egyptian people are a force in the world. One of the most powerful forces in the world, as Chester Bowles said not long ago, is people. People, not H-bombs, because, fellow Americans, we don't dare to use and H-bomb and we know it. We know that the official policy of our Government is not to use these terrible weapons of destruction unless we are forced against the wall as a last effort for survival.

In the meantime, what happens when the forces of political attrition nibble away one country after another? What do we do? Did you ever figure that out?

Let me say there is no political policy we can design today which will appeal to Egypt because of the attitude of her leaders. But there is a social policy that can be designed which will appeal to the people back in the villages. There they will know that the food which comes into the mouths of their children is food from America. A message of goodwill is brought every hour of the day. That cannot be destroyed in Egypt any more than it could be destroyed in Poland, where people at the Posnan Fair said, "Thank God for America." That is our reservoir of goodwill. I submit, the Poles didn't say, "Thank God for America" because we were going to put a stockpile of atom weapons in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. I may think this is necessary, but I don't go around talking about it.

It is mighty nice to have some of the comforts of living, and people remember us best for the little things we do. It is like politics. Very seldom at home does a constituent get after me because of a vote I made in a major decision; he becomes distressed because his letters were not answered, or he was perhaps ignored at the county fair, or he just was not noticed on some occasion or another. That is what destroys his faith. These seem little things, but they really are not little; they have everything to do with one's attitude toward people.

I have known many an intellectual who is brilliant in terms of liberal idealism and yet doesn't like people and demonstrates it occasionally. When one doesn't like people and has no faith in them, then our actions usually reveal it, because it can't be covered up. It will come out sometime, and that's the day when a fellow gets into trouble; that's the beginning of difficulties which may well be destructive.

Now we Americans like people and we like them all over the world. We have a vehicle in CARE to demonstrate this neighborly feeling, not by word but by precept. I hope that our Government will reinstitute a feeding program; I say here as I have said before, we should continue to feed the people of Egypt as we do those in other parts of the world.

I hope our Government will recognize what was said before today, about the sale

of our surplus commodities under title I. Such sales are still needed, but donations under title III also have a unique role to play, and maybe a better role than title I sales.

I have heard people say, "What are we going to do with all this foreign currency received from food sales?" If you worry about the foreign currency being piled up, don't. It works; I used some of it on a recent trip myself. It bought things; I ate well with it; had no trouble at all. I know some Americans are lazy, and won't look around to see how they can use foreign currency. I say that respectfully. If any of us is really worrying about having too much foreign currency, why don't we divert more food into these great country-feeding programs? We not only deliver the food but receive in return a kindly attitude. We deliver a package with the spirit of America in it; the warm smile, the helpful hand. Maybe a little piece of literature can be added; but, most important of all, it shows we are interested, that we care.

You know, many people are lonesome. Most people want somebody to care for them. This is why a program such as CARE is so symbolic. It not only provides the material thing that is needed; it provides personal interest with it.

#### MY EXPERIENCE WITH A GREEK FAMILY

I saw this in Greece. There is a picture over on that table showing me taking a package to a family in Greece. I didn't know them; nobody else knew them. It wasn't a preselected family; the name was pulled right out of the file. There was no "fix."

We went down to a neighborhood in the suburbs of Athens. I was told that this was one of the heavy Communist districts. It so happened that a lady in Minneapolis had sent the money for that package, and I was asked to deliver it—a CARE package for a family, four children, husband and wife, and, I believe, the grandmother.

When I came into that house with the CARE representative, I will never forget the look on the faces of that family. First of all, there was the gentleman who had lost a leg in the civil war. He told me his total wage income was 60 cents a day. Their two little rooms were clean, and in them lived some clean-hearted people. I have been in houses—I won't call them homes—that were physically immaculate, but the people involved were slovenly of spirit. Here I found two little rooms clean, reasonably livable, and filled with warmth and human spirit.

When I presented this little package of food to the head of that household, he wept, not in shame but in gratitude. It was tough to take. I asked, "Who is this little lady behind me?" He said, "That's grandma." She came up and I talked with her. I told her about the fine Greek people in Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth. I visited with her so I could gain my composure, really. All she could do was smile; she was so grateful.

This man told me if it wasn't for the American food package they received about once every 7 or 8 weeks, he didn't know how they would be able to live.

#### LET'S NOT WASTE FOOD

When I think of what I have read in American newspapers about waste of food, I say every American ought to be ashamed that such waste occurs. Any American who is willing to permit even as much as one bushel of our wheat to be wasted is committing a sin. Whenever I hear an official of Government talk about how much it costs to store this grain I say, "Why don't you give it away, then it won't cost so much." It doesn't cost too much to store it right inside the stomachs of hungry people.

It often costs more when we don't act. If we are interested only in saving money, shall we take our children out of school?

Of course, it will be costly because they are going to remain ignorant. If we are interested only in saving money, shall we refrain from seeing the doctor? We may not live long, but we will save money.

I repeat, there is not a single thing that will not cost money. The amount that we spend on the total food program is insignificant compared to the total foreign policy and defense expenditures of our Government. It's significant, I think, how much we are given free in service from CARE, for example, and other voluntary organizations, and what an impact this makes upon people. This is the best spent money that we will ever spend.

Have you ever figured out how long we would have gotten along in Yugoslavia without food? Our military assistance for Yugoslavia may cause trouble. I am not sure; I have to rely on the President's judgment. I didn't vote in the Senate to give Tito arms because I think he's a great fellow; I don't. But I have been told by our Government that this is the way we operate our foreign policy, so I reconciled my doubts.

But I talked to a man from Yugoslavia last week. He came here to visit his brother who lives at Harrisburg, Pa. His brother had been in Yugoslavia several years ago. I went with his brother to the Yugoslavian Ambassador; I heard what his brother said to the Ambassador about Yugoslavia—the number of people that were in jail. I asked the man from Yugoslavia, "What is it that Americans have done, that you people in Yugoslavia know the most about and like the most?" I just asked him that without any briefing, he didn't know what I was after at all. And do you know what he said? "CARE. CARE. That's the greatest thing," he said, "that's America."

#### POWDERED MILK HELPS MORE THAN NEWS OF URANIUM

I found out in Greece, for example, that what they called CARE was America. Little fellows, the little ones that you see in the pictures over there, called CARE America. Was I ever proud when I found our American butter and dried milk in Greece. We have taken a lot of razzing from some people about producing too much milk. Well, I found that a pound of powdered milk will do us more good in some countries than a pound of uranium. People are afraid of uranium, and the fear of people can destroy the world. They love a glass of powdered milk, milk we and our children won't drink anyway because we want whole milk. But other people are eager for a pound of powdered milk. In Spain, where the National Catholic Welfare was administering the food relief program, I watched them mixing this powdered milk in little washing machines.

When I saw these children lined up and their mothers with liter jars, and when I heard what they had to say, I had two feelings: First, I was proud to be an American; second, I was ashamed that we Americans had sold millions of pounds of that powdered milk to feed our hogs. I ask any person in this room: Do you think you have a right to feed pigs wholesome, nutritious, powdered milk when you are unwilling to give it to hungry children in other countries? It might be well to ask the agencies of Government whether we are going to have very much powdered milk for feeding these countries in the days to come.

We have dairy farmers in my State who are having to sell their dairy herds that they worked 25 years to build. There is no market for their goods. Can you imagine that? We are closing down part of America's agricultural plant at the very time that we warn that we are in a life and death struggle; at the very time we insist we have to have more missiles, more this, and more that. I have a suspicion that that man Khrushchev wasn't kidding when he appeared on TV not long ago, when he said that it will be only a short

time before the Soviet Union will produce more products, both dairy products and cereal grains. And then he said, "Watch out"; they know what to do with it.

I saw what happened in Cairo, when we refused to sell wheat to the Egyptians. I saw the Soviet wheat they obtained instead, and I learned that in Port Said little Russian flags went up on refugees' tents. I believe our food ought to be used to help people.

In Israel the Prime Minister told me of the desperate need for food. What are we going to do to feed these people? Fortunately the Government of the United States gave them half of their requisition, but only half. There was a statement made here that a national policy is needed so CARE can plan its program further in advance. You cannot afford to set up missions and utilize your energies unless there is something with which to work. Public Law 480 ought to be extended, not 1 year, but a minimum of 3 years. I have asked every reasonable American with whom I have discussed this, "Do you think the surplus agricultural problem will be over in 1 year?" To a man they agreed it will not. Then I ask our Government why it wants only a 1-year extension of our surplus disposal legislation? How is it the administration can ask for 3 years for a loan fund to loan our money, yet shy away from planning more than a year ahead on use of food? How can our Government insist that food is not a vital part of our foreign policy?

Of course it is—and I hope that you will get behind the proposal for an extension of our present programs to more than 1 year; a part of that year is already gone.

May I add one other thing. I believe the gentlemen of the Congress should insist that our Government handle ocean freight negotiations so that CARE and other voluntary organizations should not be forced to argue like diplomats with the government of a recipient country on the details of the payment of ocean freight. We have experienced people in every one of our Embassies. They have the time to negotiate these matters that relate to ocean freight costs so our voluntary workers will not be involved in such activity.

I want to commend you for your plan to have two American CARE officials in each country. I believe that number is about right. The more of the native population that you can use, with some good American guidance, the better off we will be. This will prevent Formosa incidents.

Where our people have been ministering to health needs, to food and nutritional needs, to educational needs, where we confine ourselves to such services, we are not confronted with rioters who tear down our flag or mobs who tear up our files, beat up our representatives and attempt to banish us from their country.

#### FOREIGN COMMENDATIONS OF PUBLIC LAW 480

From my brief examination I can say that wherever CARE has gone or wherever our other great voluntary agencies have been at work, I have found a reservoir of good will that is far beyond and above the mistakes we make in policy. I have had heads of government say to me, "You Americans can clear up an abysmal and abominable situation; if you will just help us with food we will forgive you almost anything."

I found many Prime Ministers and their ministers of commerce and agriculture who knew all about our Public Law 480, the so-called surplus disposal law, officially called the Agricultural Trade Development Act. I found that these public officials of other countries knew more about our Public Law 480 than people living right here in the United States. They knew more about it than people in our Embassies. I went into office after office in Italy, Spain, Greece, Israel, and Lebanon. The officials I talked to had all the hearings and legislative debates laid out before them, and knew more

about Public Law 480 than most Members of the Congressional Committees on Agriculture who considered and approved the bill. When I compared the knowledge and information of these officials with the knowledge of our Embassy officers it was apparent that these boys are graduates and ours are just in kindergarten. They knew; to them it was the difference between life and death.

In Spain, for example, I had the minister of commerce tell me that never again as long as there was a Spain would his people ever be on such a low diet as they were before American food came. No government, dictatorial or otherwise could stand long under such conditions.

#### FOOD AS VITAL AS ARMS TO NATO

I heard the top military commander of our southern NATO forces, Admiral Briscoe, tell me that our food program is as vital to the success of NATO in southern Europe as are military supplies. He told me how little food supplies we had available in southern Europe, and that it might be nothing short of a military debacle if there were any hostilities. Yet we have food stored all over the United States. While Napoleon didn't know about rocket warfare and things of that kind, he did know enough about armies to say an army traveled on its stomach. He apparently didn't know about NATO. Recently, I had the opportunity to present these comments to the President.

#### THE LARGER SIGNIFICANCE OF CARE

Well, I could go on and on. This is my crusade. I want you to know that. I am more interested in this subject right now than almost anything that has ever touched my life. I believe that in this food program, going beyond what you do in CARE alone, there is an opportunity for the redesigning of a foreign policy with great potentialities. In the sale of our food we provide economic means for other countries. We momentarily ease the tension and the suffering. We develop new markets and habits. We carry with it a message of American generosity, kindness, and democracy, particularly when you tie in donations through voluntary agencies. We build new contacts. We touch the lives of many people and we reach the man in the street, so-called little people whose minds are still open, those whose spirits have yet to be fully roused.

So it is on that basis that I commend you. I appeal to the advertising council for help. While no one has asked me to do this I appeal to them to put this program at the top of the list. I know there are many important programs; there always are. There is nothing more important, however, than a realization of the great human suffering in the world and a program to alleviate human wants and needs. Toynebee called this "a revolution of rising expectations." He said people today just expect more, and no longer can the oldtimers of the Victorian Age say they are not going to get more because they are. People refuse to die quietly, my friends; they just won't cooperate. They just refuse to lie down and play dead, just because someone says "Don't make any noise. We haven't time to help you."

#### LET US ACT WITH BOLDNESS

People all over the world today are demanding a place in the sun, are asking for recognition, and, unhappily, some of these people believe the only way they can gain status is through the totalitarian method. Regrettably in a free country governments are timid. Most of the time, unless under duress and emergency, they lack courage. Where is there no timidity? In the people. Most Members of Congress are more timid than the people. There are some of us that aren't timid; I guess I qualify on occasion. But timidity is a characteristic of free government; courage and zeal to meet any emergency is a characteristic of a voluntary

agency. We must have that or I am afraid we might lose that one game world series I spoke about.

Congratulations to you all; to CARE, its officers, its contributors, its host of friends.

Thank you very much. It was a privilege to be here.

(Standing ovation.)

### Jerome K. Kuykendall

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1957

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Chairman Jerome K. Kuykendall to the Federal Power Commission is before the United States Senate for confirmation.

Chairman Kuykendall during his tenure of office as Chairman of the Federal Power Commission did absolutely nothing to protect the consumers' interest and devoted his entire time and effort to serving the vested interest that he was charged with regulating. He is unfit for any office, especially that which he seeks.

A number of very important charges were leveled at him during a hearing before the Senate committee which heard his case. These cases were included among others, and I will only summarize briefly:

First. The fact that he has traveled around the country at the expense of the oil and gas companies which he was charged with regulating.

Second. That he made misleading representations to Congress in 1954 when he declared that the now defunct Dixon-Yates power contract was fair and reasonable to the Government, and suppressed criticism of the contract by the Federal Power Commission's Bureau of Law.

Third. That he is consistently, constantly, and unflinchingly giving the gas companies precisely what they want in rate cases. Indeed, unless the claims of the gas companies were vigorously contested by the consuming interests he probably gave the gas companies whatever they wanted. In the recent matter of the Olin Transmission Corp., Mr. Kuykendall said, "Olin was a bit lucky here because I don't think their case was contested like it could have been."

Imagine entrusting the consumers' interest to a man of this sort, who thinks so little of the consumer that he makes an award to a gas company merely because the matter of consumer interest is not pressed vigorously enough.

Fourth. That he has permitted electric and natural-gas companies to use fast tax writeoff certificates as tax-free dividends to enrich supposedly regulated utilities and to gouge consumers.

Fifth. That he admitted in the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that he called secret meetings of representatives of the gas industry to draft the present natural-gas bill, and that he actively participated in that

endeavor, plainly aimed not at protection of consumers but rather at enrichment of the large natural-gas producers.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD a copy of a letter sent by me and four of my colleagues, the Honorable THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, the Honorable JOHN E. MOSS, the Honorable B. F. SISK, and the Honorable CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, detailing a still further reason why his appointment should not be confirmed, the opinion in the Catco case matter.

Mr. Speaker, I hope very sincerely that the Senate of the United States will not permit this tool of the vested interests to pass upon the consumers' problem and that his nomination will be denied confirmation by a resounding vote.

JULY 18, 1957.

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,

Chairman, Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Since several of the undersigned appeared to testify against the confirmation of Chairman Jerome K. Kuykendall of the Federal Power Commission, certain matters have come to our attention which we feel should be considered in connection with his confirmation. It is our feeling that these matters furnish additional grounds for withholding confirmation of Mr. Kuykendall to the Federal Power Commission for another 5-year term. It is our hope that you will include this letter in the record of the hearings.

Our opposition to Mr. Kuykendall's nomination is based on his disregard of, and lack of sympathy for, the obligations, duties, and responsibilities placed upon the Federal Power Commission by the Congress of the United States in committing to that Commission the preservation of the public interest in the development of the Nation's resources and the protection of consumers of electric energy and natural gas against exploitation at the hands of the electric and gas companies under the Federal Power Commission jurisdiction and control.

Mr. Kuykendall's disregard of, and lack of sympathy for, his obligations, duties, and responsibilities as a member of the Federal Power Commission is self-confessed. Testifying before the House of Representatives Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during hearings on H. R. 6790, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to deprive consumers of natural gas of effective protection against exorbitant gas rates, which bill Mr. Kuykendall enthusiastically endorses, Mr. Kuykendall was questioned about the Commission's recent decision in the Olin Gas Transmission Co. rate case. In that case the Commission granted Olin an increase in rates based in substantial part on an allowance of the field value of its own produced gas which exceeded Olin's actual cost of gas production by 100 percent. In excusing the windfall granted Olin and the very favorable disposition of other issues in favor of Olin, Mr. Kuykendall offered the incredible explanation that "Olin was a little bit lucky here because I doubt that their case was conducted like it could have been" by Olin's customers. If it had been contested more vigorously, he testified, "we might not have had substantial evidence to support a finding that this was warranted."

This is shocking testimony from a public official. Candid, to be sure, but nonetheless shocking and revealing. It reveals a callous disregard for his responsibilities which renders him totally unfit for the position to which he aspires and a fundamental failure to understand the Commission's proper function and the reason for its existence. Obviously, the Commission's responsibility to protect the consumers against excessive rates imposed upon the Commission by the

Federal Power and Natural Gas Acts does not vary with the degree of opposition that may prevail in a given case from the customers of the pipeline company and cannot be made to depend upon it. The Commission's obligation exists and persists in every proceeding, at every stage, in the same degree, regardless of the degree of participation of the customers. The Commission, which includes its expert staff of technicians and lawyers, owes its existence to the fact that consumers are unable to protect themselves adequately against the utilities that are well able to take care of themselves, having the resources and the wherewithal to retain experts to present the utilities' point of view. How can consumer interests be entrusted to him.

One might conclude from Mr. Kuykendall's testimony with reference to the Olin case that he welcomes and encourages intervention of customers. But this is not the fact, for under his leadership the Commission's attitude toward intervention has been much less liberal and in the courts the Commission has opposed review of its orders at the instance of consumer-intervenors on technical grounds more than it ever did prior to his leadership of the Commission.

There was a time when the Commission rarely objected to review of its orders on technical grounds. Rather, it welcomed review. Today, however, the reverse is the case and the major reversals suffered by the Commission in the courts when consumer interests have managed to overcome the technical obstacles and secured review of Commission orders explains the Commission's greater preoccupation in recent years with efforts to block court review by consumer interests.

There was also a time when review of Commission rate orders in the courts found the Commission and consumer interests defending the Commission's rate orders against attack by the regulated utilities. Today, however, review in the courts finds the Commission and the regulated utility standing shoulder to shoulder against the consumer interests which have had to invoke the aid of the courts to secure fulfillment of the Commission's responsibilities.

The Commission's dereliction of its responsibilities under Mr. Kuykendall's leadership has become so grave that it has produced the remarkable spectacle of a regulated utility protesting the Commission's failure to protect the consumers against exploitation and calling upon the court to "act as a guardian of the public interest." In a brief filed with the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, Mississippi River Fuel Corp. declared:

"In sum if the prices paid by a pipeline company to nonaffiliated producers are to be accepted as sufficient in themselves to form the basis for future decisions in determining the fair field, market, or commodity value of pipeline-produced gas for ratemaking purposes, the consuming public—represented here by Mississippi—is being deprived of even the minimum protection to which it is entitled under any criteria of ratemaking. An affirmation of the Commission's order and examiner's decision will put a stamp of approval upon a method affording a pipeline company self-regulation of the price of gas produced by it or an affiliate. The correction of this patent error is of crucial importance if an effective system of regulation is to be maintained."

"In this, it need only be pointed out that the Commission has a positive duty in this respect, a duty entrusted to it by the Congress under the Natural Gas Act. That duty is to protect the consumer interests against exploitation at the hands of private natural gas companies, or to protect consumers from excessive rates. That duty is not discharged by inaction of the type which counsel for

the Commission endeavors to explain in his brief.

"This is not the first time, even in recent years, that this court has been called upon to act as guardian of the public interest when this and other regulatory commissions have been derelict in their duties in carrying out Congressional mandates."

"Apparently, unless the Commission's functions are to fall into a condition of regulatory desuetude, this vigilance on the part of this court must continue. No better example of such a necessity can be found than in this case."

On July 8, 1957, the court of appeals vacated the Commission's order and remanded the case to the Commission for the performance of its duties. *Mississippi River Fuel Corp. v. Federal Power Commission*.

Mr. Kuykendall's leadership produced the recent unconditional surrender of the consumers to the mercy of the producers in the Catco certificate proceedings involving applications by four producers from which the proceeding derives its short name (Continental Oil Co., the Atlantic Refining Co., Tidewater Oil Co., and the Cities Service Production Co.) to sell a large block of gas from their leases off the coast of Louisiana to Tennessee Gas Transmission Co. at an initial price of 22.4 cents per thousand cubic feet until November 1, 1962, which thereafter would escalate by 2 cents per thousand cubic feet every 4 years until the contracts for sale expired.

First, by order issued April 22, 1957, the Commission said:

"\* \* \* The record shows that the 22.4-cent price is higher than Tennessee Gas is paying under any other contract. It is this price, with the provision for escalation, to which the interveners have made vigorous objections in exceptions to the presiding examiner's decision, which would grant a certificate without a rate condition attached to it. They contend that if the rate were allowed to stand it would establish a higher price plateau in a new area to the detriment of consumers.

"The record contains insufficient evidence or testimony, however, on which to base a finding that the public convenience and necessity requires the sale of these volumes of gas at the particular rate level here proposed. The importance of this issue in certifying this sale cannot easily be overemphasized. This is the largest reserve ever committed to one sale. This is the first sale from the newly developed offshore fields from which large proportions of future gas supplies will be taken. This is the highest price level at which the sale of gas to Tennessee Gas has been proposed.

"These factors make it abundantly evident that, in the public interest, this crucial sale should not be permanently certificated unless the rate level has been shown to be in the public interest. (See Cities Service Gas Co., Signal Oil & Gas Co., opinion No. 288, Nos. G-2569, G-2570 November 28, 1955, affirmed as *Signal Oil and Gas Co. v. F. P. C.* 238 F. 2d 771 (C. A. 3), certiorari denied 353 U. S. 923.)"

"The contracts between Catco and Tennessee Gas provide November 1, 1957, as the date for commencing service, and in order to comply with the leases and the Louisiana Shelflands Act, production should commence by 1958. To meet this schedule Tennessee Gas must build its underwater pipelines before the onset of the season of bad weather. In view of this total situation we are disposed at this time to grant temporary certificates to Catco for the sale of gas and to Tennessee Gas as requested by it for its proposed 107 miles of connecting pipelines. At the same time, we shall remand the Catco proceedings to the presiding examiner to determine at what rates the public

convenience and necessity requires these sales to be made if permanent certificates are to be granted to these companies upon final disposition of their applications."

This disposition of the case did not, however, satisfy the appetite of the producers. They threatened to cancel their contract for the sale of the gas unless the Commission issued a permanent certificate for the sale at the initial price of 22.4 cents per thousand cubic feet.

The Commission then yielded to the demand for a permanent certificate in its order issued May 20, 1957, but insisted that protection of the interests of consumers required that the producers agree to an initial price of 18 cents per thousand cubic feet, "the highest price presently being paid by Tennessee Gas for the purchase of any gas produced in the Southwest area." As a further concession to the producers, however, the Commission agreed in advance to permit the producers to file for an increase in that rate, even to the 22.4 cents per thousand cubic foot price, and to suspend the proposal for only 1 day although the Natural Gas Act provides for the suspension of a rate increase proposal for a period of 5 months in order to maintain the status quo while the Commission has some opportunity to investigate the reasonableness of the proposal.

This concession, of course, literally reduced to lip service the Commission's avowal of concern for the protection of the consumer interests. But even this was not enough for the producers. They demanded a permanent certificate with no strings attached. By order issued June 24, 1957 the Commission, therefore, abjectly surrendered its public responsibility and issued a permanent certificate at the initial price of 22.4 cents per thousand cubic feet, although it had previously loudly proclaimed, and the fact remained, that the evidence could not support a finding to support the issuance of a certificate on this basis.

This was too much for Commissioner Connole, who dissented. Protesting the abandonment of public responsibility he said:

"The record is plain that the controlling reason the parties refuse to submit their contracts to regulatory review in the manner found to be necessary in the public interest is their preference for a proceeding in which the burden would be on the Commission to establish that the rate was more than reasonable. They flatly refuse to submit to one in which the parties would be required to show only that the rate was required by the public convenience and necessity. No citation of authority or reference to regulatory theory is needed to demonstrate that the burden of showing the public convenience and necessity requires a proposed service at a particular price level is on the party seeking to take advantage of the proposed service and not on the tribunal before which the case is to be made. Under the unique conditions found here, the critical importance of that decision is indisputable."

"The decision of the majority is justifiable only by the evil consequences of the loss of these reserves to the particular pipeline which is a party to the contracts. Such evils would, in the opinion of the majority, exceed the gain to follow from the proof that the public convenience and necessity does not require the sale of this gas at proposed rates.

"In my opinion, the consequences of abandoning our position will be more serious than their effect on this particular sale. Whether by design or accident, the issues in this proceeding now transcend the close limits of the original hearing. At stake is the question whether the Commission should hold a position which it has determined is in the long run public interest, or whether it should abandon it when confronted with allegations

that short run injury to one segment of the industry and consumers might result. Where the issue is reduced to this simple statement, the answer is clear."

"As concerned as I am for Tennessee's customers, I am more concerned for the whole body of consumers on all transmission pipelines for whose protection we are responsible. And as deserving of preservation as I believe those particular orders to be, I believe the principle that Federal regulatory orders should not be changed by threats of abandoning public responsibility is even more important.

"On balance, and in view of the expansion of the issues beyond those originally contemplated by this docket, I believe it more important to the public interest to preserve the Commission's authority to make lawful and necessary orders than it is to preserve these contracts as written. The right to maintain valid orders against allegations of urgency, the importance to the consumer of the Signal Oil doctrine, and the right of all consumers for protection against unreasonable initial rates outweigh the potential damage to the consumers of Tennessee Gas Transmission which might flow from maintaining the position I urge here.

"While dissenting may appear to serve no useful purpose, the damage to consumer and to the public interest, to the regulatory process, and to the future of the interstate natural gas business as it is given me to discern it, would be such under the majority decision that, inevitable as that decision may appear to be, I am left no choice but to protest it by filing a dissenting vote."

It is true, of course, that Mr. Kuykendall's name does not appear on the final order issued Monday, June 24, 1957, since on that date he was no longer a member of the Commission, his term having expired the evening of June 21, 1957, the preceding Friday. He did, however, participate in the oral argument on June 12, 1957, and was in attendance at each of the series of Commission meetings from then through the meeting which took place on Friday, June 21, 1957, at 3 p. m., with the exception of the 10 a. m. meeting on June 19. The only other meeting at which he was not present during which the Commission could possibly have considered this Catco decision was on June 24, at which time the Commission made the formal vote on this last surrender to the big oil companies. It is interesting to note that on that date, June 24, the Commission met at 9:30 a. m. and at 11:30 a. m. the final form of the very lengthy order was not only completed but was approved and was mimeographed for distribution to the press and public. A long dissenting opinion by Commissioner Connole was also drafted, filed and reproduced. On the basis of these facts it appears reasonable that discussions of the Catco matter must have been held during this interim period in which Chairman Kuykendall was not only present according to the Commission's minutes, but most probably participated actively. It is also fair to infer that he must have played a part not only in the consideration by the Commission of the necessary preliminary drafts but in the acceptance of the Commission of the final form of this last giveaway of his term, which was so much in keeping with the tenor of his leadership in the previous two decisions of the Federal Power Commission on this same Catco matter, and in other similar giveaways such as Hells Canyon, Dixon-Yates, and the Olin case.

One may also fairly wonder, in the circumstances, why no order was forthcoming while he was still a member of the Commission. We respectfully suggest that the pendency of the hearings on his confirmation may have had something to do with it.

At any rate, Mr. Kuykendall should be compelled to justify his actions in these

specific cases which have arisen since the date of the formal hearing on his confirmation, and which so flagrantly constitute a complete, abject and dismal surrender of the consumer interest and the Commission's responsibility to the very people who are to be regulated by the Federal Power Commission.

These are but a few of the horrible examples. There are others. The record of Mr. Kuykendall's administration of the affairs of the Federal Power Commission during his term which has recently expired, in our opinion, shows his unfitness for continued service as a member of the Commission and we, therefore, urge that the committee disapprove his nomination.

Very sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,  
15th District of Michigan.

THADEUS M. MACHROWICZ,  
1st District of Michigan.

JOHN E. MOSS,  
3d District of California.

B. F. SISK,  
12th District of California.

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,  
4th District of Wisconsin.

## Drought Damage in Texas

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 13, 1957

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, at the hearing yesterday before the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, on a supplemental appropriation for rehabilitation of soil damaged by disaster, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] pointed out that tree rings in the Southwest showed that the recent drought in the Southwest was the worst in the last 600 years.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks before the subcommittee on soil damage in Texas caused by drought and floods be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR RALPH YARBOROUGH BEFORE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AUGUST 12, 1957

Chairman HAYDEN and members of the committee, Texas, in the last few years, has undergone two such opposite disasters as to be unique in memory.

The Texas farmer's plight might be compared to the man dying of thirst on a desert: The man, who has somehow managed to keep up his courage, has crawled across the hot sands and he finally sights a body of water. At the moment of his jubilation, a gigantic flood wave sweeps him down the channel to destruction.

The first disaster suffered by the Texas farmer was the worst drought in Texas history. This was a slow torture to the farmer. For 7 years, he would search the skies in hope of some cloud, even a small one. He watched his water tanks dry up and he knew he had no water for his cattle. He was forced to sell at any price. He watched his grass dry up. He planted his crops over and over. Each time the crops merely with-

ered in the parched, cracked land or failed to come up at all.

In a report prepared for President Eisenhower during his inspection of the drought areas last January, Dr. Tyrus R. Timm, head of the department of agricultural economics and sociology at Texas A. and M. College, said this was the worst drought in Texas history in terms of financial losses, necessary human adjustments, and deterioration of physical resources.

The United States Department of Agriculture classified 94 percent of the Texas counties (244 of the 254) as disaster counties. Large areas of the State did not have a single year of normal rainfall from 1950 to 1957. Many farmers on the high and rolling plains and Edwards Plateau prepared their land and planted seed 3 consecutive years without harvesting a crop. Many ranchmen in the same areas fed supplemental rations to their breeding herds almost the year round since 1951.

The carrying capacity of most of the rangeland was seriously depleted.

All 20 major rainfall-reporting stations in Texas during this period showed 20 to 77 percent below normal rainfall.

A study conducted on the Edwards Plateau of the files of 45 members of the Texas Production Credit Association showed that between the fall of 1950 and the spring of 1954 ranchmen lost 38 percent of their net worth.

Literally thousands of Texas farms and ranch people were forced to the wall. In Mills County, for example, 1,000 of the 6,000 farm people left agriculture. From 1951 to 1952, the movement from farms of 80,000 persons annually was considered normal. During 1953-54 Texans left their farms at an annual rate of 160,000.

By 1955 wind erosion and the heartbreak of economic collapse that goes with it, was only one of the consequences of the drought. When the crops failed for the second and third consecutive years, all protective stubble disappeared. Nothing was left to hold the loose, dry soil in place on these cultivated fields. The fields were ready to blow and did blow away.

The cattleman, the sheep raiser, the cotton and wheat farmer—in short, every person connected with agriculture—lost tremendous amounts of money.

And since agriculture is the backbone of the Texas economy, every person in Texas suffered.

Perhaps no one can estimate with any accuracy the untold amount of damage done by the drought. Responsible officials have said it was in the billions.

In late spring and early summer rain began to fall in Texas. At first the rain was greeted with prayers of thanks.

Unfortunately, the farmer's problem had just started.

Whereas the drought was slow torture, the floods which inundated great portions of Texas were sudden disaster.

In a period of 70 days, the total flood damage to crops, seeds, and labor was estimated by John C. White, Texas agricultural commissioner, as \$34,536,728. Permanent land and property damages from spring floods were approximately \$50 million.

We think it is interesting to note the fact that officials say the flood damage in Texas would have been \$106.3 million greater had it not been for a number of flood-control projects recently completed. The total cost of these projects was \$121 million. In other words, these projects almost paid for themselves in this 1 year.

One of the tragic results of the floods is this fact: despite the fantastic amount of water that fell, the rainfall was of the wrong kind for breaking the drought.

On July 30 of this year, Mr. Timm reports that economic drought scars are not erased by these floods. Furthermore, the lack of

rain and near-100 degree temperatures have accelerated the drought problem during the last 2 weeks. The situation could become very serious if rains fail to fall rather generally during August.

However, since the law under which this hearing is being held authorizes appropriations only for permanent damage to land, and does not cover crop loss or cattle loss or loss of buildings, I will now limit my statement to land damage.

Texas has had two separate areas of agricultural land qualifying for assistance under the supplemental appropriations act. One area qualifies under the wind erosion provisions and the other qualifies under the flood provision. It should be pointed out that the wind erosion damage was centered in the areas of the Edwards Plateau and the Rolling Plains of west Texas while the flood damage was sustained in north, central, and south Texas. For this reason there is no overlap in the acreage affected by the two types of disasters.

The Texas Department of Agriculture informs me that there are 1,971,849 acres of Texas land meeting the requirements of the act because of recent disastrous floods. At an anticipated assistance level of \$6 an acre this program would require appropriations of \$11,831,094.

In addition, the 7-year drought created a wind erosion conservation problem on 3 million acres of crop land and 300,000 acres of pastureland. This would require \$19,800,000 in appropriations for this wind erosion damage. This figure includes only the land damaged by erosion. It does not include the many millions of additional acres which have been severely damaged by the drought but which have not started to blow as yet. The State of Texas has 141 million acres of agricultural land and a great percentage of this acreage has sustained drought damage.

The total appropriations urgently needed to cover the types of damages clearly covered by the law to save the erosion and flooded land areas of Texas amounts to \$31,631,094.

## Tuna Import Regulation

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1957

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I have referred from time to time over the past several years to the increasingly difficult problems arising from the twin desires of increasing trade with Japan and keeping our tuna fishing industry not only alive but in a thriving, prosperous and growing condition.

I find it necessary to report that neither of these desires is being fully met under the present law and its administration. Once again the price of albacore to our fishermen has dropped, this time to a level lower than any time prior to World War II. The distress felt in the albacore fleet is keen and current. This is reflected in the number of vessels engaged in the albacore tuna fishery which this year has reached hardly a third the number which were engaged in that fishery so short a time as 6 years ago.

The purse seine fleet which makes the town of San Pedro and the port of Los Angeles a primary fishing port of the Nation has recently had the price for

its bluefin tuna catches reduced by another \$20 per ton from an already unprofitably low level. It was notified this past week by one of the major tuna canners that no yellowfin and skipjack tuna would be accepted by it for the indefinite future. The cumulative economic effect of these past 8 difficult years on that fleet is indicated by the fact that no new tuna purse seiner has been built in that length of time and whereas 125 purse seiners were engaged in the tuna fishery as short a time as 6 years ago, only 51 were so engaged this year.

The bait boat fleet which makes San Diego a primary fishing port of the Nation, normally provides 70 percent of the total annual domestic landings of tuna in the Nation, and provides a major part of the raw material for the great tuna canning industry of Terminal Island, has been affected even more seriously by the events of these last several years and even days. The fleet has decreased from 214 vessels to 153 in the past 6 years. Only nine new vessels have been constructed in that length of time, and the fleet now averages 12 years of age. At the present time 40 vessels containing 8,000 tons of frozen tuna in their holds are lying in San Diego Bay. For 2 months the vessels of this fleet have had to wait 20 to 30 days before they could unload their catches, and it is now apparent that these delays will stretch out to 40 to 60 days as the summer progresses. Prices are down a quarter from what they were even 3 years ago and it is evident that the present critical situation in the market will drive these already unprofitably low prices down yet further.

These adverse reactions from the steadily increasing flow of tuna imports, primarily from Japan, have been aggravated substantially by the general inflation which has been taking place in our domestic economy and which has had the effect of steadily increasing the cost per ton of production by our domestic fishermen and boat owners.

While the distress in all branches of our domestic tuna fishing industry has been increasingly painful and sharp it should not be thought that this has resulted in absolute peace and prosperity in the Japanese tuna fishing industry. The contrary has been the case.

Certainly one of the objectives of our country's foreign trade policy as it affects our ally Japan, is to increase her dollar earnings in this country. While the volume of tuna imported from Japan has continued to increase steadily, the actual dollar earnings by Japan from its tuna exports to the United States has trended downward steadily for these past 3 years. Obviously this part of our trade policy is not working well.

This has been reflected by major adverse movements in different branches of the Japanese tuna industry. In 1955, the Japanese canners were forced to dump a considerable amount of canned tuna on the world market at less than their cost of production. In 1956 the Japanese frozen tuna exporters were forced to dump about 14,000 tons of frozen albacore on this market at about \$100 per ton less than their cost of production. This action produced such distress in the Japanese industry that the

Japanese Government has been brought to making basic changes in its legislation governing the tuna export trade.

This year the price received by the Japanese albacore fishermen has been a little less than half what it was the year before and the distress which has been felt in turn by the Japanese tuna canner, and then by the Japanese frozen tuna exporter, has now been transmitted to the Japanese fisherman.

It must not be thought that the two governments have avoided cognizance of these problems. The Japanese Government has from time to time over these several years established check prices and voluntary quotas over the various tuna commodities in its export trade in an effort to mitigate or eliminate the gyrations of price and volume which afflict this trade. These steps have been unavailing. The political forces arising from the various branches of the Japanese tuna industry and the economic forces arising from the interaction of the several tuna commodities upon each other's markets in this highly competitive trade have been too great to give these programs of the Japanese Government sufficient permanence or strength to meet the problems.

In 1955 the crisis was so bad in the United States tuna fishing industry that the White House established a task force composed of the Departments of State, Commerce, Interior, Labor, Treasury, and Defense to examine into the problem and make recommendations for its alleviation. The study was completed and a number of recommendations short of import controls were made.

The domestic tuna industry actively followed up each of these recommendations during the remainder of that year and during early 1956. All of the recommendations were found to lead into blind alleys and one of the reasons for this was found to be a lack of authority and direction within the executive to implement the recommendations. As a direct outgrowth of this discovery a number of us who are particularly interested in the welfare of the domestic fisheries introduced legislation designed to establish a policy for the domestic fisheries and to provide an agency in the executive competent to implement the policy. As a result the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 was enacted into law and the carrying out of these functions in the executive have been undergoing the reorganization prescribed by that law for the past year.

Beneficial results have already begun to flow from this new legislation to several branches of the domestic fishing industry and it would appear that it will turn out to be a milestone in the Nation's handling of its commercial fishing problems. But that law has not prevented a continued sharp deterioration in the tuna trade for the reason that the troubles of the tuna trade arise from basic anomalies in the treatment of tuna commodities under the tariff act and under the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act.

Having seen all other recourses exhausted over these past several years to bring our tuna fishing industry to a

healthy condition and to regularize our tuna trade with Japan in a manner beneficial to both nations I have drafted and introduced legislation that will strike at the heart of the matter by amending the Tariff Act of 1930 and by directing the President to take certain actions under the authority given to him by the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act.

What the bill will do may be described as follows:

First. Section 2 (a) provides that the importation of all tuna in whatever form—canned, frozen, discs, loins, or whatever—shall be limited to 200 million pounds per year when converted to a round weight basis, or 35 percent of the average of the apparent annual consumption of tuna in the United States, whichever may be the larger quantity.

The actual situation for the past 2 years, and it appears likely for this year too, has been that the total amount of tuna imported into the United States when converted to a round weight basis, has varied between 200 million and 207 million pounds per year. The apparent annual consumption of tuna in the United States last year, when converted to a round weight basis, was between 620 million to 640 million pounds. Accordingly 200 million pounds of imports would be about 30 percent to 31 percent of the apparent annual consumption of tuna. However, the consumption of canned tuna in the United States has been increasing steadily and when an average is struck over the past 5 years 200 million pounds will be found to be about 35 percent of the apparent annual consumption during that period.

Thus this bill does not intend to reduce the imports of tuna from Japan or from other countries as to actual volume. It accepts the status quo with respect to volume.

Nor does this bill attempt to restrict the share of the domestic tuna market that is now enjoyed by the foreign producers. Since the market for canned tuna has consistently increased over the past 20 years at a rapid rate, and is predicted by competent authorities likely to continue to so increase for the indefinite future, the effect of this bill will be to permit the foreign producers of tuna to continue to send in approximately the same volume of tuna that they now do, and as the market in this country increases the actual volume which the foreign producers can send in will increase so long as it does not exceed 35 percent of the total market.

What this section of the bill does do to aid our domestic fishing industry is to guarantee to it 65 percent of this market and permit it to plan for a stable future. In view of the wide spreading penetration of Japanese tuna fishing vessels under the sponsorship of the Japanese Government into the eastern Pacific, the Caribbean, the Atlantic, as well as throughout the tropical and subtropical Pacific and Indian oceans, this absolute safeguard is required by our industry.

Second. Section 2 (b) defines terms used in the act.

Third. Because of the numerous tuna commodities that enter world trade, and their varied treatment under our trade

law and in trade agreements, it is necessary to deal with them in two groups—those commodities that are not cooked or canned and those commodities which are so prepared and preserved.

Section 3 (a) of this bill deals with the former category. Principally affected is frozen tuna in the round but also affected are frozen tuna which have, in the parlance of the trade, been gilled and gutted, and also fish which have been filleted and frozen but not advanced so far in their manufacture as to be cooked. This section provides three levels of treatment for this class of tuna commodities:

a. Up to a limit of 50 million pounds per year, or 5 percent of apparent annual consumption whichever is the larger, these commodities will be in a duty-free status.

The reasons for this provision are various. In the first instance there is a small quantity of tuna produced by several Latin American neighbor countries for the United States market. The quantities are not large either severally or together and the cost of production is such that these imports on a duty-free basis do not create disturbances in this market. The practical effect of this provision will be to provide for the growth of these small fishing industries in our neighboring countries or at least to place no impediment upon that growth.

In the second instance there are small tuna canneries on the east, west and gulf coasts of the United States too far distant from the center of domestic tuna production to be able to rely upon it for their raw material and which rely wholly upon imported frozen tuna. The net effect of their operations do not materially disturb the domestic market. The practical effect of this provision will be to assure them a continuance of their foreign source of supply or at least not interfere with it.

In the third instance the product of the domestic albacore fishery has not been sufficient in the last few years, because of the distressed economic condition of the industry, to provide all of the raw material required by the United States market for this sort of canned tuna. This provision, taken together with the provision instructing the Secretary of the Treasury to provide individual quotas for the different species of tuna on a historic basis within this duty-free quota, will protect our albacore fishermen from sudden surges of cheap albacore into their market, while protecting our small canner's source of raw material and providing an adequate volume of this sort of tuna for the market.

b. Up to a limit of 140 million pounds per year, including the 50 million pounds of duty-free frozen albacore provided for above, or 15 percent of the average apparent annual consumption of tuna in the United States whichever is the larger, frozen tuna shall bear a duty of 3 cents per pound.

This is approximately the amount of frozen tuna which has been imported in each of the past 2 years and is anticipated this year. Since this rate of duty will not be prohibitive the present volume of frozen tuna being imported will not be lessened. However, the provision

of this duty will protect the price received by our domestic tuna fishermen and raise it somewhat above its presently depressed low level. This is the only way in which the domestic tuna fishery can be headed in the direction of becoming the vigorous growing industry it once was.

c. Any frozen tuna above 140 million pounds per year, or 15 percent of apparent annual consumption, whichever is the larger, will bear a duty of 6 cents per pound. This rate of duty is intended to be prohibitive and in the generality of years will be so. Only when there is an abnormal glut of tuna abroad will it be not prohibitive.

The intent of this provision is to throw the other 60 million pounds of tuna provided for under section 2 of the bill into the cooked or canned form of imports. Since this is approximately the level and proportion of these forms that have been imported in recent years the effect of this provision will, like other provisions of the bill, be to stabilize the market, protect the status quo situation and provide for the rational growth of the market, the domestic industry and the import trade alike.

Fourth. At the present time there are four tuna commodities imported in the cooked or canned form. Three of these are products that have arisen not from the natural demand of the market but have been developed to take advantage of loopholes in the tariff law. Three of the four commodities bear different duties and are involved in different trade agreements.

Tuna canned in oil bears a duty of 35 percent ad valorem under the trade agreement with Japan.

Cooked frozen loin tuna and tuna discs bear a duty of 1 cent per pound under the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade by reason of coming within a basket category in the tariff act.

Tuna canned other than in oil bears a duty of 12½ percent ad valorem under the trade agreement with Japan.

The confused situation of the tariff treatments of this class of tuna commodities, and the generation of these three artificial tuna commodities, by the tariff act itself, has been one of the most important factors in keeping the United States tuna market continually disturbed and in inducing a distressed condition in the domestic tuna fisheries.

The function of section 3 (b) of the present bill is to establish a definite uniform tariff base for all cooked and canned tuna commodities at the duty rate now paid on the primary commodity in this category, tuna canned in oil, which is 35-percent ad valorem. While this section will not alter the tariff rate on the principal tuna commodity in the United States market it will contribute in a major manner to stabilizing the canned tuna market in the United States protecting the earning power of tuna imports, and providing for the prosperity of the domestic tuna industry.

Fifth. Section 4 (a) provides for the entry into effect of various provisions of the bill.

Sixth. Section 4 (b) provides that no duty imposed by these amendments shall

be collected in violation of any international obligation of the United States and directs the President to renegotiate any international obligations necessary to carry out the purposes of the act.

Mr. Speaker, our domestic tuna fishermen are in a critical stage of distress. This is harmful to the economy of these west coast port cities. The effect of this is to create disturbance in our friendly relations with our good ally, Japan. The earning power of Japanese tuna exports to this country is declining, and the trade in tuna is an important part of Japan's dollar-earning capacity. The tuna industry in Japan is not much less disturbed by these factors than is our own domestic industry. I am hopeful that the bill which I have introduced will go a long way toward mending the basic causes of these difficulties. I am mindful that there can be no positive action on this bill until we reconvene in 1958. In the intervening months, however, the appropriate executive agencies can provide the necessary technical studies upon which appropriate changes in the proposed bill might be based. I am informed that the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries of the Department of the Interior is already well advanced on such studies and that the United States Tariff Commission is about to engage in bringing up to date its studies on this complex subject.

I have also been mindful that there are different views in the different branches of the domestic industry as to how these matters may best be handled. I am hopeful that those several interests may be able to use this bill as a basis for composing any differences that may so exist among themselves during the months of the summer recess.

If these several lines of actions can be advanced by the executive agencies and the industries, Mr. Speaker, I should hope that the Congress would be in a position to enact legislation of this nature next year that would be at once beneficial to our domestic economy, our foreign trade, and improved understanding in our foreign relations.

### Dispelling the Economic Fog

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1957

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, it is estimated for the year 1957 that the total value and production of goods and services of the United States will reach an alltime high, of about \$450 billion.

Since this great expansion of business, increased wealth and prosperity has made it possible to employ 67 million people at the highest wages on record, it would seem that the millions of men and women throughout the Nation who invest their capital in business enterprises, and the leaders of business as well, ought to be shown greater appreciation by the people generally, and by the Members of

Congress, than has been shown in the last few years.

Mr. Speaker, I make this statement because groups and organizations have developed in our country which, through false publicity and propaganda, constantly try to deceive the people and prejudice them against business leaders—both large and small.

Those most active in making such accusations of exorbitant profits made by business are largely followers of the ADA political group, and in addition most of the so-called liberals and the Socialist-fringe crowd. They, and their organized groups, constantly quote the volume of gross profits made by corporations, but they never tell the public about the small net profit remaining with which to pay the stockholders and to continue the business that furnishes the employment—in fact the intent of this repeated propaganda and misstatements is to deceive the great bulk of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, may I illustrate my point by referring to the recent rise in the price of steel? The price of steel went up on August 3, 1956, when the United States Steel Corp., after holding out 34 days against a strike—at the loss of millions of dollars—finally had to agree to a 3-year labor contract, which would give their employees about 21 cents an hour wage increase each year. When August of this year came, steel had to raise its prices because of this 21 cents an hour increase in the cost of labor.

An investigation has recently been conducted in the other body by the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, which has had the United States Steel officials before it, trying to determine why it was necessary to raise steel prices.

It seems obvious that any corporation, or an individual businessman, who had been forced to sign a contract to raise the wages of his employees 21 cents an hour each year, for 3 years, would most likely be compelled to raise the price of the product sold in order to remain in business.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to give some real facts: The records show that from 1940 through 1956, United States Steel's employment cost per employee-hour went up 250 percent while the materials they had to buy, all their taxes and other costs rose 315 percent. United States Steel's cost per employee-hour rose 284 percent over this period of time.

In contrast, United States Steel held down the price of finished steel mill products, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, to an increase of only 138 percent. The difference between the total cost and the increase in price was absorbed by United States Steel over the years through greater efficiency and operation, and at the expense of billions of dollars in modernization and improvement of its facilities, and partly, too, by lower profits.

Mr. Speaker, it might surprise you to learn that United States Steel Corp., emerging from the depression in 1940, made a profit of 9½ cents on each dollar of sales; that last year their profit on dollar sales was 8⅔ cents.

In 1956, United States Steel had left for reimbursement in the business 4⅓

cents of the sales dollar, and paid out 4 cents of each sales dollar in dividends.

Mr. Speaker, now the same propaganda has been put out about the enormous profits made by the International Harvester Corp., John Deere, and other concerns manufacturing farm implements.

Let me illustrate by quoting from International Harvester's annual report to stockholders in 1956:

Each dollar gross receipts of a total of \$1,270,275,000 was distributed as follows:

For cost of materials, supplies, and other expenses, 56 $\frac{1}{10}$  cents.

For wages, salaries, social-security taxes, and employee plans, 35 $\frac{1}{2}$  cents.

For taxes, Federal, State, local (excludes social security), 3 $\frac{3}{10}$  cents.

Dividends to shareholders, 2 $\frac{1}{10}$  cents.

Retained for use in the business, 1 $\frac{3}{10}$  cents.

Mr. Speaker, you will note that the dividends going to the shareholders who furnish the investment to keep this great production going, with hundreds of thousands of people employed, only received 2 $\frac{1}{10}$  cents out of each dollar of receipts and, in addition to that, stockholders must pay Federal income taxes on dividends received.

You will further note that the company was able to hold out only 1 $\frac{3}{10}$  cents, which they retained for use in the business for the coming year.

Mr. Speaker, about the same ratio applies to Allis-Chalmers, John Deere, and other manufacturers of farm equipment.

Now, the so-called liberals, leftwingers, and Socialist fringe, among the people and in the Congress, make the same charges about the exorbitant profits of General Motors.

Mr. Speaker, they never tell the people that all of the large corporations are taxed about 52 percent of their net earnings. They don't reveal that General Motors on a \$10,910,000,000 gross business netted last year only 7 $\frac{3}{4}$  cents profit on each gross dollar of sale. They do not tell that 5 $\frac{1}{4}$  cents was paid out of these net profits to their over one-half million stockholders in dividends, who finance the corporation and make possible employment for over one-half million people.

Mr. Speaker, they do not tell the public that the General Motors Corp. out of that gross dollar of sales retained for facilities and working capital only 2 $\frac{1}{2}$  cents of every sales dollar.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not speaking for business by reason of the fact that I own stock in these corporations; in fact I must confess I own no stock in any of them. I am making these statements because the private-enterprise system has helped to make this the most powerful Nation in the world, supplying the finest equipment in every line in the world, and furnishing employment for 67 million people who have the highest standard of living and the highest wages of any people in the world.

Mr. Speaker, in my humble way I am trying to shed the light of truth and justice on the businessmen of the Nation in the hope of giving such facts as will penetrate, and maybe partially dispel the fog of misrepresentation and the false statements that are directed against the business interests of our country.

## Looking Back and Looking Ahead at Jamestown

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1957

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of a significant address delivered by our colleague, the Honorable WATKINS M. ABBITT, on the occasion of the Appomattox Area Day, at Jamestown, Va., August 5, 1957.

The address follows:

It is a great privilege and high honor for me to be here today to participate in the celebration of the 350th anniversary of the establishment of the first permanent English settlement in America.

I am sure that many of us fail to realize or to appreciate the significance of that occasion. It is hard for us to visualize what it has meant to the development of the Anglo-Saxon civilization. Here were planted the first seeds of the greatest Republic ever to exist in the world. They could have hardly begun under a greater disadvantage. At that time, there was considerable rivalry for the settlement of the New World. Spain and Portugal had been allotted this New World territory by Pope Alexander VI in 1493, with the western coast of North America going to Spain. Spain subsequently protected her claim by establishing settlements in Florida. She had also attempted to establish colonies in Virginia but it was a complete failure.

It was in this historical context that the British began to establish rival colonies of their own in North America. The British, being mostly Protestants, considered it important that Protestantism, preferably the Protestantism of the church of England, should gain a foothold in America. Historians also agree that economic motives were important in the settling of Jamestown. I think we can agree today that the determination to establish an English colony in the New World sprang from religious and economic motives.

In the early 1600's there were hard times in England. Many people were out of work. There were many young sons of nobility who had no title, had no trade, and were without means of livelihood. There were also many people of substantial means who desired to establish in the New World a colony with which the mother country could trade, where its young people could go to find opportunity as well as to spread the Christian religion.

It was under this atmosphere that private individuals banded together in 1606 and secured from King James a charter authorizing the company known as the Virginia Company of London to establish colonies in North America in the area lying between the present locations of Philadelphia and Wilmington, N. C. Finances of the enterprise were entirely the responsibility of the investors and not the Government.

While the colony was at the outset under strong royal control, the original impetus and the responsibility of its success came from private enterprise. In other words, the establishment of the colony was not being undertaken by the Government but rather it was being carried on by those great individuals in England who had dreams of a great future for the mother country by establishing in the New World Colonies which would permit the expansion of trade and religion on the part of England.

I am sure that they had no idea of the great future in store for civilization as a result of their efforts at colonization. Their motives, however, were inspired by patriotism, piety, and profit.

We are all familiar in a general way with the details of the settlement of Jamestown, the hardships, the perils, and the disappointments encountered by the settlers. We are familiar also with the fact that gradually those settlers who were able to survive overcame and conquered the hardships and slowly expanded the colony, with the help of new arrivals, into a permanent, self-sustaining territory. A new trail was being blazed and there was no past experience to point the way.

Little did these first settlers and their immediate successors realize the trail that they were actually blazing.

Here in this colony was nurtured and born the spark of liberty and freedom. The first trial by jury in America was held at Jamestown soon after the first settlers landed. The accused was Capt. John Smith who had been put under arrest on a charge of attempted mutiny before the colonists had landed. Smith's enemies among the Jamestown authorities had planned to return him to England, at the time of his accusation, for trial but Smith demanded his rights under the Magna Carta and demanded a trial by his peers. On June 20, 1607, the trial was held and the jury acquitted Smith. We see that from its very inception, the colonists were determined to protect the freedoms and privileges of the individuals so far as they could under the existing circumstances.

The settlers of Jamestown naturally brought with them their own British traditional notions of government and law. In addition, they were far removed from the seat of government and it made them yearn for self-government, liberty of action and recognition of the dignity of the individual. We are familiar with the fact that here in this little colony at Jamestown was established in 1619 the first representative legislative body in the Western World and the first General Assembly of Virginia consisting of the governor, the council and the house of burgesses. From then on until the Colonies were freed from England at the close of the Revolutionary War there was a constant struggle between the Colonies on one side and the Crown on the other. The Colonies struggling to secure freedom and the Crown to compel obedience to its will including taxation without representation. We will not attempt to go into the great struggle for freedom and the hardships overcome by the Colonies in establishing this great Nation of ours. Suffice it to say, our forebears came here and carved out of the wilderness a great Nation. They had to fight every step of the way. There was a constant uphill battle against tyranny, oppression and the desire on the part of the mother country to extract part of its livelihood from its Colonies. Our great Nation has come a long way since 1607. Since those brave, courageous and hardy settlers set foot on this sacred spot, much has been done to achieve freedom and liberty for the people of the great Nation.

First, our freedom was obtained from England. It was done at the cost of great sacrifices in life and material wealth. Patriots fought, bled and died that men might be free, that individual liberty could be had in this country. We had the Declaration of Independence given us as the pole star to guide this little country in its fight for freedom.

Following that, great statesmen and scholars of that time produced the Constitution of the United States, the greatest document ever conceived by man. It guaranteed to the people their liberties and freedoms. It guaranteed to the States their sovereignty. All of this flows from that little

seed planted in this hallowed spot by those settlers 350 years ago. Our Nation, from then until now, has grown into the mightiest Nation on earth. We have the greatest civilization ever known to mankind. We live in a land of plenty.

The National Government under the Constitution started out to be the servant of the people. It was so created and it was never intended that the people would be the servant and vassal of the Government.

It is time now that we pause, take stock, and ascertain in which direction we are now headed and try to determine where we will land if we continue our present course.

In the past few years, the Government has grown so fast and become so large that the people are in grave danger of losing control over it. We have created a huge Frankenstein monster whose power, if allowed to continue to grow, will gobble up its creators. Our people have been so busy accumulating material wealth and trying to get advantages from the Government that they have failed to realize how big our Government has become and how dangerously close we are to losing the birthright and heritage that has been ours for generations. We are raising up a generation who is being taught to look to the Government for their needs, desires, and wants rather than to rely upon their own individual ingenuity and self-help.

Our people must realize that there is no such thing as Federal handouts. The Federal Government cannot give us anything until they have first extracted it from the people. The people never give up their liberty but under some delusion. Many of our people have been deluded into believing that the Federal Government can solve all of their problems without cost to the taxpayers and can carry their burdens and obligations on its shoulders without cost. Nothing is further from the truth but so many people believe in this philosophy that our Government has gone a long way toward a centralized, all-powerful dictatorship. This trend must be stopped in the foreseeable future if we are to retain our republican form of government and preserve the rights and freedoms of our people.

We fail to realize this country was founded on private enterprise. It has become great because of individual initiative, determination and hard work on the part of citizens who have not in the past depended upon the Government to look after their wants, needs and desires. We have remained free because the people were willing to do for themselves, to work hard to get ahead, and had a determination to remain free.

There are some in this country today, and their number is not small, who are determined to nationalize, federalize, and socialize this country of ours from one end to the other. They desire to make of this great Nation a socialistic, welfare state. The time is at hand when the people of America must choose up sides. They must make a determination as to which course we shall pursue. This is an opportune occasion for the people to rededicate themselves to the cause of liberty, freedom and the concept of Government held by the Founding Fathers of this great Nation. Many of our people do not begin to comprehend or realize that a great battle is raging throughout the Nation today. Insidious forces are at work endeavoring to weaken, to break down, to change our form of government, and to wreck our way of life as we know it. They desire to concentrate all authority in the National Government. They are making an all-out effort to put the purse strings of the Nation directly under the control of the Federal bureaucracy.

Our people and the Nation as a whole fail to see the significance or importance of this conflict. They do not believe that a conspiracy is afoot against the rights and privileges of our people and the sovereignty of our

States. What we are fighting today is not just a recent movement or a small operation. It has been building up for years and years. It has behind it some of the most wicked forces presently inhabiting this earth. The battle has become of such momentous importance, the stakes so high, and the outcome so vital, that I shudder to think what will happen to our people if we lose the conflict. Make no mistake, our very way of life is at stake.

The creeping socialistic invasion of State and local power by the Federal Government must be stopped before it turns this Nation into an all out socialistic welfare state. The hour is already late and unless our people awaken and realize the seriousness of the situation, we will soon see our way of life taken from us and the liberties and freedoms that were wrought out for us by our forebears devoured by the octopus-like Federal Government that we have allowed to be established.

In the very recent past, we have seen the judicial arm of the Federal Government attempt to strike down the customs, habits, mores, and traditions of our people by usurpation of authority that they never had, authority that was specifically retained by our Founding Fathers for the people themselves and the individual sovereign States.

That was just one of many such incidents when the judicial branch of the Federal Government has, by usurpation of power and authority, attempted to amend by judicial decree the Constitution and by judicial fiat write into legislation the personal, political philosophy of the individual members of the Court. This same Court is gradually taking over the legislative and executive functions of the Government.

It is interesting to note that only last week the members of the American Bar Association held their annual meeting in England. While there, the members of the bar association, including members of the Federal judiciary, dedicated a memorial to the Magna Carta, that great instrument which 2,000 English patriots wrested from arrogant, truculent King John in the year 1215. This instrument has been hailed by many historians as the first statement and source of many human freedoms in English civilization. It was the first solid achievement in the struggle for liberty in the English speaking countries.

I pray that the judicial branch of the Federal Government will stop digging the grave and erecting a tombstone over the liberties and freedoms of the individuals and the sovereignty of our States. I say to you in all candor that this is being done step by step and will be carried through unless the citizens of this great Nation arise to the occasion, fight off this octopus-like arm of the Federal Government and demand a return to the concepts of constitutional government where the dignity of the individual is recognized, the sovereignty of our States preserved, and the private-enterprise system continued.

It is indeed discouraging to observe that the spirit of self-reliance so dominant among our early leaders is becoming more difficult to find today. It is alarming to note that principle is being sacrificed too often for the sake of political expediency. The lure of a welfare state has caused many to surrender their liberties. Many of our people forget the duties and obligations they owe as citizens of this great country of ours. It is so easy to look for security rather than to stand upon principle.

Apparently, there are those in the Congress and executive branch of the Government who have joined hands with the judicial branch in an effort to take from our people the liberties and freedoms guaranteed them under the Constitution.

I have reference to the so-called civil rights legislation now pending before the United States Senate. This legislation is the

most obnoxious, evil, liberty destroying proposal that has been before the Congress in our time. It strikes at the very heart of the liberties and freedoms of our people and the sovereignty of our States. It is an attempt to strike down with one stroke of the legislative pen the theory of our very form of government itself.

This legislation is intended to deprive the people of this great country of many fundamental rights that our forefathers guaranteed to them by the ratification of the Constitution.

The legislation, as passed by the House of Representatives, strikes down the right of trial by jury. It does away with the sovereignty of our States. It takes from our individuals their right to be tried in the local courts. It sets up a small Gestapo under the direction of an Assistant Attorney General who will be the political hatchetman of the administration in power. It allows our people to be dragged from the four corners of our country and brought before an agent of the Federal Government without a formal charge being placed against them and without knowing who instigated the investigation. If enacted into law, it will be the beginning of the end of our very way of life and of democracy itself in this great country of ours.

This legislation is intended to establish law by injunction. It permits the Attorney General to make of the local Federal judge the administrator, the prosecutor and the executor of the functions of the States and localities, particularly the operation of the schools, transportation system and other public recreation activities.

These are but some of the evils of this legislation. The most shocking part of it all, however, was the part played by a large segment of the press and other news media in keeping from the people the true facts about the so-called civil rights legislation. Large segments of the press, radio and television commentators failed and refused to give the public information and news dealing with the civil rights legislation.

Now the iron curtain of the news media has finally been broken down and the northern press is carrying the true facts about this iniquitous legislation. As a result of the long debates, the people at last are becoming aware of the evils that are contained in this legislation. I have hopes that when the people awaken to the dangers confronting them they will rise up and demand that this legislation be killed.

I realize what a dreary picture for the future of our Nation has been painted in what I have had to say but I say to you, in my opinion, it has been a true picture. America is at the crossroads. Our people are on trial today. It is for them to say whether or not we will measure up to the principles and heritage that that little band of settlers and their predecessors wrought out for us. The only hope is for a rededication on the part of the American people to the concepts and precepts of fundamental constitutional government. There must be a determination on the part of our people to keep this country on a solid foundation of private enterprise, and individual freedom.

I have great faith in the American people. I believe that when they become aware of the consequences facing us they will measure up to the high standards set by those who have gone on before and will clean up the temple and steer our ship of state back on its right course.

We must preserve liberty and freedom in this country. We must see that State sovereignty is respected and maintained. We must instill in the younger generation that the least governed are the best governed and that there is no such thing as something for nothing. This we must do and shall do or else we will have lost what this great Republic has gained in the years gone by.

**Address of United States Senator Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at the Annual Convention of the American Legion, Department of Pennsylvania, at Harrisburg, Pa., August 10, 1957**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**

**HON. JAMES G. FULTON**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, August 13, 1957

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, Senator EDWARD MARTIN on Saturday morning, August 10, 1957, delivered an address before the American Legion convention in Harrisburg, Pa., which I believe to be an important statement on the economic health of the United States. Senator MARTIN speaks of the sound policies that are necessary for the healthy, vigorous growth of our country in order that our national prosperity will continue and grow.

Both as a longtime friend as well as a Pennsylvania colleague of Senator MARTIN, it is a pleasure to insert this tribute to the ability and sincerity of our senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

ADDRESS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT HARRISBURG, PA., AUGUST 10, 1957

Your many invitations to speak at your annual conventions help the morale of an old soldier more than these humble words of mine can express.

I sincerely appreciate the honor of addressing you, because the Legion has done so much to advance patriotic Americanism and to build the material, spiritual, and cultural strength of the United States. You have fought bravely and intelligently for all things American. You have battled courageously against all things un-American.

Over the years I have talked to you on many subjects. Today, I would like to bring to your attention the financial situation of our Government and its relation to the welfare of our people. This may not arouse much enthusiasm, but basically it is one of the most important problems confronting our country.

Before taking up what some may consider a dry financial discussion, let us look back with pride at the background of the United States.

The history of America is a glorious story. It tells of toll, sacrifice, and heroism. It tells of victory produced by a people whose hearts and minds were aflame with the spirit of liberty and independence.

It tells of those courageous patriots who met in Philadelphia more than 180 years ago, and pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, to establish a new nation. For the first time in all the world, government recognized the divine origin of man's inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

For the first time a government was based upon the sound principle that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Upon that foundation, in less than 200 years, a savage wilderness has been transformed into the most powerful nation of the earth, with the highest spiritual and cultural level ever attained by any similar area in the world.

We surpass every other nation in industrial and agricultural production but regard-

less of our great national wealth we are confronted by grave problems.

Our most serious internal danger is the depreciation of the purchasing power of the dollar.

Yes, my fellow Americans, I want to impress upon you that inflation is the No. 1 danger to our country. If allowed to continue it can destroy our system of government. Recent world events have demonstrated beyond all doubt that inflation is a direct threat to freedom.

It has the power to crush any economy upon which it fastens its grip. The record of history proves that more great nations have been overthrown by inflation than by invading armies.

I have every respect for the economist who can discuss inflation from the technical standpoint and can support his conclusions with charts and statistics. His expert knowledge has great value but you don't have to be an expert to know that no matter how fat your pay envelope may be, the thing that really counts is how much you can buy with your dollars.

Let me give you the figures on how much the dollar has depreciated in value.

In 1939 the dollar was worth a little more than 100 cents in purchasing power. Inflationary pressure during World War II forced the value of the dollar down to 78 cents. The decline continued during the postwar years and at the beginning of 1953 the dollar represented only 52 cents in purchasing power. For a time it appeared that the value of the dollar had been stabilized at that point and for the next 3 years remained practically unchanged. However, in 1956 the downward trend was resumed and the value of the dollar sank gradually month after month, going down from 51.5 cents in June 1956 to 49.8 in April of this year.

This is an alarming situation. If the downward trend is not checked the healthy, vigorous growth of our country cannot be maintained and our prosperity will become a thing of the past.

When the dollar loses its purchasing power, it damages all with fixed incomes. The person who lives on a pension, social security, or interest on savings cannot escape the evils of inflation. There are now in the United States more than 16½ million on social security, corporations, and Government retirement, veterans pensions, veterans survivors benefits, and military retirement pay.

Values built over a lifetime, or even over generations, are reduced or wiped out by inflation. Those damaged by inflation include the more than 125 million savers in the United States, the shareholders in corporations, owners of life insurance policies and savings accounts. Men and women paying into social security make up another great list of savers whose benefits are reduced by inflation.

I turn now to some of the causes of the inflationary pressures that have been building up over the years.

First, I would point to big government as one of the primary causes. This includes excessive Government spending, deficit financing, a staggering burden of debt, printing press money and unsound fiscal policies. There has been so much expansion of government that more than 7 million are now employed at the three levels, Federal, State, and local. They are not producers and the total payroll puts into circulation nearly \$40 billion dollars a year.

Second, increased labor costs with a corresponding rise in the cost of production. When higher wages bring an increase in productivity there is no danger. But this has not been the case here in the United States in recent years. Inflation results when production does not keep pace with rising wages.

Third, too much use of borrowed money in the expansion of business and purchases by government, corporations, and individuals, particularly money borrowed from banks.

An official Department of Commerce report issued on May 27, shows that the American people, at the end of last year, owed a total of more than \$800 billion in gross private and public debt. This is an average of about \$4,700 for every man, woman, and child in the Nation.

Net State and local government debt has increased from \$13½ billion in 1945 to \$42.7 billion at the end of 1956.

Net corporate debt went up from \$93½ billion in 1946 to \$208 billion at the end of 1956.

People have been buying out of tomorrow's pay checks. At the end of 1945 they owed less than \$6 billion. In 1956 this figure had increased to \$42 billion.

Fourth, experience has shown that there is no limit to human desire for goods and services, but there is a limit to the means by which these desires can be satisfied.

We must remember that even though we are the richest Nation on earth there is a limit to our resources. Therefore, when government attempts to carry out competitive political promises, many of them made by demagogues, and undertakes to supply the wants of groups and individuals, the cost is likely to exceed available revenues. In that event, government resorts to deficit financing. Increased debt and more inflationary pressure are the natural consequence.

How can inflation be curbed?

It can be done by drastic governmental controls over wages and prices. Americans do not want such governmental controls. We want a free economy, because the great strength of our Nation is our system of free competitive enterprise. If it collapses our entire structure will fall.

Living standards here in the United States are the highest in the world because American productivity has been advanced to the highest level in the world. Production is the golden key to prosperity. We cannot have great industrial production if we have restrictive legislation or controls enforced by administrative directives.

It can be done by voluntary restraints on the part of the people, by reducing individual spending and by building up savings accounts and other forms of savings. But that method has never been effective.

It can be done by tough credit restraints and higher interest rates to make borrowing more difficult. This is not very palatable as far as the American people are concerned but it is one of the best ways of curbing inflation.

It can be done by raising taxes so high that it would control a boom. We will not accept that plan. Taxes are too high now. Tax cuts are not inflationary, if accompanied by reductions in Government expenditures.

Many feel that the objective of full employment is inflationary. It has been suggested that wage and price increases, when more than one State is concerned, should be subject to national approval.

Politicians want to avoid brutal methods like high interest rates, curbing appropriations, and increasing taxes. Such actions are always unpopular. Too often the politician takes the easy way, without regard for the dangers that lie ahead.

The curbing of inflation is a job for all of us because in the United States, we the people are the Government.

The Federal Reserve Board by restricting the expansion of credit has done much to check inflation. This restrictive action has been accompanied by rising interest rates and many now contend this is one of the reasons for the high cost of government. However, the curbing of inflation in defense spending alone has saved us an amount greater than the increased cost of interest to

the Federal Government. The stand of the Federal Reserve Board has been criticized but it has rendered a great service to the Nation.

Why has government become so expensive? One reason is that Federal and State Governments are financing a great variety of activities that formerly were the responsibility of local government and depended upon the self-reliance and initiative of the people in their home communities.

As an example let me cite the big increase in so-called grants-in-aid from Washington to the States. In the early twenties \$100 million a year in Federal funds were paid in grants to the States. This has now increased to \$4 billion.

Here is another fact. One American out of five—men, women, and children—gets a check at regular intervals from Uncle Sam.

Another illustration of the increase in the cost of government is that the Federal Government proposes to spend \$14 billion a year for welfare projects compared with \$4 billion 10 years ago.

While we must all work for a sound and solvent America, we must not forget the dangers of Red propaganda. We have found that large quantities of Communist propaganda has been received by embassies and other so-called diplomatic representatives of the Soviet and that this material has been distributed throughout the United States.

Recently there was broadcast into millions of American homes an example of Communist propaganda more flagrant than anything ever before attempted.

It was a brazen attempt to convince American listeners that Soviet Russia has no evil designs against the free nations of the world. We were told that the Russian dictators seek only friendship and peaceful coexistence.

Yes, my fellow Americans, the Communist boss talked peace but real Americans were not fooled. The record denies their words.

Their fundamental objectives have not changed. They have not abandoned their unholy ambition to destroy all human freedom.

Those of you who heard that broadcast will recall the prediction that the grandchildren of Americans living today will live under a socialistic system.

That was a grim warning. It must not be ignored. It calls upon us to be constantly alert to the dangers of Communist influence here at home. We must fight disloyalty with every weapon at our command, and if our laws are not strong enough, they should be made stronger.

We can have a strong and prosperous America if we work for four important objectives:

1. Labor must be gainfully employed at wage scales adequate to maintain the American standard of living.
2. The farmer must have a profitable market for his product.
3. The investor in industry must have a fair return on his investment.
4. The dollar must be stabilized.

In every age in America we have looked forward. We have looked forward with a mixture of courage and doubt. Each one of us has fought his own battle. Many of us have lost. Some have won. The great majority have had both defeats and victories. But, in every generation, courage in the United States has prevailed.

Personally, I feel that America today has the same courage that caused our forefathers to move ahead. They did not have it easy. We will not have it easy. We must always fight for the stability of our currency; for the improvement of living conditions; for our up-building, morally and spiritually.

The early settlers in the New World, facing the hardship of a vast and unknown wilderness, had one thing in common—an ardent faith in God.

Let us emulate their example.

As militant, God-fearing believers in American ideals, let us fill our more than 300,000 churches, cathedrals, synagogues, and temples in the United States, 165 of them built before 1776.

Let us wage a war for complete loyalty by all living in the United States to the principles for which a million Americans died on battlefields within our borders and in foreign lands.

Let us live by the motto "In God We Trust"; and if that trust is deep enough, America will survive every attack.

### Let's Save the Old War-State-Navy Building

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1957

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith a letter of protest I have written to Mr. Robert V. Fleming, Chairman of the Presidential Advisory Commission on Office Space, in the matter of the Commission's recommendation that the War-State-Navy Building be razed. My letter and the material referred to in the letter follows:

AUGUST 9, 1957.

Mr. ROBERT V. FLEMING,  
Chairman, Presidential Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space, General Services Administration Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FLEMING: It is with much regret that I read the recommendations of the Presidential Advisory Commission on Office Space to tear down the old War-State-Navy Building and erect upon the site a modern, functional building.

Frankly, I cannot understand the lack of appreciation of traditional value that this exemplifies. There are very few buildings left of this architectural design, which represents a very definite period in the building of America. Some call it the Grant era, others remind us that it really has a French second empire style. Comparable buildings are considered to be the Luxembourg Palace, the Louvre in Paris, and in our own country, Philadelphia's City Hall.

Passing it the other evening I was struck with a sense of its beauty that I had not before appreciated. Why in the world should we want to destroy everything that sings our history, to reduce ourselves to a monotonous modernity, I cannot understand.

The \$6 million it would cost to destroy the building might certainly be well used for cleaning it and altering the interior to a more useful arrangement of the rooms.

I protest, as strongly as it is possible for one person to do, what I consider ruthless destruction of one of the most perfect examples of French Renaissance architecture in the United States. Tied in as it is with our history, how can we give consideration to its destruction.

Attached is a collection of quotations from published material regarding the building which, while not organized in article form, do describe the building's beauty, utility, and architectural significance.

Hoping that the Commission may find it possible to reconsider their recommendations on this matter, and with all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

FRANCES P. BOLTON.

#### QUOTATIONS FROM PUBLISHED MATERIAL REGARDING THE PRESERVATION OF THE STATE-WAR-NAVY BUILDING

A. B. Mullett's \$12 million design was described as "an almost perfect specimen of architecture \* \* \* the interior has been constructed in a very magnificent and yet entirely substantial manner." As the Federal Government grew, the War and Navy Departments moved to buildings of their own, the State Department remained here until after World War II.

American mansard was considered the perfect style to express the dignity of Government at every level. The United States Post Office, the State university, the county courthouse, the city hall, and the township hall—all were crowned with mansard roofs and often had towers with mansards of their own. For some years A. B. Mullett, supervising architect of the United States Treasury Department, held a virtual monopoly on the design of major Federal buildings; he preferred the French Renaissance manner with row upon row of pillars and columns. The mansard roof itself took many shapes, its slope could be straight, or concave, or convex, or both combined in an S-curve. The dormer windows might be rectangular or pointed and gabled or round-like port-holes. Some large roofs even featured a double row of dormers, one above the other.

The massive 5-story building, containing 566 rooms leading off 2 miles of corridors, stands at 17th and Pennsylvania Avenue, as a tomb or a monument to an architectural phase—depending on the architect one talks to.

Admirers laud the structure, fathered by Treasury Architect A. B. Mullett, as a worthy remembrance of times past. The opulent structure, French second empire in style, is a reflection of American interest in 17th century French architecture.

The columns, pilasters, pavilions, pediments, and rusticated basement are harmoniously assembled into a careful piece of architectural design. Comparable buildings are the Luxembourg Palace and Louvre in Paris and the Philadelphia City Hall.

The porch block constitutes a central pavilion that is articulated; that is, it gives an indication of what's inside. The porches are emphasized by superimposed orders of columns, with the first three stories being Doric style and the fourth, Ionic. The porches narrow as they ascend.

Each vertical strip of windows, from ground floor to top, reflects the subtlety of design that avoids dullness. Over each window in the strip is a different pediment or eyebrow—curved, segmental, triangular, and so forth.

The paired pilasters or flat strips at the corners give the feeling of strength to the building. They are a variation from free-standing columns.

Each facade has receding and projecting planes to break up the surface and avoid monotony. The high rusticated (in grooves) basement, for example, offers a variation.

Some way must be found to make the present old War-State-Navy Building more useful. It would be a discredit to our foresight to replace this important architectural example with a new building which would be contemporary for another few years.

Many people also question the appropriateness of the classic marble buildings on Constitution Avenue, with their own share of cluttering columns, but none considers demolishing any of these.

Why then tear down one of the really interesting buildings in the city, to replace it with something that will sink into its surroundings better?

Contrast contributes much to the character of Washington, and buildings such as the old

State and the Smithsonian serve to throw the White House and the Mall into sharper relief.

Let us have a sense of tradition, and even of humor. Let us keep Washington from becoming a monotony of modern efficiency. Save this wonderful period piece.

This building is classed by Henry Russell Hitchcock, of the Architectural Historians Society, as one of the two most important 19th century structures standing in the Federal City. The other is the Treasury Building.

Three most interesting and beautiful buildings in Washington stand side by side: State-War-Navy, White House, and Treasury. All the more interesting and beautiful because each is different.

All that the fine old State-War-Navy Building needs is a good scrubbing to restore it to its original classic beauty.

This beautiful building of French Renaissance, which so long housed our State, War, and Navy Departments, would be the pride of any other capital city in the world. The mere mention of its destruction is enough to make our great statesmen, generals, and admirals, who occupied it, cry out from the grave in protest.

At the recent convention here of the American Institute of Architects, many of its most distinguished members, including Ralph T. Walker, of New York, who received the institute's "special centennial medal," strongly opposed the contemplated destruction of what is, perhaps, the finest building of its type in the United States, and a landmark in Washington since it was completed in 1888.

It is a striking commentary upon today's inflationary market that it would cost nearly as much to tear this building down in 1957 as it cost to build it in 1875-88, the price then being \$10,038,482.42.

While taste has changed since its erection when it was considered the finest building in Washington, it is still just as impressive in design and scale as it was then, and its granite steps and columns and details are unblemished by 80 years of weather. With its superposed orders and mansard roofs and towers, it is a monumental example of Second French Empire architecture, simplified to suit the hard stone.

Its ample, ornate corridors and curved, cantilevered staircases are impressive. Its offices are spacious with high ceilings and decorative cornices and window embrasures. All appears in perfect repair.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 14, 1957

The Senate met, in executive session, at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Rev. William W. Fendleton, priest in charge of St. John's Episcopal Church, Centreville, Va., and Christ Episcopal Church, Chantilly, Va., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious God, we humbly beseech Thee, as for the people of these United States in general, so especially for their Senate, now assembled: That Thou wouldst be pleased to direct and prosper all their consultations, to the advancement of Thy glory, the good of Thy church, the safety, honor, and welfare of Thy people, that all things may be so ordered and settled by their endeavors, upon the best and surest foundations, that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety, may be estab-

### A PLACE FOR PRESIDENTS TO WORK—COST: \$32 MILLION

A plan is afoot to change and enlarge the White House.

The goal is to give the President enough office space, for the first time in more than 100 years.

Ike backs this plan. But there's opposition, too. A Washington landmark would have to go.

It is going to cost at least \$32.8 million to give future Presidents the space they need to house their staffs.

That simple figure offers an idea of the size to which the job of being President has grown. It is a figure arrived at by a special Commission—including Members of Congress—that just completed a study of the White House.

This amount, the Commission says, would provide offices outside the White House big enough to meet needs for Presidential offices for at least the next 50 years. The new construction, the Commission adds, can be done in a way to preserve and enhance the traditional appearance of the President's home.

Details of the Commission's plan were first reported in the March 8 issue of U. S. News & World Report.

Today, President Eisenhower's staff of about 1,500 people is jammed into cramped offices in the east and west wings of the White House, and in the 70-year-old State, War, and Navy Building, across the street from the west wing.

Arrangements are "outmoded, overcrowded, inefficient," according to the study Commission's report.

#### STANDING ROOM ONLY

The President's staff secretary shares one room with four other people. The appointments secretary's office is too small to hold enough chairs for visitors; some must stand while they wait. Mr. Eisenhower's press secretary has a news ticker in a washroom. Desks and files and stacks of documents are scattered through corridors, the basement, the attic.

It's a situation that has been getting worse and worse since 1800 when the White House was first occupied. All early improvements, the Commission notes, were made "without any consideration" of the President's office needs.

When original offices on the first floor became too crowded, some activities were moved up to the second floor. Cabinet meetings also were transferred to the second floor, close to the President's study. As years passed,

secretaries, officials, and visitors who had to see the President increased—and privacy of the President's living quarters declined.

By 1902, the situation was so bad that President Theodore Roosevelt, unable to get support for a plan to create permanent office space, built a temporary office west of the Executive Mansion.

Now, 55 years later, the temporary office is known as the west wing. It was completely rebuilt in 1934, by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. An east wing also gobbled up for offices, was added in 1942.

In 1946, President Harry S. Truman tried to enlarge the west wing to relieve congestion, but Congress impounded the money after protests mounted.

Mr. Truman then took over the State, War, and Navy Building, renaming it the Executive Office Building. Some thought that that solved the space problem, yet in 10 years it has become more acute than ever.

In the Study Commission's view, for 157 years the problem of giving the President office space has always been dodged, never faced. Only makeshift improvements have been made. Meanwhile, elsewhere in the Government, great office buildings such as the Pentagon were being put up for all the other departments and agencies—which take orders from the President.

A permanent cure? Heart of the Commission's plan is to tear down the old State, War, and Navy Building and replace it with a modern structure three or four stories high and in keeping in size and character with the White House.

In the White House itself, the west wing offices would be torn out and replaced with spacious living quarters for visiting dignitaries. The east wing would be made over to include an entrance for large social functions; an art gallery and museum. But outward appearance of the White House would be little changed.

The opposition. Proposed destruction of Old State has created opposition to the Commission's plan. To some, the venerable building is an architectural monstrosity. To others, however, including the powerful Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas, it is a historical edifice worth preserving.

The man who lives with the White House space problem, President Eisenhower, is sentimental about Old State, too—but, for the comfort and efficiency of future Presidents, he is backing any solution that will get more office room and preserve the White House as a home for Presidents and a shrine for all Americans.

lished among us for all generations. These and all other necessities, for them, for us, and Thy whole church, we humbly beg in the name and mediation of Jesus Christ, our Lord. And now may the grace of God Almighty, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, be amongst you and remain with you always. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, August 13, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on yesterday, by error, I requested that the Armed Services Committee be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today. I was in error; I thought today would be Thursday. I now renew the request, and ask that the Armed Services Committee be permitted to sit on Thursday, during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the following committee and subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Committee on the Judiciary, until 12 o'clock meridian.

The Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.