

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. Con. Res. 285. Concurrent resolution favoring the acceleration of civilian construction programs for which appropriations have been made; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. Con. Res. 286. Concurrent resolution favoring the acceleration of military construction programs for which appropriations have been made; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. Res. 500. Resolution authorizing the expenses of the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration created by House Resolution 496; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mrs. BLITCH:

H. R. 11236. A bill for the relief of Arthur G. Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 11237. A bill for the relief of Androula G. Kyriacou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 11238. A bill for the relief of Primetta Galli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 11239. A bill for the relief of James F. Moran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 11240. A bill for the relief of John Andrew; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON of New York:

H. R. 11241. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Antonie Maass; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENDEL:

H. R. 11242. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Gangemi, his wife Maria Scavo Gangemi, and their two children, Agata Gangemi and Giovanna Gangemi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### Use of Senate Caucus Room

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have received from the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration a letter report on the incident which involved the use of the Senate caucus room for a press conference a week ago Wednesday. I ask unanimous consent that this report be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of the Senate and the country.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON RULES  
AND ADMINISTRATION,  
March 3, 1958.

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: Pursuant to the discussion which recently transpired on the Senate floor in connection with the use of the Senate caucus room by Mr. Walter Reuther for a press conference last Wednesday, I have obtained signed statements from the Superintendent of the Senate Press Gallery and the Superintendent of the Senate Office Building and transmit copies herewith. These enclosures substantially confirm, I believe, the factual account of the incident given to the Senate, on the following day, by Senator HUMPHREY. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 27, 1958, pp. 3023-3024.)

It is of course not the practice or policy of the Committee on Rules and Administration or of any Member or employee of the Senate to permit the use of rooms in the Senate Office Building for formal private press conferences. To the extent that the event involving Mr. Reuther was accompanied by some advance announcement, the incident was unique and isolated. I am reliably informed, however, that it is the frequent habit of our accredited newspapermen to interview Senators and other prominent persons and participants, in various rooms and corridors of the Senate Office Building, during intermissions and after recesses of committee hearings. As long as we enjoy freedom of the press and its concomitant priv-

ileges, that custom of the press is one I think no Senator would willingly proscribe.

Reverting again to the situation of last Wednesday, the circumstances under which the location of the Reuther conference was changed from the press room to the caucus room in the Senate Office Building are set forth in the attached statements. It seems hardly necessary to add that an original request for the use of the Senate caucus room for a private press conference of the representative of a commercial organization of any kind would be summarily denied.

It is the firm general rule that space assigned to the Senate will not be utilized for activities disassociated from a Senate committee or a sponsoring Senator. In the supervision of this rule, there may be an occasional difference of opinion as to the pertinency or propriety of a particular request for assignment of the caucus room, or any other Senate facility. The Committee on Rules and Administration exercises its best discretion to grant no request likely to be dissonant with the desires of the Senate or the public interest. Individual sponsoring Senators and Senate committees are necessarily accountable for activities indulged during the periods of the temporary assignments made to them. Generally speaking, I believe this accountability has been circumspect.

I hope this letter will sufficiently answer the inquiries initiated by the interview, on February 26, 1958, of Mr. Walter Reuther by members of the press in the Senate caucus room. If you or my colleagues believe broader inquiry is necessary, please let me know. Whether or not you decide to insert this letter and its enclosures into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or otherwise make them public, I leave to your sound good judgment.

With warmest regards to you, as always.

Yours sincerely,

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,  
Chairman.

P. S.—I am sending a carbon copy of this letter to Senator KNOWLAND for his information.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
PRESS GALLERIES,  
Washington, February 27, 1958.

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,  
Chairman, Rules and Administration  
Committee, Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENNINGS: Upon my return Wednesday, February 26, at 11:40 a. m., from the White House press conference, I was informed by several members of the Senate Press Gallery that Mr. Walter Reuther had scheduled a press conference to be held in the pressroom of the Senate Office Building at 1:00 p. m. that day. This press conference was not cleared through me or any member of my staff.

As you probably know, there were 8 or 10 committee hearings in the Senate Office Building on that day, and the pressroom was a very busy place. Quite a number of newspapermen asked me not to permit this press conference to be held in the pressroom where some of them were typing or dictating stories.

After an unsuccessful attempt to reach Mr. Reuther's press assistant, in an effort to cancel the press conference, I went to the pressroom at 12:30 p. m. to see his press representative, who arrived at about 10 minutes to 1. I informed him that the press conference could not be held in the pressroom.

There were 75 or 80 newsmen in or around the pressroom at that time, and some of them suggested that the press conference be held in the hall or some committee room. I told them that any use of a committee room, or even the hall, would have to be cleared through the custodian's office or by an official connected with the committee now using the room.

My assistant, Don Womack, telephoned the custodian's office and requested permission to use the caucus room for this purpose. He also telephoned someone connected with the Select Committee on Labor Activities for their permission, which was also granted; in order to accommodate the press.

I gave no instructions to the police on the door of the caucus room to bar Senators or any Senate official from the room, only tourists.

Thank you for the opportunity of explaining how this happened.

Yours very truly,

JOSEPH E. WILLS,  
Superintendent, Senate Press Gallery.

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
SENATE OFFICE BUILDING,  
February 27, 1958.

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,  
Chairman, Committee on Rules and  
Administration, United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENNINGS: At approximately 12:30 p. m. yesterday someone called this office. The phone was answered by Harry Clarke, service officer.

The caller stated that he had read on the teletype that a press conference was to be held in the caucus room at 1 p. m. for Walter Reuther. The caller wanted to know how Mr. Reuther obtained the room and permission to use it. The unidentified caller was told by Mr. Clarke that we knew nothing about the conference. I found out last night that the call came from the office of Senator GOLDWATER.

At approximately 12:45 yesterday Don C. Womack, Assistant Superintendent of the Senate Press Gallery, called this office. Mr.

Harold Brannon, service officer, received the call. Mr. Womack asked if he could use the caucus room in the Senate Office Building for a press conference for Walter Reuther. Mr. Brannon told Mr. Womack that the room was assigned for the day to the Select Committee on Labor Management, and that he would have to have the permission of that committee.

Mr. Womack called back a few minutes later and stated that he had contacted Mrs. Ruth Watt, clerk of the committee, and that she stated it was all right for them to use the room. Mr. Brannon asked Mr. Womack if he wanted the room unlocked, and Mr. Womack stated that he was already in the room.

Sincerely yours,

J. LEWEY CARAWAY,  
Superintendent.

### Start of the New Deal

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago the New Deal was born when Franklin D. Roosevelt became President of the United States.

We remember those days as a time when our country was literally flat on its back, when commerce and industry had come to a standstill and unemployment was of such vast proportions as to constitute a national calamity.

We did not have television in those days to enable those of us living away from Washington to watch the historic moment when Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes and the President-elect raised their right hands for the swearing in ceremony at the Capitol.

But all of us who could were glued to radios around the country, listening to the ceremony and to the stirring, masterful inaugural address of the man who was to lead our country out of the wilderness of despair into a new day of happiness and prosperity for the American people.

Twenty-five years is a short period of time as history is measured. For all of us who remember those days of 1933, it was one of the most dramatic moments of our lifetimes, and one we shall never forget. We tend to forget, however, that to millions of Americans born shortly before then or after 1933, including many who are now voters, the depression of 1929-33 might have been generations ago—something completely remote from them.

Yet we know that the prosperity we have enjoyed in these last two decades could never have occurred if the President who was inaugurated on March 4, 1933, was not determined to end poverty and misery in our midst and was not also determined to act with speed and with wisdom and courage in meeting the problems of depression.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt earned a place in our history among the greatest leaders our country has ever

had. And he earned a place in the hearts of the American people that few men have ever matched.

To the extent that we have prospered in this country in the last 25 years—and compared to depression days, today's recession is mild, indeed—we can be thankful for the great leadership and the great humanitarianism demonstrated by one of our greatest Presidents.

To the extent that we are now suffering economic dislocation, which is truly tragic for millions of Americans made jobless by present conditions, I think we can honestly say that we can point to failure on the part of our present national leaders to recognize the danger and to act against it—failure to follow the example set by Franklin D. Roosevelt in launching the New Deal and restoring America's spirit.

#### Propaganda Advertising Not Tax Deductible

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the following in the RECORD:

#### PROPAGANDA ADVERTISING NOT TAX DEDUCTIBLE

Mr. Speaker, for many months past, there has been publicity by private power organizations in the press and in magazines throughout the country, large and expensive ads, by the American Independent Electric Light and Power Companies, practically all of which appear to me to misrepresent the facts, with the result that these ads cannot be justified on the grounds of rendering a public service.

Such ads appear in the October 1957 issue of Redbook and the Reader's Digest, and in the October 1, 1957, issue of Look magazine.

Mr. Speaker, these ads appear to be a series of propaganda ads sponsored by a national group of electric utility companies, and, of course, paid for by the customers of these companies. I understand that the space for the ads in these three magazines alone cost about \$56,000.

Mr. Speaker, it seems clear that the purpose of these ads is to prejudice the people against the Electric Power Cooperatives—hoping to gain favor for the private power industry.

I think there's plenty of room in this country for both the private power industry and the REA network cooperatives of the Nation who have been doing such a splendid job in bringing light and power to rural America.

Mr. Speaker, some of these ads complain that, whereas taxes allegedly constitute 23 cents of every revenue dollar paid to private utility companies, "People who get electricity from Federal Government electric systems \* \* \* are privileged people."

The ads claim that "electric cooperatives pay a far smaller tax—only a fraction of the taxes paid by private power customers" because, the ad concludes, "a strange twist in Federal law exempts them (meaning the cooperatives) from paying most of the taxes in electric bills \* \* \* because they get their electricity from Federal electric systems," meaning the REA.

The facts are that the REA is a nonprofit organization and, like all other nonprofit organizations, is exempt from income taxes. Of course, the private utilities' organization publishing the ads knew this quite well, but left the misleading inference to the contrary. The private utilities pay income taxes because they are in the business for profit, and income taxes to corporations and individuals alike are assessed on profits.

Despite the claims of the advertisement, there is no law which exempts anyone from paying taxes merely because he is a purchaser of Federal power. If that were true, the very power companies which sponsor the ads, and which purchase much more Federal power than do the nonprofit cooperatives, would themselves be exempt from the taxes about which they most complain.

These advertisements are designed not to build good will, not to sell electricity, not to render a public service, but solely and exclusively to destroy whatever small competitive influence exists in the electric utility business. Their motivation is the destruction of the Federal power program which in many areas has made possible rural electrification, and which helps to make feasible the irrigation of arid lands, the abatement of floods, and the deepening of navigation channels in our major rivers.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Power Commission, I understand, about a year ago set a precedent prohibiting such propaganda ads from being classified as an "operating-expense deduction before taxes." This action should reduce such propaganda advertising activities.

#### Ireland Needs Help

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the United Irish Societies of Baltimore—the Ancient Order of Hibernians, Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, the Hibernian Society, and the Emerald Isle Club—are to be commended for launching a program designed to attract new industries to Ireland.

Because so many of my constituents are of Irish heritage, I am even more mindful of the economic struggle that has long confronted the proud people of Ireland, and the program to locate major industries in that country deserves complete support and understanding on the part of business leaders throughout the Nation.

Ireland has always been and will continue to be a popular tourist center, but American businessmen have been slow to recognize the tremendous potential and actual opportunities which exist there. The available manpower, the excellent facilities, resources, and the friendly and cooperative attitude of Irish officials are but some of the factors that make Ireland ideal, geared to accommodate industries of all types and sizes.

As the program undertaken by the Irish Societies of Baltimore gains impetus, I am sure a growing number of American firms will investigate conditions and become firmly convinced of the fact that Ireland has much to offer.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of  
Pennsylvania, to the National Guard  
Association of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on October 8, 1957, at Louisville, Ky., I delivered an address to the convention of the National Guard Association of the United States. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

ADDRESS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES, LOUISVILLE, KY., TUESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1957

It is a distinct honor to be invited to speak to this historic and distinguished organization which has worked so courageously to protect and advance the American way of life.

As members of the National Guard you hold a unique position. You are both citizens and soldiers. You know the dangers involved in excessive taxation and the high cost of government. You also realize that one of the most important obligations of American citizenship is to share in the defense of our Republic.

Over the centuries the best minds of the world have tried to outlaw war. In spite of these efforts armed conflict has come generation after generation, in greater magnitude and with greater cost in money and in human agony and suffering.

In the eight wars in which we have been engaged 965,572 Americans have given their lives and another 1,276,520 have been wounded. The overall cost in money can hardly be estimated, but it is by far the largest item in our combined budget.

We are a peace-loving people. As Americans we do not want armed conflict because we do not covet anything that any other nation possesses. Everything that is honorable should be done to prevent war. The record of history proves that treaties, resolutions, and good intentions will not bring peace to the world. Strength is the only means by which war can be prevented.

More than 300 years ago George Herbert, the English poet and philosopher, expressed that thought when he wrote:

"One sword keeps another in the sheath."

We can be brought to disaster if we allow our Nation's sword to become dull and rusty.

Our wise forefathers realized that one of the most important functions of government is to provide for the common defense. They recognized the dangers of war and that it can be avoided only by adequate preparation. Therefore, they set forth the plans for our Nation's defense in the Constitution. One of the fundamental objectives of the immortal document, as stated in the preamble, is to provide for "the common defense."

The Constitution itself provides for calling out the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and to repel invasions. It further provides for organizing, arming and disciplining the militia, "reserving to the States, respectively, the appointment of the officers and the au-

thority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress."

This wise reservation of certain powers to the sovereign States was to prevent an overpowerful central government from destroying the authority of the States. The National Guard is a fundamental part of that plan. It must be sacredly guarded. Even Federal appropriations for National Guard purposes must be carefully watched because they may be used to gradually destroy the direct State control of the guard. We must always remember whenever we seek financial aid from a higher level of government we may surrender some controls.

The National Guard, and its predecessor, the militia, have taken a glorious part in all our wars. They have served in the front lines from the Revolution to the frozen hills of Korea. Local pride and pride in the history of their organizations have carried them forward. From the days of the Roman legion it has been found that men make better soldiers when they fight at the side of their neighbors.

The embattled farmers at Concord and Lexington gave new ideals to military work. They stood their ground against trained British regulars because they believed in the cause for which they took up arms.

Every State has many historic outfits, many of them dating back to the Revolution.

In this discussion of national defense we must face a world of realities. Peace among nations, the great hope of mankind, will come slowly. It must grow out of education in which the spiritual will take a great part. Until the world knows how to live we must have a stabilizing police force.

While the slow process for peace continues, the American school system must provide for the education of all the children in the principles of the Republic. In that education we must emphasize patriotism, respect for the law, the rights of the individual, and loyalty to the Constitution. In this educational crusade we must also reach the many misguided American-born who have really forgotten the ideals of their fathers and the liberties we enjoy.

We must never forget that individual morality is our own responsibility. We must not forget that justice is an inward expression and not an outward force. We cannot legislate justice in the hearts of men. We all must aid the powers of righteousness so we may live in peace and good will under God. But until that great day comes, we must be prepared to defend our freedom and our national honor.

George Washington, as you so well know, wanted a well-regulated militia—well organized and well established.

In planning the military defense of our Republic, I believe we should have the best trained Regular Army in the world. It should have the most modern equipment. It should be the fastest with the greatest firepower the world has ever known. It should be prepared to move by air and sea to any place in the world.

Our National Guard should be under the control of the States until called into the Federal service. It should be trained by the best and most patriotic brains of the Regular Army.

We should have a great Reserve Corps of citizens, trained as both officers and enlisted men, and the training should be under the supervision of the best the Regular Army can provide.

We should have an Air Force so powerful that we could have complete supremacy in the air and enough planes to carry our ground troops to any part of the world.

We should have the world's most powerful Navy so that we and our allies will have complete command of the sea.

We should have a great merchant marine.

To guard and defend our liberty we must have great military strength, but equally important, we must have economic, industrial, agricultural, cultural, and spiritual strength.

We must maintain a strong and expanding economy that will provide employment for our workers at a wage scale adequate to sustain the American standard of living, and to provide the equipment for the Armed Forces.

We must have a high level of production in our mills, factories, and mines.

We must have the maximum production of food on our farms to meet the needs of our Armed Forces and our civilian population.

We must strengthen our financial position through economy in Government, and sound fiscal policies in order to prevent inflation.

We must economize in every function of Government. The cost of defense can be reduced by greater unification of procurement. There are more than 2,000 posts, stations, and camps in the continental United States with a civilian employment of more than 1 million. Many of these could be eliminated at a great saving in cost.

We must never forget that we have obligations in America as well as rights. We will have no rights of any value unless we preserve our great ideals.

Following that principle I believe that every American, regardless of his station in life, should be ready to defend his country and should be prepared by taking basic training.

A great American statesman, Daniel Webster, summarized the obligations of free men in his inspiring speech when he said:

"God grants liberty only to those who love it and are always ready to guard and defend it."

But defense means more than weapons. It means trained manpower. For many years I have maintained that universal military training is the only real solution. It is the right way for a republic, because if a republic is to survive, its wars must be fought by the people. There is much opposition to this plan. Some criticism comes from fathers and mothers and from those with deep and sincere religious conviction, but much of the opposition is expressed by politicians seeking the easy way.

Another group in opposition, and the real danger, are those subversive elements who would deliberately weaken and destroy our country by playing on the fears of others to serve their own sinister purposes.

Actually universal military training is real democracy, in that the rich and humble alike, share equally the responsibility of our Nation's defense.

If America is to be preserved as the greatest nation of all time every citizen must accept a full share of individual responsibility. Every American must join with complete loyalty and unselfish devotion to the task of building a national defense so strong that no aggressor will dare threaten our safety and security.

To meet the challenge of these disturbing times we need a great new wave of patriotic fervor. We need the power and strength of a united people, combining 100 percent Americanism with the highest moral and spiritual standards. We need the resolute courage and the high morale of God-fearing, clean-living, law-abiding people who appreciate our precious heritage of liberty and independence and are willing to make every sacrifice in defense of our ideals.

We all hope and pray that we may be spared the tragedy of another war. But if war should come, I don't want to see the youth of America thrown into battle without proper training.

That training should not only be the best in military work but the trainee should also

be taught the meaning of our form of government and what the American way of life means.

When his basic training is completed the trainee could elect service for a fixed period in the Regular establishment or a longer period in the National Guard or Reserve, which would excuse him from additional military obligation, except during a declared emergency. Thus we would be able at all times to muster a citizen army, ready, trained and prepared to meet any threat to our national security.

A plan of this kind would train every American in the basic principles of military work. It could be done at a time that would least interfere with the career or the education of the citizen, such as two yearly 3-month periods during June, July, and August. All of the clerical and supply work could be done at home.

The training should be done by carefully selected officers of the Regular Army, National Guard, and Reserve. It would be helpful if the training was done as near home as possible.

From the trainees, or those serving in the Regular establishment, National Guard, or Reserve, there should be selected by the officers in charge of training certain men who are qualified for schooling in our various colleges and universities. These men, with special training, would always provide a large reservoir of well-prepared officers and technical men.

Universal military training would show the world that we are prepared and would be a great step for peace.

As military men we must recognize the world situation. There is a contest for world domination. It may be through a cold war or it may be a shooting war. In either case, America must be prepared and every American must do his full duty.

We, in the United States, recognize the liberty and freedom of the individual as God given. Any other philosophy is nonreligious and un-American. Anyone advocating deviation from these ideals does not belong in the United States and if he does not volunteer to leave our shores he should be sent to a country where he and his philosophy of government may be exercised.

What do we need to prepare ourselves for the great task of defending our freedom?

1. We need accurate information as to our standing among the nations of the world. We must know our enemies and their real strength. We must know who our real friends are and what they can and are willing to contribute in defense of the common cause.

2. Our plans should be made. The part to be taken by each element should be clearly known.

3. Training should be thoroughly consistent with our financial situation.

4. Means for the production of supplies should be adequate.

5. We must have high morale as a Nation.

By precept and example we must inspire deeper love of our country, greater respect for its laws, more active support of the church and more individual assistance in all public spirited undertakings.

Let us emulate our forefathers by taking a more active part in Government.

Our forefathers were courageous and self-reliant. Without seeking governmental aid, they crossed the mountains with Bibles, rifles, axes, and plows. The axes and plows provided their food and shelter. The rifle was for protection. The Bible was the source of their deep religious faith.

Let us depend more upon ourselves and less on Government.

It is not necessary to relate to this real American audience how the early settlers toiled, suffered and died to start and then build this country. While this continent is more richly endowed by nature than any

other of the world—its development was the result of the spirit of America.

That spirit built the solidity of the eastern coast line, developed the fertility of the great Central West, made the beauty of the Deep South, crossed the rugged Rockies and placed the hand of real progress on the slopes of the Pacific. That spirit made us a united Nation, the greatest in all history.

If we, in our day, live by that spirit, America will go forward to still greater achievement in the years that lie ahead.

### Plywood Industry Needs Protection From Japanese Plywood Imports

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the Portland Oregonian, of Portland, Oreg., one of the largest newspapers in the Pacific Northwest, carried a top-of-the-column front page news story last Friday which said, "widespread plywood plant shutdowns will idle thousands of Oregon, Washington, and northern California workers."

The Oregonian news story went on to say that some of these plywood plants are closing for an indefinite period and that others have announced a shutdown of 1 week to 10 days. Other plywood plants, says the Oregonian, are working on a curtailed workweek basis.

Reason for the shutdowns, says the Oregonian, is that the price of plywood—one-fourth inch AD grade—dropped from \$80 last fall to \$72 by January 1, 1958, and by March 1, 1958, to \$64. The price of plywood today is the lowest in 20 years and plywood mills no longer can be operated at a profit. When a plant is down and idle, its expenses, in some instances—taxes, management, watchmen, interest on loans, maintenance, and so forth—still continue. The management finds that it costs less to be closed down than to operate and so are closing their plants.

What has brought the plywood industry to this low level in employment and prosperity? One of the main reasons is too heavy imports of plywood produced by Japanese labor which is paid only 11½ cents an hour compared to a wage of \$1.85 an hour in the plywood industry of the United States.

The Oregonian in its news story on plywood plant closures which are idling thousands of Oregon, Washington, and northern California workers, gave a list of the plants which have closed for indefinite periods and for 1 week to 10 days. This list includes the following plants scattered in widely scattered areas:

Oregon: Pacific Plywood, Dillard; Grants Pass Plywood, Grants Pass; Coquille Valley Lumber Co. plywood plant at Milwaukie; Coquille Valley Lumber Co. plywood plant at Swisshome; Medford Valley Plywood, Medford; Oregon Veneer, Medford; Custom Plywood, Grants Pass; Industrial Plywood, Coos

Bay; Brookings Plywood, Brookings; Cascades Plywood, Cascades; and Western States Plywood, Bandon. Most of these plants employ 100 to 400 workers each. The idled Cascades plant is the largest plywood plant in the world and employs about 1,000.

Washington: Centralia Plywood, Centralia; Mount Baker Plywood, Bellingham; Hoquiam Plywood, Hoquiam; Elma Plywood, Elma; Hardel Plywood, Olympia; and Totem Plywood, Olympia.

Northern California: Interstate Container, Red Bluff; Durable Plywood, Arcata; Lund Plywood, Crescent City; and Northern California Plywood, Crescent City.

American plywood producers obviously cannot compete with the low-wage rates of Japan.

Japan last year shipped \$60 million of plywood into the United States. These shipments were the equivalent of the output of 12 large American plywood plants employing 150 to 400 workers each. The Japanese plywood imports took away the jobs of 5,000 American plywood plant workers and also the jobs in those allied industries such as the loggers who supply the plywood mills with logs.

This breakdown in employment in the American plywood industry can be speedily corrected if the Democrat majority which now controls both Houses of Congress only will act and report to the floor of Congress a bill to limit imports of foreign hardwood plywood to 15 to 20 percent of the American consumption.

Foreign plywood last year supplied 54 percent of the domestic demand for hardwood plywood. Limit this to 15 to 20 percent of that demand, and Japan still can sell \$20 million a year of her plywood in the United States which will be more plywood than Japan ever sold in the United States prior to World War II.

By limiting Japanese imports of plywood to 15 or 20 percent of the domestic hardwood plywood market, jobs for some 3,500 American plywood workers will be restored immediately, domestic production will be brought into balance with domestic demand, and plants that are idle will go back into production.

### Where Small Business Stands on Issues Before Congress

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the National Federation of Independent Business recently polled its members on several issues before Congress. I commend to the attention of all of our colleagues the positions expressed on three of these issues.

Postal rate increases, 61 percent against; small business tax revision, 86 percent favor; make Small Business Ad-

ministration a permanent agency, 84 percent favor.

I believe these positions to be sound and not only in the interest of small business but also in the public interest.

### Thirteen Years of Enslavement in Rumania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

**HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, this 6th of March is a sad day for the Rumanian people. It marks 13 years since Rumania's enslavement by the Soviets. This occasion should bring to our minds more vividly the tragedy of modern slavery.

Victims of Moscow's aggressive expansionism and of international failures which abandoned the eastern part of Europe to the absolute rule of the Russians, the Rumanians have since then been subjected to merciless Communist oppression.

The starting point for this Rumanian drama was one of the most flagrant and brutal examples of interference and seizure of a free nation by the Soviets. Two weeks after the Yalta declaration, one of the signatories, Soviet Russia, was ruthlessly crushing the independence of the country with a brazen display of brute force. While 19 Rumanian divisions were fighting alongside the Allies, Vishinsky, backed by the Russian tanks, ousted the legal government of General Radescu and imposed a Communist stooge government of Soviet agents.

It is to the honor of the Rumanian people that after 13 years of Communist terrorism, deportations, slave labor camps, religious persecution, and economic bleeding, their spirit of resistance is still alive today. I am informed that a new huge slave labor camp is now functioning with thousands of miserable, prowestern, pro-American prisoners, in the swamps of the Danube Delta. But in spite of all this the nation's spirit is not vanquished.

The pro-American sentiment of the people is shown on every occasion. For instance, the first day the American exhibition of architecture was recently opened in Bucharest, more than 20,000 despite the risks entailed, visited it.

The Rumanians like other East Europeans are deeply attached to Western culture and aspirations. Notwithstanding the long Soviet Communist occupation and the apparent Western acquiescence in this state of affairs, they are obstinately clinging to their beliefs and hopes in the Free World. This fact is a major problem for the Kremlin throughout East Europe, because its rule requires the periodic deflating of those expectations and hopes. It is for this reason that Moscow tries to induce the United States to officially drop the issue

of the status of the Russian controlled Eastern Europe and is continually pressing for a disengagement which would help consolidate the status quo.

The Rumanian people have undergone these last 13 years untold suffering and disillusionment.

On this sad anniversary of the Soviet seizure of Rumania, I convey to its people our hopes and faith that the future will bring to them freedom and liberation.

### Failure To Extend Lease Purchase and Further Scuttling of the Program in the Independent Offices Appropriation Bill Means End to Planned, Long-Range Federal Building Program and Eliminates Coordinated, Well-Programmed and Expeditious Authorization of Additional Buildings in the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

**HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the failure of the House to act on S. 2261, the extension of lease purchase, since it unanimously passed the Senate early last year has resulted in effectively scuttling the only program recently devised to provide for a planned, well-coordinated program for catching up on the Federal building needs throughout the country which have grown critical because of no program since 1938.

The provisions of the independent offices appropriation bill, that passed the House today, drove the last nail in the casket in which was buried the lease-purchase program, denying the General Services Administration even the authority to go ahead with the program between the passage of the bill and July 1, the effective date of the appropriation bill, when money may be made available by direct appropriation.

The death of lease purchase means that no new projects, outside of the 92 already authorized by the well-planned, soundly programed and simplified method of authorization provided in the Lease Purchase Act, can be authorized by a regular Public Works Committee resolution upon recommendation of the General Services Administration. Any future buildings must go through the long and arduous process of authorization by separate bill, after lengthy individual reviews and reports by the executive branch, that must be acted upon by Congress and finally, an appropriation by separate item action must follow. Incidentally, no such local buildings have been approved in any substantial number since 1938.

There were many projects under active consideration by GSA when lease purchase expired in June 1957; and many others were obviously available for

consideration and authorization. All these projects are, for all practical purposes, dead at the present time. I include a portion of the minority report on S. 2261 which sets out a list of these projects, for the information of the Members, hoping that this will clearly demonstrate the concern of the minority over the failure of Congress to extend lease purchase.

That portion of the report follows:

The following is a list of 200 lease-purchase projects (GSA) that were being considered for submission to committees of Congress for approval before Public Law 519, 83d Congress, expired:

Alabama: Birmingham, Montgomery, Tuscaloosa.

Alaska: Anchorage, Juneau, Seward.

Arizona: Holbrook.

Arkansas: Camden, Fayetteville, Harrisburg, Jonesboro, Pine Bluff.

California: Bakersfield; Eureka; Fresno; Los Angeles, FBI; Los Angeles, West; Los Angeles; Menlo Park, Geological Survey; Pomona; San Diego; San Francisco, FSS WHESE; San Francisco; San Luis Obispo; San Mateo; Santa Rosa.

Connecticut: Greenwich; Meriden; Middletown, New Haven, Willimantic.

Delaware: Wilmington.

Washington, D. C.: National Metropolitan Center, etc.

Florida: Gainesville, Jacksonville, Tampa.

Georgia: Athens, Hazlehurst, Thomasville.

Hawaii: Honolulu.

Idaho: Boise, Pocatello, Twin Falls.

Illinois: Alton, Aurora, Belleville, Champaign, Chicago, East St. Louis, Mount Vernon, Springfield, Urbana.

Indiana: Anderson, Indianapolis, Muncie.

Iowa: Ames, Des Moines, Fort Madison, Keosauqua.

Kansas: Great Bend, Topeka.

Kentucky: Benton, Frankfort, Henderson, Lexington.

Louisiana: Baton Rouge, Houma, Natchitoches, New Iberia.

Maine: Portland, Wiscasset.

Massachusetts: Amesbury, Lawrence, New Bedford.

Michigan: Detroit, Grand Rapids, Lansing, Owosso, Saginaw.

Minnesota: Roseau, Virginia.

Mississippi: Jackson, Natchez, Quitman, Tupelo.

Missouri: Independence.

Montana: Billings, Bozeman, Butte, Great Falls.

Nebraska: Lincoln, Nebraska City, North Platte.

Nevada: Reno.

New Hampshire: Concord, Nashua, Portsmouth.

New Jersey: Camden, Morristown, Newark.

New Mexico: Carlsbad, Roswell, Santa Fe, Socorro.

New York: Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse.

North Carolina: Bryson City, Fayetteville, Lexington, Raleigh, Winston-Salem.

North Dakota: Bismarck, Fargo, Mandan, Minot, Williston.

Ohio: Canton, Cleveland, Columbus, Dayton, McArthur, Youngstown.

Oklahoma: Altus, Durant, Guthrie, Lawton, Wagoner, Tulsa.

Oregon: Medford, Portland.

Pennsylvania: Harrisburg, Philadelphia.

Rhode Island: Bristol, Providence, Westerly, Woonsocket.

South Carolina: Charleston.

South Dakota: Huron, Mitchell, Pierre, Rapid City.

Tennessee: Bristol, Oak Ridge.

Texas: Austin, Corpus Christi, Dublin, El Paso, Ft. Worth, Levelland, Mineral Wells,

San Antonio, San Augustine, Sherman, Texas City, Tyler.

Utah: Ogden.

Vermont: Montpelier.

Virginia: Roanoke, Suffolk.

Washington: Aberdeen, Dayton, Everett, Olympia, Pasco, Richland, Seattle, Tacoma, Vancouver.

Wisconsin: Madison, Milwaukee.

Wyoming: Casper, Cheyenne, Cody, Rock Springs, Worland.

None of these 110 projects may be submitted to the Committees on Public Works since the time for securing approval under the lease-purchase law (Public Law 519, 83d Cong.) has now expired. Passage of S. 2261, as passed by the Senate, is necessary to provide for lease-purchase construction of these projects.

The following is a list of 71 Government-owned sites which may be used for new public buildings lease-purchase projects if Public Law 519, 83d Congress, is extended.

Alabama: Florala, Livingston, Moulton.

Arkansas: Ashdown, Augusta, Harrisburg.

California: Bakersfield, Los Angeles (terminal annex).

Florida: Monticello.

Georgia: Hogansville, Metter, Thomasville, Vienna, Warm Springs.

Illinois: Casey, Eureka, Fairbury.

Indiana: Bicknell.

Iowa: Ames (College Station).

Louisiana: Coushatta.

Maine: Wilston.

Michigan: Dearborn (Monroe Blvd. station), Milan, Tecumseh.

Minnesota: Roseau.

Mississippi: Quitman, Tupelo.

Missouri: Cape Girardeau, Independence, Moberly, St. Louis (Richmond Heights Branch).

Montana: Whitefish.

New Jersey: Carteret, Garwood, Newton.

New York: Dannemora, East Syracuse, Mohawk, Montour Falls.

North Carolina: Scotland Neck.

Ohio: Akron, McArthur, Oak Hill.

Oklahoma: Mountain View, Wagoner.

Pennsylvania: Beaver, Branckenridge, Clifton Heights, Downingtown, Emmaus, Greencastle, Jersey Shore, Newport, Reynoldsville.

South Carolina: Charleston, Lyman.

Tennessee: Etowah, Hartsville, Sharon.

Texas: Dublin, Levelland, Madisonville, New Boston, Orange, San Augustine.

Virginia: Waynesboro.

Wisconsin: Evansville, New London, Tomahawk.

Hawaii: Wailuku.

Passage of S. 2261, as passed by the Senate, is necessary to authorize lease-purchase of construction on the above mentioned sites.

If our lease-purchase program is continued additional needed projects in other locations will be submitted to the committees of Congress from time to time. Projects in which you are interested may be included and added to the list for construction under lease-purchase contract.

It is conceded that, thus far, the operations under Public Law 519 have not come up to expectations, but this is due to several provisions in the law that have resulted in unnecessary inflexibility.

S. 2261, as passed by the Senate, carries amendments designed to eliminate all these difficulties. For instance, the Senate version enables the General Services Administration and the Post Office Department to negotiate with local taxing bodies to reduce taxes on purchase-contract projects or arrange tax exemptions. Certain steps in procedure have been modified in the Senate passed S. 2261; also there is an amendment making it necessary to resubmit projects for committee approval only in instances wherein the cost exceeds estimates by 7 percent or more, thereby speeding up the program of construction.

I trust Congress will this year take some action to provide for a method to continue this much needed Federal building program on a planned, long-range basis.

### Summit Spectacle

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, for many months we have been following with a great deal of interest the running battle of words flowing between the Kremlin and our own State Department regarding a proposed summit conference. While some of our allies have been clamoring for such a meeting at any price, I have been strongly impressed by the wisdom and logic of Secretary Dulles. He has consistently contended that a top level conference should not be held until the Soviets demonstrate by deeds and not mere words that something constructive might result from a meeting of the heads of state.

Past history indicates only too clearly that there has been more heat than light emanating from the conferences which we have attended at the express bidding of the Soviet leaders. Unless or until Bulganin and Khrushchev are willing to agree to a specific agenda of items to be discussed at a summit meeting, it would seem fruitless to beat the drums for such a conference. We cannot expect our President or the leaders of the other nations to travel half-way round the earth to listen to a mere harangue of Communist charges and counter charges without any hope of constructive accomplishment.

It would now appear that after months of exchanging diplomatic notes we are finally getting through to the Kremlin, and the Soviet leaders are more receptive to a preliminary meeting of foreign ministers to draw up a firm agenda of items to be discussed at a summit conference to be attended by President Eisenhower and the other heads of state. We should not look toward such a meeting as panacea which would solve all the ills of the world, but perhaps it would at least relieve tensions and create a more healthful atmosphere for promoting world peace.

In regard to my own thoughts on this important matter of foreign policy, I would like to call attention of the House to an outstanding editorial commenting on this subject which appeared yesterday, March 13, 1958, in the Fairmont Times, a leading and progressive newspaper published in Fairmont, W. Va., in my Congressional District. The editorial entitled "Summit Spectacle," follows:

The Department of State caught the Kremlin squarely between wind and water with these pointed questions in our latest note on the proposed conference at the summit: "What is the purpose for which a summit meeting would be held? Is it the purpose

merely to stage a spectacle? Or is the purpose to take meaningful decisions?"

The barrage of letters from Bulganin has not obscured the fact that what the Russians seem to want is a spectacle. This is shown by their insistence that a preliminary meeting of foreign ministers be strictly limited to drafting an agenda and fixing a time and place for the summit conference. That would commit President Eisenhower and other Western leaders to meet with the Kremlin chiefs without any assurance that there could be agreement on matters of substance. Such a meeting would almost certainly be fruitless. Washington has wisely rejected such limitations on the foreign ministers' meeting.

The rejection included these blunt words: "A meeting of heads of government that was merely ceremonial or social, or which merely repeated promises already given or hopes already expressed would not, in the opinion of the Government of the United States, be warranted."

It is a pity that things have reached this impasse. The world yearns for summit talks that would magically clear the way toward mutual understanding and peace. But such talks are not to be realistically hoped for. The best we can hope for is talks based on firm preparations by the foreign ministers. Until the Russians agree to at least that, a summit conference would be pointless.

### Corrections and Additions

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to insert at this time corrections and additions to previous speeches appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In the speech appearing on Thursday, March 18, 1954, I ask that the following sentences be added at the bottom of the speech:

The living conditions of the aged are far worse than living conditions in many parts of the world that our leaders are so concerned about. In fact, many of the countries we are giving billions to have a better old-age pension system than we ourselves have. Where is the heart and conscience of America to treat others better than we treat our very own? Most unfortunately, the majority of Congressmen have toured to other parts of the world, but they have never toured the small communities of our Nation to see the sad conditions under which our aged people are struggling to survive. America would look better in the eyes of the world if we turned our attention to taking care of these people who no longer can care for themselves.

To the speech of Friday, June 23, 1957, I wish to add the following sentences to the end of that speech:

The planes we gave France killed hundreds of innocent women and children in Tunisia. This is just one example of the many where our foreign-aid program has led to murder and has turned the people of the world against us. Yet in the light of this condition, our leaders are urging more and more giveaways of the same type. What a tragedy. Today we are being asked to vote more billions for a foreign giveaway program. I wish to report to the people I represent that I have never voted for this monstrosity, and

the more the world sees of it the more my position has been proved right. How can anyone in good conscience justify giving away more than \$130 billion of the people's money only to have the world getting worse and worse instead of better and better?

To the remarks of Thursday, Jun 17, 1948, I would like to add this sentence:

Since these figures were compiled, we must add another \$5 billion our Government gave away last year. So the amount that we actually gave away since 1941 is \$136 billion. This appears to be just one-half of the national debt staring into the faces of our children and our children's children.

### A Much-Needed Bill

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. KENNETH B. KEATING**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I introduced a bill, H. R. 11554, to give credit to those States which have already completed portions of their share of the Interstate Highway System. The principle embodied in this and related measures, now before the House Public Works Committee, is a sound one. If simple justice is to be served, it should be enacted into law in this session of Congress.

This measure will provide equitable reimbursement for New York and other States which have shown the initiative and ability to go ahead on their own in building the Interstate Highway System. The repayment would be achieved by allowing Federal payments up to 90 percent for substitute mileage to be added to the System in place of completed highway mileage.

As of June 30, 1957, New York State had completed nearly 580 miles of the original 1,200 interstate mileage allotment, at a cost of \$1,062,600,000. Under terms of H. R. 11554, some \$822,800,000 would go to New York in payment for completion of the substitute mileage. This amounts to roughly \$50 per person in my State. The payments would take effect beginning in 1960.

Many other States which have forged ahead on their own would also benefit from this legislation. On the overall national level, credit would total about \$4,200 million, for 10,859 miles of completed highways.

The pay-as-you-build principle embodied in the original highway bill is a sound and constructive one. Were that more Federal programs were run on such a hardheaded basis. However, we should not let that auspicious start be darkened by allowing later inequities in the distribution of funds.

It is my understanding that when the New York State Thruway and other road programs were begun prior to enactment of the highway bill, it was thought some sort of reimbursement for completed work would later be forthcoming. In all due fairness legislation to provide some form of repayment

should be enacted. It would prevent the States which went ahead on their own from being penalized just because they had the foresight to get the job done, instead of waiting for Uncle Sam to provide the money.

As it is, New York State receives its usual short end of the stick under this Federal program. We are the most populous State in the Union. We are the most important business, manufacturing, and commercial State. We rank second in the Nation in number of automobiles and in gas consumption. As a result, New York contributes heavily to the revenues available to the Federal Government for this highway program. As usual, we put in more than we get out. We should at least receive credit for our contributions to the System.

The Federal Interstate Highway System marks a significant forward step in the internal development of our Nation. By drawing together our great industrial and population centers, it provides an important link in times of war or peace. But its worthy purposes and methods should not be used to deprive States which have already contributed to it from getting money for their work.

Because H. R. 11554 and the other identical bills before the Public Works Committee provide a fair and sane answer to the problem of the States which have pushed ahead with their contribution to the Interstate Highway System, it deserves the full support of this committee and eventually of the Congress and the President.

### Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas G. Masaryk

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, the founder and first President of the Czechoslovak Republic. It is fitting that we commemorate this anniversary, not only because he was one of the great statesmen and democratic leaders of the century, but also because of his many close ties with this country.

Thomas Masaryk was a close friend of one of our greatest leaders, Woodrow Wilson. Indeed, it was in part through President Wilson's policy of self-determination that the Czechoslovak Republic came into being. The Constitution of the Republic which Thomas Masaryk helped to frame was based in large part on the Constitution of the United States. In many other ways this great man helped bring our two democracies together.

A strong spirit and bond of friendship exist to this day between the peoples of the United States and Czechoslovakia. Unfortunately, the ruthless, aggressive actions of the Soviets have ended free communication with Czechoslovakia.

We look forward to that happy day when the undying resistance of this brave nation will triumph over the oppressive domination of the Soviet tyrants.

### Address Commemorating 91st Birthday of Nebraska as a State

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA**

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, Saturday, March 1, was the 91st birthday of the State of Nebraska. It was particularly appropriate, therefore, that members of the Nebraska State Society, of Washington, D. C., should meet to commemorate the event.

Also in the spirit of the day was a short address delivered to the members of the society by Representative R. D. "BOB" HARRISON of the Third District of Nebraska. In his remarks, Representative HARRISON traced the colorful history of Nebraska to its achievement of statehood on March 1, 1867.

All Nebraskans, Mr. President, take great pride in the initiative and perseverance of those who established our great State on the plains of the Midwest. This pride is well reflected in Representative HARRISON's remarks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech, Nebraska Becomes a State, by Hon. R. D. HARRISON, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

#### NEBRASKA BECOMES A STATE (By Hon. R. D. HARRISON)

Ladies and gentlemen of the Nebraska State Society, it was very kind of you to invite me to talk to you for a few minutes, and you may be sure that the invitation was accepted with genuine pleasure. In the 7 years that I have been in Washington, I have derived very real satisfaction as a member of our State society; I have observed the pleasure we, one and all, obtain from our gatherings. And these meetings and social occasions serve a deeper purpose than mere entertainment: they serve to remind us that we are all sons and daughters of the same mother State; they forge anew the bonds between us, so that wherever in this, the National Capital, we chance to meet, we can say that the meetingplace is constructively, for the time being, Nebraska soil.

I should like to talk to you for a few minutes this evening on the origin and beginnings of our statehood: I feel the more confident, not because of my own powers, but in my choice of topic, for that subject must always be of interest to us Nebraskans.

I take it that all of us know the origin of our State's name; still, "just for the record," as we say on the Hill, I will quote briefly from that admirable book on Nebraska in the American Guide Series:

"In 1842," we read, "Lt. John C. Frémont led an expedition to explore the country lying between the Kansas and Platte Rivers. On his return, he attempted to descend the Platte, but gave up the venture after dragging his boat for 3 or 4 miles over the sandy

bottom of the river. In his report to the Government he wrote: "The names given by the Indians are always remarkably appropriate; and certainly none was ever more so than that which they have given to this stream—the Nebraska, or Shallow River."

Recent finds in the western portion of the State point to the existence of an extremely ancient culture, estimated by conservative scientists to have existed some ten to twelve thousand years ago. These archeological discoveries whose type was first unearthed near Folsom, are known as the Folsom Culture. As for the historic Indians, at the time of the Lewis and Clark expedition in 1804-06, the Pawnee was the largest indigenous tribe of Nebraska Indians, their number probably reaching 10,000. There were four divisions, but after 1804 these united to form the Great Pawnee Nation. After various treaties with the United States Government, the Pawnees in 1875 finally ceded their Nebraska reserve and removed to Indian territory in Oklahoma.

In 1541 the Spanish adventurer, Francisco Vásquez Coronado, with 30 soldiers, moved northeastward from the Arkansas River under the guidance of the Indian Ysopete. The conquistador was seeking the Quivera—a land to the northwestward where, according to the fantastic report of a plains Indian, living as a captive at Pecos pueblo, gold was so common that the natives did not care anything about it. The old Spanish conquistadors were motivated by lust for that metal quite as much as by missionary zeal, and they were completely taken in by the report of the Indian captive who was, of course, by way of revenge, gloriously spoofing them.

The party marched for 40 days and at last came upon an Indian village somewhere near the present Kansas-Nebraska line. Here the adventurers heard of a large watercourse farther to the north—presumably, the Platte. From here, the white men moved eastward and may have reached the Missouri River. Though Coronado claimed actually to have found the mysterious kingdom of Quivera, it is not known just where he thought he had discovered it: the Republican River Valley in Nebraska has been named as the most likely place. Certainly the old conquistador found no gold; he and his followers, however, could probably claim to be the first white men to have set foot in what is now Kansas and Nebraska.

For the next two and a half centuries the region was occasionally entered by both Spanish and French explorers and by French traders and fur trappers. France's claim to the entire vast territory drained by the Mississippi was finally established by the Sieur de la Salle, who in 1682 explored the basin of the mighty river and took possession in the name of the French Crown.

American interest in the Kansas-Nebraska territory dates, of course, from the Louisiana Purchase in 1803 and the explorations of Meriwether Lewis and William Clark in 1804-06. Many of the earlier explorers were far from impressed by the region—indeed, from some reports, one would gather that it formed part of the Great American Desert. In these early years of American possession much of the exploration and all of the earliest settlements were connected with the fur trade. Manuel Lisa established the first fur-trading post at Fort Lisa in 1807, near the site of the present village of Fort Calhoun. Fort Atkinson served as a military post in the same area. Bellevue on the Missouri, in the present day Sarpy County, became the nucleus of the first permanent white settlement in 1823.

In 1834 Nebraska had been included in that territory designated by Congress as Indian country, from which all white men were excluded except the military and certain agents and officials who had special Government authorization. In 1844 Stephen A. Douglas in-

troduced the first bill to create a Nebraska Territory. Not succeeding, he introduced similar bills in 1848 and 1852. By this time the slavery versus antislavery agitation had reached the boiling point, which was to lead to the fiery ordeal of the rebellion. After a conference at the White House with President Pierce and his Secretary of War, Jefferson Davis, Douglas submitted to the Senate one of the most fateful measures ever to reach that body. This was the Kansas-Nebraska bill. Instead of creating a single territory of Nebraska, the new bill provided for two territories, divided by the 40th parallel: Kansas, to the south, to admit slavery, while Nebraska to the north would probably be free soil. The new bill repealed the ancient, time-honored Missouri Compromise of 1820, declaring it inoperative and superseded by the legislation of 1850 (Clay's, Webster's, and Calhoun's famous compromise). The bill became law with the signature of the President, May 30, 1854. It is unnecessary to dwell upon the terrific storm which this ill-starred legislation provoked: suffice to say, that no measure laid before the Senate since the Jay Treaty with Great Britain in 1795 ever stirred such bitter opposition; that it was the greatest single concrete factor which made inevitable the looming Civil War, and that its consequences to the States, the Nation and the world were immeasurable and are felt to this very day and hour in which I speak.

So the great war came, and all else was forgotten in the fierce struggle on the part of the North to save the Union.

The war over, the thoughts of the people of the Nebraska Territory turned toward statehood, and after a long and acrimonious controversy involving considerations both of expense and national political questions, Nebraska at last became a State, March 1, 1867. A new State constitution was adopted in 1875, and revised by constitutional convention in 1920. The most magnificent subsequent revision was the adoption of the unicameral legislature, which became effective in 1937, and which was largely due to the unremitting efforts of George W. Norris.

In these brief moments at my disposal it is obviously impossible for me to offer, even in barest outline, the history of our State. This much, however, can be said in conclusion: As Nebraska nears the century mark of her admission to the Union, we may look back with pride and affection upon the noble, truly heroic record of our pioneer forebears—indeed, we feel we can claim that the pioneer spirit has not departed from our midst; we hail with equal satisfaction the advances, scientific and commercial, intellectual and cultural, of the modern generation, and we feel we can honestly claim that we have lived up to, and shall continue to exemplify, the noble motto of the State: "Equality Before the Law."

I thank you.

### Thomas Masaryk: Man of Ideals

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, March 7 marks the 108th anniversary of the birth of a man of great ideals, the founder of the Czechoslovak Republic, Thomas Masaryk. Although the life of that republic was short lived, nonetheless, the name of the man who gave it creation will live long in the memory of all of us.

I know that the people of the world who hold sacred the ideals of freedom and independence, which inspired Masaryk, join with me in the hope and prayer that the bells of freedom will ring out once again for the subjugated nations of the world. I know, too, that Americans of Czech origin and the people who inhabit that part of the world look eagerly forward to that day.

It is my privilege on this anniversary date to salute those Americans who claim kinship with Thomas Masaryk and join with them in just reverence to his memory.

### Statement by Hon. John Lesinski, of Michigan, Upon Introduction of the Bill To Provide That Only 32 Hours of Service Need Be Performed by Postal Employees During Any Week in Which a Holiday Falls

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would provide that no more than 32 hours of service would be required from postal employees during any week in which a holiday falls.

Mr. Speaker, on February 5, the Comptroller General of the United States ruled that employees who rendered service on a Saturday which also is a holiday are entitled to compensatory time and also to holiday benefits.

Under this ruling the Post Office Department has held that the benefits of the ruling could be applied only to those people actually scheduled for duty on the holiday. The Post Office Department has informed employees that the law does not grant Saturday holidays, and that accordingly the day cannot be treated as it would were it to fall between Monday and Friday. At the same time, the Comptroller General has said that to deny holiday benefits to employees working on holidays is contrary to the basic concept of the law.

In the postal field service, the handling of the mail on a 24-hour around-the-clock basis frequently disrupts what otherwise would be a holiday schedule. Employees who work on "swing" and "graveyard" shifts find it difficult to understand that just because they may be scheduled off on a holiday which also is a Saturday, they should be required under the Comptroller General's decision of February 5, to perform an additional period of service.

Accordingly, I have introduced today a bill which would make sure that holidays would be granted equally to all postal employees, regardless of the day of the week upon which they happen to fall. This would be accomplished through the simple expediency of requir-

ing that no more than 32 hours of service would be required during any such week. In the event that more than 32 hours of service were to be required, compensatory time would be granted within the benefits and provisions of existing law.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the idea embodied in my proposed amendment is necessary to the smooth functioning of the postal service. I hope that early action can be taken.

### Trinity River

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I sent a letter to the senior Member of the other body from California relative to the Trinity River project in that State. It seems certain that reclamation in California will be struck a deadly blow unless the partnership plan is adopted in which the power revenues would aid and assist reclamation in the Central Valley project.

The irrigators of the Central Valley project should be keenly aware that unless this partnership plan is adopted that there will be less money to assist them in the payoff on reclamation. If the Government develops the Trinity River power project, it will be selling power for less than the cost of production. The partnership plan would help reclamation in California.

The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 19, 1958.

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: It was with a great deal of satisfaction that I read your recent statement expressing emphatic approval of the partnership plan of joint development of the power facilities at the Trinity River project in California.

This indicates your usual sound and courageous thinking on matters of this kind. You have again demonstrated to my mind that you reflect the views of the majority of sound thinking people, not only in California, but in the rest of the Nation.

In this connection, I would like to call your attention to an excellent factual study of the Trinity case which has just reached my desk. I refer to the last bill analysis, dated February 18, 1958, which has been issued by one of the Nation's leading non-partisan economic research organizations, the American Enterprise Association of Washington, D. C. These are the same bill analyses which deal with the pros and cons of current legislation and which are regularly circulated among a large number of the Members of Congress.

Though there are points which can be stated on both sides, the bill analysis shows clearly that the only sound course is to pass legislation which will permit joint developments of the power features of the Trinity project. I might say that I was particularly impressed with this document on the views favorable to joint development by professors at Harvard University and University of

Chicago—two of our top-ranking institutes of higher learning.

There is one feature of the bill analysis which was pointed out very forcefully and which disturbs me greatly. It is the simple fact that under all-Federal development the power feature at Trinity would actually be a drain on the California Central Valley project. The document shows that if this procedure is followed in California and other parts of the West, reclamation would receive a body blow.

You realize, of course, that historically power has been regarded as the paying partner of reclamation. As you know, the very act authorizing the Central Valley project provides specifically that power revenues shall aid and assist the water features of the project. I am also pleased to add that the Secretary of the Interior would specifically on this same point when he appeared before our committee on February 3, 1958.

It is important for all of us who are truly interested in reclamation to recognize that an all-Federal project at Trinity would reverse this historical pattern and thus hit reclamation a deadly blow. I might illustrate in terms of a proposal now before our committee, which concerns the San Luis project in your State. This project, as you know, would require substantial financial assistance from the Central Valley project. If this assistance is jeopardized by an all-Federal Trinity development, the prospect at San Luis would be bleak indeed.

On the other hand, joint development would provide substantial additional revenues to the Central Valley project which, together with Federal taxpayments, would assist materially other projects in California and the West.

This question of assistance to reclamation is no small one. For example, testimony by the Secretary of the Interior and others before our committee (the same matter is clearly analyzed in the bill analysis to which I referred before) emphasized the fact that Federal power at Trinity would be sold at an average of 4.6 mills per kilowatt-hour which is only slightly above half its production cost of 8.9 mills. This is equivalent to a loss to the Federal Government of about \$4 million annually which would be just the reverse of the intended function of power facilities.

Each of us is vitally interested in reclamation in his area. In my general territory, there are many projects contemplated in the Missouri Basin, the upper Colorado River and so on. If the unsound principle of selling power from reclamation projects at less than Government cost is applied to other projects in the West, there can be only one result: Our water needs will go unfilled, and our States' economic growth will be stunted. That would be a terrible price to pay for a mistaken power policy. Let me add that the bill analysis already mentioned supports about the same conclusion.

Similarly, may I call your attention to the way in which joint development at Trinity would help meet the Nation's temporary unemployment problem. We have a huge national debt. This cannot be allowed to rise without limit. Joint development at Trinity would save the Government \$60 million, which means that employment-generating reclamation projects now held back for lack of funds could get the go-ahead again to the extent of \$60 million if Congress approves the partnership plan advocated by the Secretary. Some of the presently excluded reclamation projects are in my territory, and some are in your State. You know, for example, of the problems connected with California's Sacramento Valley canals. These canals were authorized by our committee, but I can't help wondering how the funds for the canals would be obtained when the Appropriations Committees of Congress real-

ize that \$60 million in reclamation funds were unnecessarily diverted to Trinity power facilities, especially when such division actually results in such power being sold at less than cost, thereby draining off some of the financial assistance required for the canals unit.

Again, I want to express my appreciation of your generous interest in reclamation and water conservation. I am sure your State and the West will be in much better position to secure needed reclamation funds if your counsel is heeded. I am sure that many thoughtful people in your State and throughout the West will applaud your forthright stand in the interest of reclamation and needed water resources development.

Sincerely yours,

A. L. MILLER,  
Member of Congress,  
Fourth District, Nebraska.

### National Farm, Business, Organization Leaders To Meet on Rural Development Program

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to comment on the announcement of a most important rural development program conference to be held June 16 and 17, in Memphis, Tenn. We have the opportunity to lend encouragement and offer suggestions to this meeting. The progress of this program in less than 3 years is most encouraging.

It is a program which adds strength to our total Nation as low-income rural families and families on small farms attain more adequate incomes.

For example, the great metropolitan area of St. Louis, which I serve, draws many of its workers and leaders from rural areas where there is underemployment and small farms. These people serve best the cities and industrial centers when they have grown up with adequate medical care and received more education than is now usually the case.

Also, every town, city, and trade area is aware of the fact that the 1.5 million farm families with \$1,000 or less of income per year are not very large customers for all the goods and services that most families are able to enjoy.

The private citizens and nongovernmental organization representatives who gather in Memphis will discuss ways in which they can be even more effective in helping move the rural development program forward. Its success depends upon the way in which State and local leaders team up and make a determined effort to get at the problems of underemployment in rural areas.

I serve on the Agricultural Policy Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee. We held very extensive hearings this winter. At the conclusion Senator

SPARKMAN, our chairman, issued a statement for our committee which, in discussing low-income farm families in agriculture, said in part:

The third problem is the need to develop local nonfarm resources and otherwise to assist farm-reared people who have poor opportunities in agriculture to earn income in other ways. The need is to assist farm people in making a normal change reaching back to Colonial days. But there is no implication that any program should try to push people out of farming \* \* \*.

Development of local nonfarm resources, vocational training, and improved employment information and assistance are among the means suggested for widening the employment opportunities for farm-reared people.

Missouri is one of the 30 States in which there are pilot or demonstration counties. There are some 1,000 counties in the Nation in which farms are small or land is poor and fine farm families need more income. This is not a new problem. It has existed all down through the years—but now an effective program is underway. All of us have an obligation to lend the rural development program support and encouragement. We should applaud especially private citizens and organizations for the fine work they are doing.

**NATIONAL FARM, BUSINESS, ORGANIZATION LEADERS TO MEET ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

National farm, business and organization leaders will meet in Memphis, Tenn., June 16 and 17 to review progress in the rural development program, and the contribution private groups are making to the work now going forward on a demonstration basis in 30 States.

The conference is being called by the Committee for Rural Development Program, which includes Under Secretaries of five Federal departments, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration and a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. The chairman, True D. Morse, Under Secretary of Agriculture, issued the announcement on behalf of the committee.

It is expected that all major national organizations working in such fields as agriculture, business, labor, education, conservation, health, welfare, youth programs, and religious affairs will be represented at the Memphis conference.

During the 2-day meeting, individual speakers and panel members will appraise the importance to the Nation of increased incomes and opportunities for families in rural areas of underemployment and small farms. They will also suggest ways in which private citizens and nongovernmental organizations can help on rural development programs.

Speaking for the Committee for Rural Development Program, Under Secretary Morse said the following would be among the main topics of discussion at the meeting:

Social and economic effects of underemployment among farm families.

Industrial development in rural areas.

Education beyond the high school for rural youth.

Contribution of service and civic clubs to rural development.

Role of churches and religious organizations.

Participation in rural development programs by private banks and businesses and their organizations.

Importance of participation by youth organizations.

Communications media as means of encouraging interest in local programs.

The rural development program is a cooperative Federal, State and private effort to promote balanced economic development in rural areas with substantial numbers of underemployed people. On January 1, 1958, some 100 counties in 30 States were participating on a demonstration or pilot basis. Planning and program organization are going forward in many other rural counties as well.

The forthcoming meeting will be held at the Peabody Hotel in Memphis.

Committee for Rural Development Program, Washington, D. C., is made up of:

O. Hatfield Chilson, Under Secretary, Department of Interior.

True D. Morse, Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture (chairman).

Walter Williams, Under Secretary, Department of Commerce.

James T. O'Connell, Under Secretary, Department of Labor.

Dr. John A. Perkins, Under Secretary, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Wendell Barnes, Administrator, Small Business Administration.

Dr. Joseph S. Davis, Member, Council of Economic Advisers.

### The Omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood-Control Bill

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, considerable opposition has developed to section 205 of S. 497, the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood-control bill, which will be considered by the House of Representatives next week. Serious objections to this section have been voiced by the American Farm Bureau Federation and by many States. Section 205 deals with water law. The major objections to section 205 have resulted from its broad and loose general approach to the problem. In order to give recognition to some of the objections which have been raised to this section, it is my intention to offer an amendment to section 205 when this bill is under consideration by the House of Representatives.

The language of my amendment is much preferable to the language in S. 497, since this revised language provides for the establishment of definite standards and guides for the Corps of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army to follow in connection with development of water supplies in Federal reservoirs on such important matters as consultation with the States and the Public Health Service, repayment periods, interest rates, provision for future needs, and modification of authorized projects to provide for water-supply storage. The need for these provisions to be spelled out in legislation is self-evident. The adoption of the generalities contained in section 205 (b) and (c) of S. 497 could result in administratively established standards which could set up a program far different from that contemplated by the Congress as being necessary to meet the Nation's need in the future; a program which could be in

direct conflict with the standards of section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 which governs the development of water supplies in connection with Federal reclamation projects, and which could touch off another round of competition between the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation over which agency will construct water-supply projects. The language in my amendment will minimize conflicts, and establish a program which will permit Federal participation in the development of water supplies on a sound basis.

The wording of my amendment is as follows:

On page 102 of S. 497, beginning with line 13, strike out all of section 205, ending on line 20, page 103, and substitute in lieu thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 206. (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to recognize the primary responsibilities of the States and local interests in developing water supplies for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes and that the Federal Government should participate and cooperate with States and local interests in developing such water supplies in connection with the construction, maintenance, and operation of Federal navigation, flood control, or multiple-purpose projects.

"(b) In carrying out any authorized navigation or flood-control survey, or review investigation, involving improvements which may be useful in developing water supplies, the Corps of Engineers shall consult with the State or States affected and the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with a view to including in the reports thereon submitted to Congress, plans for the development of water supplies for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes, and such reports shall include the views and recommendations of the States and the United States Public Health Service on the plans for water supply. Features for providing water supply storage capacity, facilities, or services may be included in any navigation, flood control, or multiple-purpose project recommended for construction by the Corps of Engineers, subject to the following provisions of this section.

"(c) Before construction of any project including water-supply provisions is completed, State or local interests shall agree to pay the costs allocated to water supply. Such costs shall be determined by the Chief of Engineers in such manner that all authorized purposes served by the project shall share equitably in the benefits of multiple-purpose construction. The schedule of payments by States or local interests of such costs may provide either for paying the share of the construction expenditures during construction of the project, plus annual payments for operation, maintenance, and replacement costs as incurred; or for equal annual payments for the construction costs, and interest on the unpaid balance, plus annual payments for operation, maintenance, and replacement costs as incurred: *Provided*, That the entire amount of the construction costs, including interest during construction, allocated to water supply shall be repaid within the economic life of the project, but in no event to exceed 50 years after the project is first available for the storage of water for any purpose. The interest rate used for purposes of computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction is initiated, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations, which are neither due nor callable

for redemption for 15 years from date of issue.

"(d) The plans for any authorized navigation, flood control, or multiple purpose project on which construction has not been initiated, or any existing project, may be modified or its operation changed by the Secretary of the Army to provide additional storage capacity, facilities, or services for water supply as he considers reasonable: *Provided*, That before construction is completed, or in the case of projects under construction or completed, before changes for the benefit of water supply are made in the project, or before operation is modified in the interest of water supply, State or local interests shall agree to pay the costs allocated thereto as provided in subsection c of this section: *Provided further*, That such modifications which would seriously affect the purposes for which the project was authorized or constructed or which involve major structural or operational changes shall be made only upon the specific authority of Congress.

"(e) The plans for any authorized navigation, flood control or multiple purpose project on which construction has not been initiated may be modified to include provisions for future water supply when directed by resolution by the Public Works Committee of the Senate or of the House of Representatives, or when approved by the Secretary of the Army upon recommendation of the Chief of Engineers: *Provided*, That the cost of such provisions for future water supply shall not be more than 30 per centum of the total estimated cost of the project and reasonable assurance is given by States or local interests that the use of the future water supply provided for will begin within not more than 10 years after the time the project is first available for the storage of water for water supply purposes, and that necessary water rights for such use have been or can be obtained: *Provided further*, That States or local interests indicate a willingness to pay for such water supply in accordance with subsection c above, beginning when the water supply is used, and costs allocated to water supply shall be repaid within the economic life of the project, but not to exceed 50 years after the time the project is first available for the storage of water for water supply purposes: *And provided further*, That in arriving at the costs to be repaid, the interest charges on the initial cost of provisions for future water supply during the period until the water supply storage is used will not be included, but in no case will the interest-free period exceed 10 years.

"(f) Responsibility for complying with any applicable State law relating to water supply or water use shall rest with the State or local interests contracting to pay the costs allocated to water supply or utilizing the water supply services.

"(g) That part of the second proviso of the first paragraph of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, as amended (33 U. S. C. 701h), pertaining to modification of reservoir projects is hereby repealed, except as to contracts and agreements in force at the date of this act."

## Antitrust Laws for Labor Unions

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague,

CIV—231

the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], delivered on the Dean Manion Forum an outstanding speech which should have the thoughtful consideration of every American.

Too many Americans—labor leaders, industrial leaders, agricultural leaders, and intellectual leaders—seem to be advocating the philosophy of prosperity at any price, soft living, and the get-rich-quick theory.

I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

Senator BUTLER. Thank you, Dean Manion. At the outset, let me make this perfectly clear: I know the vast majority of men and women constituting organized labor are as dedicated to the perpetuation of the free-enterprise system as I am.

However, in far too many cases our citizens have formed opinions about the American economy and the integrity of its leaders from statements by certain labor bosses and political demagogues.

In this time of crisis, when the fate of humanity hangs by a thread, our military security requires a strong domestic economy. We must produce a larger national income in dollars of constant value so that the increased burdens of defense can be borne without reducing the American standard of living.

This will require hard work. We cannot afford to continue to generate inflationary pressures. Unions cannot force round after round of wage increases which greatly exceed the increase in the productivity of our economy without jeopardizing our security.

Yet, with the threat of more inflation on the horizon, the well-worn legend that business has been reaping excessive profits is once more abroad in the land. As usual, in the forefront in advancing this charge is CIO President Walter Reuther. His accusations, and the facts concerning wages and prices, need careful examination.

Some people forget that the compensation of employees is not only income to the employee, but also a cost to the employer. It must be recovered in the price charged the consumer or we shall have neither employers nor employees.

An examination of the distribution of the increase in the national income through the last decade shows that for every additional dollar of corporate profits after taxes, employees receive an additional \$40.

Furthermore, labor's share of the total national income rose from 65.3 percent in 1947 to 70.3 percent in 1956. On the other hand, corporate profits after taxes dropped from 9.3 percent of the national income in 1947 to only 6.1 percent in 1956.

If all corporate profits before taxes in 1956 had been paid as additional compensation to employees, their total income would have been increased by less than 18 percent. However, if there were no corporate profits, the Government would have received \$22 billion less from corporate income taxes.

With the existing level of Government expenditures, higher personal income and consumer excise taxes would have been required. Since income taxes in the upper brackets have already reached the point of diminishing returns, most of this increase would of necessity have been imposed on lower-bracket taxpayers.

All of this goes to show that the profiteering legend will not stand up as an explanation for the inflation that besets our economy.

From my close observation of Reuther's political interests, I am convinced that he regards the bargaining table as a platform

for the acquisition of political power. His statements clearly show that if he were in a position of greater political power, he would attempt to destroy competitive capitalism.

For a concrete example, we need only turn to Mr. Reuther's latest proposal to the automobile manufacturers. He advocates that 50 percent of all profits in excess of 10 percent of invested capital before taxes be shared evenly between workers and consumers. He alleges that, under such a procedure, in 1956 General Motors workers would have received \$286 million in additional compensation and that consumers of its products would have received a rebate of the same amount. What he fails to say, and this is an important point, is that corporate income taxes for this one firm alone would have been approximately \$300 million less.

#### HAS BIG BROTHER COME OVER THE HORIZON?

If Mr. Reuther's plan were universally adopted, the Government would lose upwards of \$4 billion in corporate tax revenue. Incredibly, he must now vision himself as an economic dictator representing consumers, stockholders, workers, and citizens alike. In fact, he would supplant the Congress of the United States in determining the Government's revenue.

Obviously, this is more of Mr. Reuther's special brand of economic hogwash—all of which is pointed to an eventual destruction of the free-enterprise system. His statements are propaganda in its most vicious form.

Before the advent of pattern bargaining, lower prices for all Americans were the result of improved technology and increased capital investment. Every individual had an opportunity to advance further through experience and the development of superior skills. In recent years, however, national productivity has been preempted by certain union agreements. Labor costs have outdistanced national productivity, thus forcing prices to rise.

As a result, Government employees, retired people and farmers have suffered a great disadvantage. The efforts of these groups to equalize their position with organized labor has placed additional demands on budgets at all levels of Government. Increased labor costs require additional appropriations for Federal expenditures on defense materiel, one of the largest items in the Federal budget.

Similarly, the budgets of local and State governments have been strained to equalize the compensation of firemen, policemen and schoolteachers. With limited tax resources, some have pressed for Federal aid to education and other grant-in-aid programs to States and local communities.

Meanwhile, price increases for manufactured goods have depressed the parity index for farm products. This automatically results in great expenditures by the Federal Government under our price-support programs. The harassed taxpayer is thereby denied needed relief.

This is the deadly circle of inflation and economic intervention by government; it must be broken. After careful study, I have concluded that the first step in reversing this dangerous trend is to make it impossible for any group to exercise monopoly power.

Let no one misunderstand my position. I am opposed to monopoly—so much so that I have publicly stated that I would support legislation to have our antitrust laws apply to all segments of our economy. I would even make them apply to unions which were granted exemptions for many of their activities by the passage of the Clayton Act in 1914.

Certainly labor unions with millions of members, and controlling the investment of many billions of dollars through welfare funds, are in a position to exert monopoly powers.

**BIGNESS NO CRIME; MONOPOLY—SOMETHING ELSE**

I steadfastly believe that the antitrust laws have made this country strong. They have given us the competitive society upon which our future rests. I do not believe that bigness and monopoly are synonymous.

The Congress, during the 67 years since the Sherman Act was placed on the books, has never adopted legislation making bigness a crime. Repeated decisions of the United States Supreme Court have also stated that bigness per se is not a violation of the antitrust laws. I am interested in strengthening these laws so as to preserve a vigorous competitive society. We cannot operate in the world of today without big business.

However, some labor leaders primarily interested in exercising political power have attempted to justify their activities on the basis that they are working for the good of the entire economy to increase purchasing power by the device of raising wages.

Prof. Edward H. Chamberlin, one of the most distinguished economists of our generation, has just made a detailed study of the economics underlying this theory. Professor Chamberlin's views are of particular interest to those concerned with monopoly. He was the originator of the phrase "monopolistic competition". His theories have influenced economists, legislators and businessmen since the late 1930's. In his most recent study, Professor Chamberlin said:

"Whoever receives a higher money income gains relative to others who do not, and there is nothing in the argument to indicate why union laborers any more than anyone else should be chosen to have the agreeable privilege of mysteriously spreading prosperity in this way.

"But since some laborers (and some other elements of society) have more power to raise their money income than others (some, such as receivers of contractual incomes, life insurance beneficiaries, pensioners, etc., have zero power) those who have more power gain at the expense of those who have less. The interest of those who gain is hardly to be identified with the whole, if the whole includes also those who lose."

This statement is in complete contradiction to Mr. Reuther's high-sounding economic theories. His carefully designed scheme to replace our competitive enterprise system with variegated socialism, or Reutherism, as I choose to call it, must be nipped in the bud. The doing will require the wisdom, cooperation and patience of government, labor, management and the general public alike.

It is my considered conviction that we must now establish equality of treatment before the law for all organized groups in our economy—labor as well as business.

During the early days of the labor movement, there may have been some justification for labor unions receiving special treatment under the antitrust laws. Today, they have great financial resources and exercise vast political and economic power. Special treatment is no longer justified.

**Favorable Prospect for Action on Food Stamp Plan**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express my

thanks publicly to the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture [Mr. COOLEY], for arranging for early consideration by an appropriate subcommittee of the proposal which I have been urging for so many years for establishment of a food-stamp plan for the distribution of some of our vast stores of surplus food to needy Americans.

Congressman COOLEY went on record in the House last year in favor of this legislation at the time I attempted to have it enacted as an amendment to Public Law 480, the law under which we now give away surplus foods here and abroad—particularly abroad. He promised me then he would see to it that the committee took up the bill this year, and he renewed that promise to me in recent weeks.

Now I am very pleased that Chairman COOLEY has turned this matter over to the Consumers Study Subcommittee headed by Representative VICTOR L. ANFUSO, of New York. Mr. COOLEY, Congressman ANFUSO reported to us yesterday, has given that subcommittee "the green light," to proceed on this issue.

And I am also pleased that the subcommittee chairman has demonstrated his personal interest in this matter by introducing a bill based on the measure which I drafted and first introduced 4 years ago last month, and which I have been reintroducing with some modification in each succeeding Congress.

**FOOD STAMPS WOULD GO AUTOMATICALLY TO NEEDY**

This is the type of food-stamp plan, incidentally, which most of the Democratic Members present on the House floor last year voted for when I submitted it as an amendment to the bill extending Public Law 480. It is the type of plan which I am happy to say the Democratic platform of 1956 promised.

The idea incorporated within the bill is simplicity itself. In each State or political subdivision participating in the program, needy persons meeting eligibility standards would automatically receive food stamps redeemable for specified quantities of whatever surplus foods were available for distribution.

Primarily, the food stamps would be intended for persons and families on various forms of public assistance, but other needy persons would also be included, particularly during periods such as the present recession when many families are in real want but cannot qualify for public assistance if they include employable persons—even if the employables cannot find employment.

**PRESENT DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM UNSATISFACTORY**

The plan outlined in my bill would replace the present hit-and-miss program now in effect—a very unsatisfactory program—for distribution of some surpluses to the needy in States which have substantial unemployment. The unsatisfactory nature of the existing program has been pointed out time after time by officials of the States and localities which are participating in it. In many instances, it costs the State or city more to distribute occasional pack-

ages of free food than the food itself is worth.

A national food stamp plan would not only get the food to more of the people who really need it—and I have some amazing figures covering that point which I intend to present to the subcommittee at the appropriate time—but it would do it a whole lot more efficiently and at less cost than this present hit-and-miss program which is primarily a food dumping program rather than an aid-the-needy program.

The Department of Agriculture seems interested only in finding the quickest way of disposing of as much of its surplus as possible, rather than in having this food used to maximum advantage by the needy here at home. That is apparently why most of the Department's emphasis on surplus distribution has been on shipping huge quantities of it abroad to whatever country will "buy" it with local currency which is then returned to the "customer" in the form of additional foreign aid.

I am not against the Public Law 480 program. But I do think the Congress has up to now been too quick to go along with Mr. Benson's foreign dumping programs without insisting at the same time that he also help feed our own hungry through a sensible food stamp plan.

That may be a little harsh to say, Mr. Speaker, particularly since my purpose in making this statement is to congratulate the fairminded chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture for starting the ball rolling on this and turning it over to a subcommittee for early action.

I hope all Members who are conscious of the large number of needy persons in their districts will take the time and trouble to look into this matter and join in support of legislation to launch a meaningful program of surplus food distribution to our needy.

**MUCH BACKGROUND MATERIAL AVAILABLE**

There is a lot of material available on this subject for those who care to look into it.

In addition to the many speeches I have made on it in the House since introducing the bill originally on February 12, 1954, including the debate on my amendment last year on the extension of Public Law 480, further information can be found in the testimony which I presented to the Committee on Agriculture during special hearings on this matter in both the 83d and 84th Congresses. Two years ago, furthermore, we had a day of hearings before the Senate Finance Committee on proposals to include this plan as part of the public welfare programs under the social-security law. And last year I testified on it before the Humphrey subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture when that group was holding exploratory hearings on long-range proposals for improving the Public Law 480 set-up.

I am grateful that many Members over these past 4 years have joined me as co-sponsors of this legislation, either using the same bill which I drafted in 1954 or the revised version which is H. R. 949

in this Congress, or else using the overall features of my bill but revising it to incorporate additional ideas. Substantially all of these bills are identical, however, in proposing a plan which would give to all of our needy—and there are unfortunately millions of persons in our Nation who could be included in that term—an opportunity to share in our great abundance by receiving regularly on a systematic basis some of the surplus foods we are acquiring under the various Government-aid programs for agriculture.

#### NEEDY IN ALL STATES COULD SHARE IN PLAN

Every State has many, many persons who would be eligible under my bill. In most States, most such persons are not now receiving surplus food. In some States, distribution is very broad in some localities, but does not include other localities. A national food stamp program would make it possible for all States and all local communities to participate, thus assuring some of this food for each eligible person.

The best way to achieve this distribution, of course, is through the regular channels of trade, although I leave that detail open in my bill. The point is we are trying to get food to people not now getting enough to eat.

Mr. Benson has refused to show any interest in or concern for this type of program. The administration generally opposes it. I am afraid we will have to force it upon them.

Mr. Speaker, because of the growing interest in the food stamp plan in all parts of the country and, I am sure, in every Congressional District, as a result of widespread distress in our economy, I include the text of H. R. 949 in these remarks so that it can be seen how the plan would actually operate.

The bill is as follows:

(In the House of Representatives, 85th Cong., 1st sess., January 3, 1957, Mrs. SULLIVAN introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.)

#### H. R. 949

A bill to provide for the establishment of a food stamp plan for the distribution of \$1 billion worth of surplus food commodities a year to needy persons and families in the United States.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in order to promote the general welfare, raise the levels of health and of nourishment for needy persons whose incomes prevent them from enjoying adequate diets, and to remove the specter of want, malnutrition, or hunger in the midst of mountains of surplus food now accumulating under Government ownership in warehouses and other storage facilities, the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is hereby authorized and directed to promulgate and put into operation, as quickly as possible, a program to distribute to needy persons in the United States through a food stamp system a portion of the surpluses of food commodities acquired and being stored by the Federal Government by reason of its price-support operations or other purchase programs.

Sec. 2. In carrying out such program, the Secretary shall—

(1) distribute surplus food made available by the Secretary for distribution under this program only when requested to do so by a State or political subdivision thereof;

(2) issue, or cause to be issued, pursuant to section 3, food stamps redeemable by eligible needy persons for such types and quantities of surplus food as the Secretary shall determine;

(3) distribute surplus food in packaged or other convenient form on the local level at such places as he may determine;

(4) establish standards under which, pursuant to section 3, the welfare authorities of any State or political subdivision thereof may participate in the food stamp plan for the distribution of surplus foods to the needy;

(5) consult the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Labor, in establishing standards for eligibility for surplus foods and in the conduct of the program generally to assure achievement of the goals outlined in the first section of the act; and

(6) make such other rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the purpose of this act.

Sec. 3. The Secretary shall issue, to each welfare department or equivalent agency of a State or political subdivision requesting the distribution of surplus food under section 2 (1), food stamps for each kind of surplus food to be distributed, in amounts based on the total amount of surplus food to be distributed and on the total number of needy persons in the various States and political subdivisions eligible to receive such food. The food stamps shall be issued by each such welfare department or equivalent agency to needy persons receiving welfare assistance, or in need of welfare assistance but ineligible because of State or local law, and shall be redeemable by such needy persons at local distribution points to be determined by the Secretary under section 2 (3).

Sec. 4. Surplus food distributed under this act shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any welfare assistance (financial or otherwise) granted needy persons by a State or any political subdivision thereof.

Sec. 5. In any one calendar year the Secretary is authorized to distribute surplus food under this act of a value of up to \$1 billion based on the cost to the Federal Government of acquiring, storing, and handling such food.

Sec. 6. The distribution of surplus food to needy persons in the United States under this act shall be in place of distribution to such needy persons under section 32 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C., sec. 612c), as amended, and section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this act shall affect distribution of surplus food presently provided for in such sections other than to needy persons as defined in section 7 of this act.

Sec. 7. For the purposes of this act, a needy person is anyone receiving welfare assistance (financial or otherwise) from the welfare department or equivalent agency of any State or political subdivision thereof, or who is, in the opinion of such agency or agencies, in need of welfare assistance but is ineligible to receive it because of State or local law.

Sec. 8. The Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor, shall make a study of, and shall report to Congress within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, on the feasibility of, the costs of, and the problems involved in, extending the scope of the food stamp plan established by this act to include persons receiving unemployment compensation, receiving old-age and survivors insurance (social security) pensions, and other low-income groups not eligible to re-

ceive food stamps under this act by reason of section 7 of this act.

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

## The National Guard

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JAMES P. S. DEVEREUX

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1958

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Speaker, before the Armed Services Committee of this House, representatives of the Department of the Army are unfolding their plans for a drastic reduction in the Reserve forces of this country to meet the limitations imposed by the budget of the Department of Defense.

The Army National Guard is the principal victim of the proposed force reduction. In April 1957 as the result of intensive efforts to increase the strength of the National Guard, it stood at an all-time high active strength of 434,000 men and officers. The Department of Defense then ordered it reduced to 400,000 by December 31, 1957. It is now to be cut a further 40,000 men and officers during the fiscal year 1959. Thus by June 30, 1959, its strength will be not more than 360,000 and 74,000 trained men and officers will have been turned out of the military service of our country. This means that in these dark days, when our enemies are busily enhancing their military strength, the Department of the Army is proposing that we turn away volunteers for military service to the equivalent in number of almost five full-strength combat divisions, and deny them the opportunity to prepare themselves to defend their country. And mind you, these are men who have come into the National Guard under the urging for the past several years of our national leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the proposals now being made to the Armed Services Committee gravely and irretrievably weaken the ability of our country to defend itself and those portions of the free world upon which our security depends.

Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago—February 1955—General Gruenther told the Armed Services Committee:

In my position as Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, it is my responsibility to study the effectiveness of the reserve systems of the various nations of NATO. It has become increasingly clear to me that the present Reserve system of the United States is one of the weakest in the entire North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

I have studied the National Reserve plan and the choices which it offers. I consider that it is a feasible plan and better than anything we have had before. If I were to offer any criticism of it, it would be that it does not go far enough toward providing combat-ready units soon enough. I, therefore, sincerely hope that if any changes are

made in the program by the Congress, they will not be of such a nature as to weaken or dilute the present plan.

Three years ago General Ridgway, then our Army Chief of Staff, told the committee:

The Army's need for effective Reserve forces is greater today than ever before.

General Maxwell Taylor told us in July 1955:

The present weakness of our Reserve forces is the shortage of trained participating enlisted men.

Has the face of things, in your judgment, so changed for the better that the equivalent of five divisions of trained men can be cut from our first line of defense? For the Army National Guard, you must remember, is, under our law, a part of our first line of defense.

Are you satisfied that missiles, still imperfect and no one knows how far away as practical weapons of warfare, can justify the elimination by the end of the coming fiscal year of five combat divisions of trained manpower? Do you believe that we have come to the point where we cannot afford to train our young men to defend their country, and this at a time when the deadly possibilities of strange new weapons makes training a more vital necessity than ever before in history?

Less than 1 year ago when a controversy over the effect on the strength of the National Guard, of a requirement for 6 months' active duty for training for all enlistees, was before our committee, it was agreed that the strength of the Army National Guard would be maintained at 400,000 through the fiscal years of 1957 and 1958 and that thereafter everything possible would be done to maintain the guard at its appropriated strength.

The President of the United States, in a message to the National Guard Association only last year said:

As Commander in Chief I subscribe fully to the statutory declaration that now and in the future we must maintain and assure the strength and organization of the National Guard as an integral part of the first line of defense of the Nation, to the end that your organizations shall be ready to discharge their historic role at the very outset of any national emergency \* \* \*

And when appealed to personally by a delegation of State adjutants general, including Maj. Gen. Milton A. Reckord of my own State of Maryland, he assured them directly that the National Guard would not be weakened.

No longer ago than last October, Secretary of the Army Brucker told the National Guard Association:

I am determined that the guard shall not be reduced below the 400,000 level at which it is set.

Mr. Speaker, the proposals for reduction in the strength of the Army National Guard break faith with all of these high assurances and shut the door in the faces of thousands of young men who wish to serve their country in the traditional manner of American citizen soldiers. This is unthinkable. It is an action which conveys to young American

manhood the understanding that they are not needed for the security of this great Nation. It is an action which is evidenced in a most extreme manner for not only will the National Guard be required to refuse to accept the offered services of fine young men, but it must go further and turn out thousands upon thousands who are already in uniform.

There is every evidence of a purposeful design somewhere in the Department of Defense or in the Department of the Army to weaken the National Guard and to ultimately remove it from its time-honored and lawful place in the military structure of our country in deliberate disregard of the assurances I have quoted to you. I say this because I find that when reductions similar to those proposed for the National Guard are applied to the United States Army Reserve, no existing strength is lost from the Army Reserve. No men now serving will be required to leave the Army Reserve. In fact, it will continue to have room to expand its active drill strength, indeed beyond any such strength achieved in the past, and apparently even beyond the budgetary provisions being made for the Army Reserve in fiscal year 1959.

It is no secret that the Regular Army has been drastically reduced in strength over the past year and is now hard put to fulfill all of the worldwide commitments placed upon it. But it is proposed today to carry this reduction of forces into the Reserve components as well, directly contrary to the hitherto prevailing conception of the relation of the Reserve components to the Regular Establishment.

Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chief of Staff of the Army, told us a year ago:

Really we should view our Army as a combination of the Active Army and the two Reserve components. As one goes down presumably the other should go up. The world situation changes and the whole aggregate should be adjusted. \* \* \*

Admiral Radford, when he was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, also said:

The size of the Regular forces, as I tried to say in my message this morning, was geared to the size and composition, organization of the Reserve forces. In other words, if we cannot get an organized Ready Reserve, then we would have to review the size of the Regular forces.

What is it that now justifies this change of front to a proposal to drastically reduce the Reserve components of our Military Establishment at the same time that a reduction is made in the Regular forces?

It has been widely stated in the public press that the proposed slash in the strength of the Army National Guard will be accomplished by complete elimination of some 5 or 6 existing National Guard divisions along with more than a thousand other organized formations throughout the country.

Gentlemen, consider what this means: If the Army puts its proposals into effect many States which, under urging from Washington to build up its National Guard, have made large investments in facilities and have made great contribu-

tions toward the building up of a strong National Guard, will suddenly find they have little or no National Guard at all. Many citizens who have served long and loyally in the National Guard and have attained military competence of great value to our country, will be discharged. No statement has yet been made by the Army describing the means by which the planned elimination of units will be accomplished. Reflect, then, if the plan now being placed before the Armed Services Committee receives our approval, any one of you may find your State bereft of most or all of the National Guard which it has supported and of which it has been proud for generations, in many States even back to the beginning of the country.

Mr. Speaker, it is unlawful to make any change in the plans, organization, or allocation of units of the National Guard without approval of the Governor of the State—title 32, United States Code, section 104. To accomplish such a result indirectly by withdrawing Federal funds applied to the support of the National Guard is a violation of the spirit, if not of the letter of the law, and it is an action which no Federal authority should be permitted to take.

I am happy to report that just the other day the subcommittee on which I serve unanimously reported two resolutions which in essence favors the retention for the National Guard strength at 400,000 and further provides for the Army Reserve to build up to 300,000. These resolutions have not yet been considered by the whole Armed Services Committee, but I feel certain that they will be favorably considered, and I trust and hope will be passed by the House of Representatives.

The courage, patriotism, and enthusiasm of the young men of this country, as exemplified by their voluntary participation in the programs of our Reserve forces, must not be dampened for lack of a comparatively small number of dollars. This fundamental resource must be nurtured, whatever the cost. As I have pointed out, the United States Army Reserve faces no problems of strength or funds in fiscal year 1959. On the other hand, the National Guard does face most serious deprivations. I am confident that this House will not permit this segment of our first line of defense, which is so much a part of the history and traditions of our States, to parch amidst the great wealth of this Nation.

And when we have provided the funds which will sustain the National Guard with the strength and vigor it now employs to the obvious benefit of our overall military strength, no destruction of its organizational integrity can be justified, and will not be tolerated by the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the gentlemen of the House to give careful heed to the proposals being made to the Armed Services Committee and consider them in the light of what I have said today. Elimination of a part of the first line of defense of this Nation from whatever design or purpose or considerations it proceeds must not be permitted.