

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who wert the God of our fathers we thank Thee that in the annals of our national history we have the record of men and women whose life and character enshrined our country's noblest traditions and loftiest ideals.

Today we are paying tribute to the memory of an American patriot whose supreme ambition was to know and do Thy will.

We rejoice that he always kept the windows of his soul open toward the unseen and eternal, whence came his wisdom, strength, and courage.

Grant that we also may be inspired with faith and hope as we enlist in a crusade to bring peace and freedom to all mankind.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 9, 1954, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 666. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands and rights-of-way in the State of Wyoming to the town of Jackson, Wyo.;

S. 1386. An act to amend section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, relating to the meaning of the word "commodity";

S. 2772. An act to provide for the disposal of paid postal-savings certificates; and
S. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution to request the International Joint Commission on United States-Canadian boundary waters to make a survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal-power project, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the engrossed bill, H. R. 4254, for the relief of Aneta Popa.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, which was read:

FEBRUARY 10, 1954.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

Sir: Pursuant to authority granted on February 9, 1954, the Clerk today received from the Secretary of the Senate, the following messages:

That the Senate has agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 358) entitled "Joint resolution to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation"; and

That the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of Representatives of the following titles:

H. R. 5959. An act to exempt certain commissioned officers retired for disabilities caused by instrumentalities of war from the limitation prescribed by law with respect to the combined rate of retired pay and of compensation as civilian employees of the Government which retired officers may receive.

H. R. 5861. An act to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone government.

H. R. 5379. An act to authorize the printing and mailing of periodical publications of certain societies and institutions at places other than places fixed as the offices of publication.

H. R. 395. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

That the Senate has appointed the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. BRIDGES, and the Senator from Nevada, Mr. McCARRAN, as members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures; and

That the Senate has passed Senate bills of the following titles:

S. 1184. An act to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers from exceptions taken to payments pertaining to terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Department of State.

S. 1381. An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

S. 1990. An act to strengthen the investigation and enforcement provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act.

S. 2313. An act to amend the Commodity Exchange Act in order to include wool among the commodities regulated by such act.

Respectfully yours,

LYLE O. SNADER,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION ENROLLED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 395. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice;

H. R. 1129. An act for the relief of Katina Panagioti Fiffis and Theodore Panagiotou Fiffis;

H. R. 1496. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hermine Lamb;

H. R. 1516. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clemantine De Ryck;

H. R. 1674. An act for the relief of Setsuko Motohara Kibler, widow of Robert Eugene Kibler;

H. R. 2021. An act for the relief of Clarence R. Seiler and other employees of the Alaska Railroad;

H. R. 2618. An act for the relief of Santos Sanabria Alvarez;

H. R. 2633. An act for the relief of Lee Sig Cheu;

H. R. 2813. An act for the relief of William E. Aitcheson;

H. R. 2839. An act to enable the Hawaiian Homes Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange available lands as designated by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, for public lands;

H. R. 2842. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain land and access rights to the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 2885. An act authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii to issue a right of purchase lease to Edward C. Searle;

H. R. 3027. An act for the relief of Tamiko Nagae;

H. R. 3228. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ursula Eichner Clawges;

H. R. 3280. An act for the relief of John James T. Bell;

H. R. 3390. An act for the relief of Eiko Tanaka;

H. R. 3619. An act for the relief of Rufin Manikowski;

H. R. 3728. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen Bonanno (nee Koubek);

H. R. 3733. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Holder;

H. R. 4439. An act for the relief of John Abraham and Ann Abraham;

H. R. 4577. An act for the relief of Edith Maria Gore;

H. R. 4972. An act for the relief of John Jeremiah Botelho;

H. R. 5195. An act for the relief of Max Kassner;

H. R. 5379. An act to authorize the printing and mailing of periodical publications of certain societies and institutions at places other than places fixed as the offices of publication;

H. R. 5861. An act to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone government;

H. R. 5945. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Colorado to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. Don Alexander against the United States;

H. R. 5959. An act to exempt certain commissioned officers retired for disabilities caused by instrumentalities of war from the limitation prescribed by law with respect to the combined rate of retired pay and of compensation as civilian employees of the Government which retired officers may receive; and

H. J. Res. 358. Joint resolution to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Tuesday, February 9, 1954, he did on February 10, 1954, sign the following enrolled bills and joint resolution of the House:

H. R. 395. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice;

H. R. 1129. An act for the relief of Katina Panagioti Fiffis and Theodore Panagiotou Fiffis;

H. R. 1496. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hermine Lamb;

H. R. 1516. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clemantine De Ryck;

H. R. 1674. An act for the relief of Setsuko Motohara Kibler, widow of Robert Eugene Kibler;

H. R. 2021. An act for the relief of Clarence R. Seiler and other employees of the Alaska Railroad;

H. R. 2618. An act for the relief of Santos Sanabria Alvarez;

H. R. 2633. An act for the relief of Lee Sig Cheu;

H. R. 2813. An act for the relief of William E. Aitcheson;

H. R. 2839. An act to enable the Hawaiian Homes Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange available lands as designated by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, for public lands;

H. R. 2842. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain land and access rights to the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 2885. An act authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Lands of the

Territory of Hawaii to issue a right of purchase lease to Edward C. Searle;

H. R. 3027. An act for the relief of Tamiko Nagae;

H. R. 3228. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ursula Eichner Clawges;

H. R. 3280. An act for the relief of John James T. Bell;

H. R. 3390. An act for the relief of Eiko Tanaka;

H. R. 3619. An act for the relief of Rufin Manikowski;

H. R. 3728. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen Bonanno (nee Koubek);

H. R. 3733. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Holder;

H. R. 4439. An act for the relief of John Abraham and Ann Abraham;

H. R. 4577. An act for the relief of Edith Maria Gore;

H. R. 4972. An act for the relief of John Jeremiah Botelho;

H. R. 5195. An act for the relief of Max Kassner;

H. R. 5379. An act to authorize the printing and mailing of periodical publications of certain societies and institutions at places other than places fixed as the offices of publication;

H. R. 5861. An act to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone government;

H. R. 5945. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Colorado to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. Don Alexander against the United States;

H. R. 5959. An act to exempt certain commissioned officers retired for disabilities caused by instrumentalities of war from the limitation prescribed by law with respect to the combined rate of retired pay and of compensation as civilian employees of the Government which retired officers may receive; and

H. J. Res. 358. Joint resolution to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

THE LATE HONORABLE ALLEN J. FURLOW

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness and a heavy heart that I announce to my colleagues in the House of Representatives the death of a very good friend and former colleague, the Honorable Allen J. Furlow, of Rochester, Minn. He passed away from a heart attack at the age of 63 in the city of his birth, Rochester, Minn., on Friday, January 29, 1954.

The late Honorable Allen J. Furlow served with distinction and honor as a valuable Member of the House of Representatives in the 69th and 70th Congresses. He was elected to the House of Representatives in 1924 as a Republican from the First Congressional District of Minnesota. In the same year, I was elected to Congress from the Third Congressional District of Minnesota. Since 1935, I have had the honor and privilege to represent the people of the First District, which was so ably represented by Allen J. Furlow during his 4 years of service in this House.

Allen Furlow had a host of friends. He was one of my best friends. I will always remember when we journeyed to Washington, together, as newly elected Congressmen in March of 1925 to look over the situation in the House of Representatives and to select our office rooms in the old House Office Building. We were young, freshmen Congressmen, but eager to tackle the relatively few routine matters before Congress and to get on the job. We waited 13 months after our election in November of 1924 until we were sworn in as Members of the House of Representatives in 1925.

Allen J. Furlow was a man of integrity and sterling character. He was always a gentleman, and with his charming and talented wife, there was a genuine glow of friendship and understanding which endeared them to their many friends.

Mr. Furlow was born in Rochester, Minn., on November 9, 1890, son of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel C. Furlow. He was graduated from the Rochester High School with the class of 1910, and later attended the University of Michigan.

In 1913 he and his friend, the late G. P. Gentling, purchased the Rochester Daily Bulletin, which they published for 2 years. In 1920 Mr. Furlow was a graduate with a law degree from Georgetown University in Washington, D. C., where he was a member of Theta Delta Chi and Phi Delta Phi fraternities.

Following graduation, he married Miss Ruth Irish at Pine Island, Minn. Mrs. Furlow survives with two sons, John Allen Furlow, of Chicago; and Dr. William Furlow, of Hanover, N. H. Other survivors are brothers, Frederick J. Furlow, of Rochester, and Walter and Willard of Washington, D. C.

Mr. Furlow enlisted in World War I as a private on October 1, 1917, and served overseas as a pilot in the First Air Corps of the United States Army in France and Italy. He was promoted to first lieutenant and was honorably discharged from service February 21, 1919.

Following the war, Mr. Furlow resumed his law studies and was one of the organizers of the Rochester, Minn., William T. McCoy Post of the American Legion. He was one of the principal speakers at the organizational meeting at the Rochester High School.

After graduation from law school, he returned to Rochester to enter law practice. He served as senator from Olmsted County in the Minnesota Legislature in 1923-24, and resigned the senate post to become First District Representative in Congress for the 69th Congress. He was reelected to the 70th Congress. He was a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. During his service in Congress, he introduced the law providing for a continuous honor guard at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington National Cemetery.

In 1929 and 1930, Mr. Furlow was a legal representative of the Curtis-Wright Corp. in Washington, and was an editor of the 1929 volume of United States Aviation Reports which brought up to date the development of aviation law in the United States. From 1934 to 1937, he was in the legal department of the Veterans' Administration in Washington,

and returned to Rochester to resume the practice of law. In 1933, he was appointed by the Attorney General of the United States as a special assistant in cases assigned under the petroleum code.

In addition to his law practice in Rochester, he was well-known as a public speaker and toastmaster. Mr. Furlow presided over many dinners and public meetings. He took an active interest in public affairs.

Mr. Furlow was one of the principal organizers and charter members of the Rochester Kiwanis Club and served as its first secretary.

During the last few years, Mr. Furlow's law practice included representation of management in labor negotiations. He was joined in law partnership by John de J. Pemberton, Jr., and Franklin Michaels. He was also a member of the Olmsted County Bar Association, Third Judicial District Bar Association, Minnesota Bar Association, American Bar Association, and American Judicature Society.

In addition to civic organizations and the American Legion, Mr. Furlow was a member of the Rochester Lodge, A. F. and A. M., the Rochester Shrine Club, and the Presbyterian Church.

Allen J. Furlow was an outstanding citizen and a patriotic American. He served his country with distinction in both war and peace. His service as a Member of the House of Representatives in Congress is well noted on the pages of congressional history. His contribution to his home community, the State of Minnesota, and the United States marks him as a great American, who was respected and loved by his fellow men.

I will always treasure the memory of my friendship with Allen Furlow. His home and fireside were always open to me. His untimely death brings great sorrow to his wife and to his sons and also to his brothers and other members of the Furlow family, as well as to his many friends. I know that all Members of the 83d Congress will join with Mrs. Andresen and myself in extending our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Furlow and her family in their sorrow.

Funeral services were conducted February 1, 1954, at the Presbyterian Church by Dr. Hugh B. Jones, with burial in the Rochester Oakwood Cemetery.

FOREIGN-AID PROGRAM

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, during the past 13 years, as I understand it, the United States has given to foreign nations, in terms of dollar value, something over \$90 billion. If one wanted to be critical, one could pick out expenditures for such things as building ski lifts in European mountain resorts, and say the whole foreign aid program was wrong.

Personally, when I heard that America was being ridiculed abroad, I laid this not on the steps of the past admin-

istration, but on the usual individual "crackpots" who always seem to find an outlet for their pet ideas in Government spending programs.

However, the overall objective of assisting foreign nations get on their feet economically was worthy and transcended in importance any poorly conceived and administered specific projects which were a part of the program.

Now, foreign policy emphasis is being directed toward assisting friendly nations by giving them arms and thus strengthening their defenses in order that they can resist aggression. This I applaud. I come to praise Caesar, not to bury him.

In the matter of giving military supplies, however, let us have it clearly in mind we are dealing with a two-edged sword. A loaded gun is not the thing you hand to someone who you are not sure will use it the way you intend.

Recently, a State Department official stated that the Arab States are "uncertain of themselves; uncertain of their friends; uncertain of their enemies; their governments are uncertain of their position, in many cases; and their people are frequently uncertain of their government."

Last year, Mr. Speaker, Congress made \$30 million available for purchasing and giving arms to Arab States out of funds allocated to the Mutual Security Program.

How do we know such arms would not be used to defeat our own purpose? How do we know that our military aid will not simply stimulate the Arab States to renew their war on Israeli and thus the very defenses we hope to strengthen would be dissipated in another bloody division of potential anti-Soviet nation.

To me, it would be a terrible mistake, for example, to give military supplies and arms to Egypt—and yet I hear rumors that America is on the point of doing just that.

Again, I say, Mr. Speaker, to the Members of this body, let us think twice before we hand a loaded gun to an uncertain friend.

BOLZA BAXTER

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, a motion to quash a subpoena duces tecum, together with an application for an interlocutory injunction, has been served upon KIR CLARDY, subcommittee member of the House of Representatives on Un-American Activities, by one Bolza Baxter in a proceeding in the United States district court in Detroit, Mich., wherein Representatives VELDE and CLARDY are named as defendants. Bolza Baxter was subpoenaed to testify before the Committee on Un-American Activities in the city of Detroit. This step follows a pattern, a very familiar pattern. It is the third instance when members of Communist front organizations have resorted to the same tactics in an attempt to prevent the Committee on Un-

American Activities from discharging its duties.

The plaintiff in this action happens to be the State chairman of the Labor Youth League of Michigan. This organization is a proscribed organization. It was so designated by the then Attorney General, Howard McGrath, as a subversive organization and also by the Committee on Un-American Activities.

This resolution authorizes the Committee on the Judiciary to take whatever steps are necessary in order to challenge the right of this member of a Communist-front organization to question the validity of the subpoena and also to continue with the injunction proceedings, the object of which is to restrain the committee from conducting its meeting in accordance with its rules and procedure.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. I want to make a short preliminary statement as a predicate for my question. The gentleman is a member of this committee. He knows that since 1930 we have been investigating un-American activities. He knows, of course, that hearings have been held in all of the cities of the United States. Literally hundreds of witnesses have been subpoenaed. Documents over a period of years have been seized, have been obtained from different sources, until there is no room to store them.

All the committees, beginning with the committee headed by Mr. Fish, which lasted for about 9 months, and the committee which Mr. McCORMACK headed, which lasted perhaps 10 months, and the committee which I headed and which was renewed 7 times by the House of Representatives and lasted for 7 years—all of these committees, and every patriotic and civic or labor organization that has investigated this subject, have been unanimous in finding that communism is a criminal conspiracy.

Time and time again in the course of our hearings we discovered that Communists would commit any crime to further that conspiracy. At the very beginning of the movement two of the leading Communists were imprisoned for counterfeiting, to secure money with which to finance the party's activities. We succeeded in putting Earl Browder in the penitentiary because of a violation of the passport law.

It seems to me, and I want the gentleman's opinion about this, that after this long period of time, and after all these committees, headed by Democrats or Republicans, have concurred in the same finding that we are dealing here with a crime, and not with a political movement or a political party, but with a crime and a major crime, the worst crime that anyone can commit, because if someone steals your pocketbook he steals trash, you can replace it; but when he undertakes to steal your freedom and your liberty, then he is committing a heinous offense—does not the gentleman believe that in view of our declarations to the world that we are opposing a criminal conspiracy, the time has come when we ought to be consistent and outlaw the

Communist movement in this country by appropriate legislation, and say to the world, "This is a crime and we mean to treat it as a crime, the same as all other crimes in the penal code?"

What does the gentleman think about that?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. He has made a great contribution throughout the years toward exposing this criminal conspiracy. The only reason why the Communist Party was never outlawed, as I understand it, is because Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the head of the FBI, believed that to outlaw the Communist Party would drive it underground. Within the last few days that same gentleman has stated that the Communist Party has been driven underground. If that is the fact, I see no reason why the Committee on the Judiciary should not report appropriate legislation, very promptly, so that this criminal conspiracy may be branded for what it is.

One thing more. The gentleman has mentioned the tremendous amount of work that has been done in this field and has intimated that what is being done now is largely a rehash. In that connection, the gentleman might be interested in knowing that this organization, the Labor Youth League, which the Committee on Un-American Activities is investigating, was first known as the American Youth for Democracy and then the Young Communist League. So you see it smells the same.

Mr. DIES. In connection with the question of a rehashing, it is true that much of the current investigations are simply a rehashing of what was exposed years ago. It is true they have brought out some additional details and elaborations, and I do not want to disparage their work—I think there has been excellent work done and I feel it has been valuable to educate and alert the people; but in connection with Mr. Hoover's opposition, it is predicated upon the ground that if you drive them underground, then he cannot watch them. Let us be perfectly frank about this. The Communist Party was driven underground from 1919 to 1924 under wartime legislation. Our committee unanimously found, and when I say unanimously, I call your attention to the fact that that included Republicans the same as Democrats.

Mr. WALTER. Was not the division at that time 5 Democrats and 2 Republicans?

Mr. DIES. Five Democrats and two Republicans; that is correct. Our committee unanimously found during this period, as a result of a study we made of the progress of communism during the period that it was under cover, that it was not able to make any headway in this country; that they had no contacts and no influence. It became a threat when it was given the legal apparatus so that they could camouflage and masquerade their true aims and thus deceive innocent and gullible people. Furthermore, Mr. Hoover has been in possession of full and complete information with regard to Communists, those concerning

whom there is reliable evidence of communism, in the Government of the United States or who were on the Federal payroll since 1941. In 1941 we transmitted to the then Attorney General Biddle the names of 1,124 employees on the Federal payroll concerning whom we had reliable evidence of communistic affiliation. Permit me, if I may do so without trespassing upon the time of the House, to make myself clear. When I say "evidence" I do not mean we had the membership cards. In a few instances we did, but Communists had long before then destroyed or concealed their membership cards. But these 1,124 which contained the name of Hiss and White were affiliated with 2 or more organizations which were under the control of the Communists. It must be borne in mind there were literally hundreds of thousands of innocent and gullible people who joined Communist-front organizations. But these 1,124 were carefully analyzed and considered, and we believed that they comprised 98 percent of all Communists that were on the Federal payroll. We transmitted that list to Attorney General Biddle and it was transmitted to the FBI. I am interested to know what finally happened to 1 list in connection with the security firing of 2,200, and I think it is tremendously important to trace down those 1,124 or 1,125, which is an easy thing to do.

Mr. WALTER. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DIES. I am going to ask the gentleman this question.

Mr. WALTER. May I at this point interrupt the gentleman because on this charge, made by responsible officials of this Government, that there were 2,200 security risks, I sought the best information available, and I was informed that there were but 7 people whose loyalty was suspected out of that 2,200. I think an examination of the testimony adduced by the Committee on Appropriations in connection with the appropriation for the Department of State will disclose that there were 11 people in the State Department when Mr. McLeod became the head of the Security Division. Of that 11, 7 were in the process of being discharged when he came there and 4 were discovered in that whole operation by the present security officer of the Department of State.

Mr. DIES. I am sure in order to clear up this question, which seems to be of considerable interest to the country, it would be possible for your committee or some appropriate committee to simply take this list, a copy of which I can secure and which will give your committee the 1,124 names, which we believed constituted 98 percent of all people of communistic affiliations who were working for the Federal Government, and find out what the FBI did with it and what the Department of Justice did about it.

Are any of those people still on the payroll? When were they discharged? I think that reliable facts would serve a very useful purpose if some committee would follow that through.

Mr. WALTER. I would be very happy to submit that list to our committee, and

I trust that the distinguished chairman will find time to deal with it appropriately. It is an extremely important matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have two questions in one. Is it not the opinion of the gentleman that this suit is a nuisance suit, but even though it is, it is absolutely necessary that the House take action?

Mr. WALTER. Yes. The answer is "Yes" to both questions. But I think this suit itself offers very persuasive evidence of the need to enact the kind of legislation the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has spoken of, because the man who has the temerity to bring this suit is a Communist. This is simply the traditional Communist technique of dilatory tactics by harassment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution (H. Res. 441).

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Representatives HAROLD VELDE, KIT CLARDY, Subcommittee of the House of Representatives for Un-American Activities, have been summoned to appear on Monday, February 15, 1954, in the city of Detroit to testify and give their depositions in the case of *Bolza Baxter v. Harold Velde, Kit Clardy, Subcommittee of the House of Representatives for Un-American Activities*, pending in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, civil action file No. 13176; and

Whereas the service of such summons on Members of the House of Representatives who are members of a duly constituted committee of the House of Representatives will hamper and delay if not completely obstruct the work of such committee and its members in their official capacity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby approves of the special appearances of Representatives HAROLD VELDE, KIT CLARDY, Subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, in the aforementioned civil action; and be it further

Resolved, That the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is hereby authorized to direct the filing in the case of *Bolza Baxter v. Harold Velde, Kit Clardy, Subcommittee of the House of Representatives for Un-American Activities* (United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, civil action file No. 13176) of such special appearances on behalf of any of the Members of the House of Representatives named as defendants therein, and to direct such other or further action with respect to the aforementioned defendants in such manner as will, in the judgment of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, be consistent with the rights and privileges of the House of Representatives; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I did not intend to speak on the resolution before the House. I had in mind to inquire of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], who spoke upon the legislation proposed, if in the event the legislation proposed by him, or any other legislation proposed and

passed by the Congress became law, making it a criminal offense to participate as a Communist in the Communist Party, in the event that became a statute and became the responsibility of the Department of Justice, it would be no longer necessary to carry on in the House the activities of the Un-American Activities Committee, would it?

Mr. DIES. I would think if it becomes a crime it would be the problem of the law-enforcement agencies and the courts to handle.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. Later.

That, of course, does not follow, because there are other un-American activities than this Communist criminal conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States.

Before moving the previous question, Mr. Speaker, I think I should call the attention of the House to the fact that in the petition the plaintiff states in paragraph 4 that the Labor Youth League is an educational organization which exists for the sole purpose of studying the principles of Karl Marx.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER] asked the question he did. I thoroughly agree with the answer given by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] that there is need for continuing investigations, because subversive activities cover more than communism, although that is the principal field of investigation. Un-American activities go in many directions, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has so well found out as a result of his experience, likewise the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], as a result of his experience on the Committee on Un-American Activities, and as I so well found out as chairman of the committee in 1934. One of the principal fields of activity of un-American groups is the field of bigotry. That is something we have got to watch very closely.

My committee investigated the Silver Shirts, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] followed it up, an organization led by a man named Pelley—the committee of which I was chairman and of which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] was chairman for several years. So I thoroughly agree with the answer given by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to a very pertinent and proper question.

Might I call the attention of the House—and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] I am sure is acquainted with it because he succeeded me as chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities: When I was chairman of that committee, to talk about communism made people laugh and scoff; they thought you were just trying to seek phony headlines that way when you talked about the potential dangers of communism. I could not of course get an extension of my committee into a second year. But a subcommittee was appointed in 1934 to investigate commu-

nism, fascism, and bigotry and I was chairman. As a result of that investigation Hitler ordered the German Bund disbanded. Certain of the elements of the German Bund attacked the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], and his committee vigorously followed and exposed their continued activity.

But my committee also found a Fascist threat. There was a certain group of wealthy people in New York City—people who were clients of one of the largest brokerage houses in the United States—still in existence. They were afraid the late Franklin D. Roosevelt was going to tax their wealth away. They hated Roosevelt, they hated him to the point where they got desperate-minded. They sent a representative over to Europe to investigate the veterans' setup, the veterans' organizations in Fascist countries in Europe. This particular man visited Germany, France, Italy, Spain, Portugal; and he recommended to his principals, this wealthy group in New York City possessing tremendous wealth, the formation or the establishment in the United States of a veterans' organization along the lines of one that existed in France at that time. They approached the late Gen. Smedley Butler; they approached him because they had to have a general to head it. They could not have an enlisted man, they could not have a general's general; they had to have an enlisted man's general to lead this new setup designed by them to subvert our Government into a dictatorship but with their particular kind of dictator. Smedley Butler led them on.

Smedley Butler was a great American. Smedley Butler kept leading them on to get all of the information from them for the purpose of exposing them at the right time. This same group sent representatives into the national youth camps, approaching the Reserve officers we had in there at that time who were giving some degree of military training to the youngsters who were in the camps in those days.

I ascertained about this plot. We summoned Smedley Butler and he told the truth. He exposed that group and their damnable conspiracy blew up.

So this present committee, as its last report states, has in mind not only communism but other forms of subversion that exist in this country. The last report of the Committee on Un-American Activities referred not only to communism but to a dictatorship along Fascist lines. Another group of wealthy people might rise today and they might approach someone who may not be a Smedley Butler. As the gentleman from Texas so well said, the Communists have deceived good, honest-minded people, and they might also approach someone else in this period of hysteria, in a period when the people's minds are inflamed.

Yes, we have cause to watch and watch properly the Communist subversive movements in America; but there are other types of subversion that would like to take over our Government for the purpose of establishing a dictatorship, just like in Germany there were many wealthy people, not all, but some, who supported Hitler because they thought

when Hitler was dictator he would be their dictator. He proved otherwise.

There are people in this country who are mindful of the fact that 20 years ago it happened, the attempt was made. Fantastic? Yes. A fact? Yes. And it can happen again.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. May I ask the gentleman if it is the purpose of the gentleman's resolution to have these committee members submit to the jurisdiction of this court in question?

Mr. WALTER. No, indeed. Actually, it provides for a special appearance to challenge the jurisdiction of the court to consider either of the two issues raised in the pleadings filed in that court.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANETA POPA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Senate, which was read:

Ordered, That the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the engrossed bill, H. R. 4254, for the relief of Aneta Popa.

Attest:

J. MARK TRICE,
Secretary.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request of the Senate is agreed to. There was no objection.

BIENNIUM HIGHWAY BILL

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, I introduced H. R. 7818, which is a biennium highway bill. This bill, as introduced, is the result of hearings and findings of many weeks of study made by the Committee on Public Works last summer. I think that every subject contained in H. R. 7818 was discussed at our very extensive meetings. Hearing on H. R. 7818 and other bills relating to highways as introduced by Congressmen DONDERO, DEMPSEY, WATTS, MACK, OAKMAN, SCUDDER, PATTON, and others, will start on Monday, 10 a. m., room 1302, and we hope to finish on Tuesday or Wednesday afternoon. I hope that each Member of Congress will take advantage of the fact that the written hearings on the highway subject have been available not only in the Committee on Public Works but in the House document room for many weeks. I hope you will familiarize yourself with those hearings, and we will be very happy to have your

comments or your suggestions as far as the subject of highways are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting, at this point, a comparison of the highway program now in effect, and the results if and when H. R. 7818 becomes a law:

Comparison in authorizations in Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 and proposed authorizations in H. R. 7818

	Public Law 413, 82d Cong., fiscal 1954-55	H. R. 7818, fiscal 1956-57
Federal-aid system:		
Primary system.....	\$247,500,000	\$270,000,000
Secondary system.....	165,000,000	180,000,000
Primary system in urban areas.....	137,500,000	150,000,000
Interstate system.....	25,000,000	200,000,000
Total.....	575,000,000	800,000,000
Federal roads:		
Forest highways.....	22,500,000	22,500,000
Forest development roads and trails.....	22,500,000	22,500,000
Park roads and trails.....	10,000,000	10,000,000
Parkways.....	10,000,000	10,000,000
Indian roads and trails.....	10,000,000	10,000,000
Public lands roads.....	2,500,000
Total Federal roads per fiscal year.....	77,500,000	75,000,000
Total per fiscal year.....	652,500,000	875,000,000
Total for fiscal years.....	1,305,000,000	1,750,000,000
Special authorizations:		
Rama Road, fiscal years.....	4,000,000	4,000,000
Inter-American Highway 1953-54.....	16,000,000	16,000,000
Emergency funds.....	10,000,000
Defense access roads.....	50,000,000
Increased authorization for Baltimore-Washington Parkway.....	1,500,000
Total special authorizations.....	81,500,000	20,000,000
Total authorizations 1952 act.....	1,386,500,000
Total authorizations proposed in H. R. 7818.....	1,770,000,000

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which will authorize the President to use surplus agricultural commodities to improve our foreign relations, and to relieve famine, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, during the 1st session of the 83d Congress, Senator SCHOEPEL introduced a bill quite similar to the bill I am introducing today, to provide for the disposition of our surplus farm products.

The bill I am introducing would consolidate present laws on this matter which expire this year, and would provide continuing legislation. The Famine Relief Act ends March 15, 1954, and section 550 of the FOA Act expires June 30 of this year.

This legislation would authorize an appropriation for the Foreign Operations Administration with which it could purchase surpluses from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

These sales would be made either through private exporters or the FOA, and a safeguard in the bill provides that the sales must not interfere with the usual trade relations of the United States or friendly countries.

Secondly, the legislation would authorize an appropriation for FOA for emergency famine relief to friendly peoples abroad, regardless of the friendliness of their governments. We recall the great success of President Eisenhower's food-distribution program to East Germans last summer.

Under the provisions of this bill, the President would be permitted to use proceeds from the sales of surplus commodities for six purposes: First, for military assistance to countries of mutual defense organizations eligible to receive assistance under the act; second, for purchase of goods or services in friendly countries; third, for loans to increase production of goods or services in friendly countries; fourth, for developing new markets on a mutually beneficial basis; fifth, for grants-in-aid to increase production for domestic needs in friendly countries; and sixth, for purchase of materials for our stockpiles.

This bill is an attempt to use surplus American food and fiber to implement our foreign policy and strengthen the free world. It is in line with the thinking of President Eisenhower on this matter as expressed in his state of the Union message and his message on agriculture to the Congress. Finally, it should build up future markets abroad and assist in winning the friendship of peoples on both sides of the Iron Curtain, for if there is one lesson we should have learned since the beginning of the Marshall plan, it is that food makes friends, whereas dollars may make enemies.

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the gentleman from Colorado a question. Does the bill to which the gentleman referred contain a provision continuing the payment of subsidies on certain farm crops?

Mr. HILL. It has nothing to do with subsidies. Subsidies are paid on our products under another piece of legislation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman referred to certain legislation expiring in 1954, and that is why I asked that question. It has nothing to do with subsidies, then.

Mr. HILL. I would not say it has nothing to do with subsidies, but it certainly would use some of these surplus farm crops that we must dispose of.

MARIAN YEAR COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, in this Marian Year I can think of nothing that would be more appropriate than a Mother's Day postage stamp honoring Mary, the mother of Christ, and the world's greatest mother.

The Congress has delegated to the Postmaster General the prerogative of deciding on the subject and issuing commemorative stamps. I have written to the Postmaster General a letter calling his attention to the fact that a number of my constituents have requested that such a stamp be issued. At this time, I ask my colleagues to join with me in making this request of the Post Office Department.

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, atomic energy is now at the very heart of all our plans for military preparedness and our hopes for material well-being. This fact should be reflected within the National Security Council, the final clearinghouse for the most important issues of national policy. Outside of the President's own office, the NSC is the highest policymaking body in the executive branch of the Government. On it sit the President, Vice President, the Secretaries of State and of Defense, the Administrator of the Foreign Operations Administration, and the Director of Defense Mobilization. The National Security Council was established in 1947 to transform the individual, oftentimes conflicting, policy recommendations of the major departments of our Government into comprehensive national policies—policies which merge the requirements of diplomacy, economic stability, and military preparedness into unified programs best designed to promote the security and welfare of our country.

President Eisenhower, in keeping with his campaign pledges, has brought new importance to the deliberations of the NSC. Moreover, this administration has wisely established the sound custom of inviting the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission to attend National Security Council meetings. This is most appropriate, for no person can better advise the President and the NSC on the critical matters of atomic policy than the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. So President Eisenhower is to be warmly commended for taking steps to make sure that the counsel and guidance of the Atomic Energy Commission Chairman is available at first hand to the top officials of our Government.

The time has arrived for us to go even further. I believe that atomic energy is far too crucial to this era, far too intimately entwined with the very essentials of our military planning, our foreign policy, and our national welfare to permit the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission to sit on the National Security Council only by invitation of the President. I believe he should be there by act of Congress. I am therefore today introducing legislation designed to reflect the proper role of atomic energy in national welfare and security policy. I ask that the National Security Act of 1947 be amended to make the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission a full-fledged and permanent member of the National Security Council, to serve as such no matter which party has the Presidency.

There is, I think, a foreshadowing of the future in the fact that atomic energy—which less than a score of years ago was hidden in obscure laboratories of universities—even now demands a central role in our national policy discussions. Atomic energy, whether we like it or not, has become inextricably woven into our daily individual and collective lives. We must accustom ourselves to living with it, and we must take it into account in all our highest policy determinations.

I urge speedy action on the bill I now introduce.

SECURITY FIRINGS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with growing impatience to wild charges from the Republicans against members of the Democratic Party. Usually those wild charges are linked with the recital of so-called security firings accomplished under the Republican administration. I know something about the paucity of fact in both. The failure of the Republicans to give to the American public concrete facts and figures on security risks and security firings leads straight to the conclusion that to some Republicans a security risk is any Democrat who has a Government job and the only security that is involved is that of the Republican Party.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Wednesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MCCARTHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 12 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

FOOD-STAMP PLAN

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to provide for the distribution of up to a billion dollars worth of Government-owned surplus food a year to needy persons in the United States by use of a food-stamp plan. This is a matter about which every Member of Congress is concerned.

I do not pretend that this is the final answer or that it is even an original idea, but it is my hope that it will provide the Agriculture Committee with some useful suggestions. All I know is that there are many needy people who are going hungry today, and that we are storing up and storing up and storing up food that is not being eaten.

I call your attention to the fact that the Department of Agriculture now has more than \$6 billions worth of food in storage. I think it is absurd and tragic and cruel to build up these mountains of hoarded food while families on relief—or in genuine need but ineligible for relief—struggle along on less than a minimum diet and in some cases actually go hungry.

My bill is to replace an existing and, up to the last few weeks, little-used program under which the States must establish special machinery to obtain surplus food for needy families. Only a few States have set up the necessary certification and distribution machinery.

Some of the other States have shown some casual interest in the existing program, but most of them apparently do not have either the money or the inclination to arrange for the special machinery required under the present law.

Since relief is primarily a local problem, my bill permits local welfare bodies to participate in the surplus food distribution program either directly through arrangements with the Secretary of Agriculture or through their State welfare agency.

Although aimed primarily at families on public welfare whose food allotments cannot begin to assure them adequate diets at today's high food prices, my bill also provides for distribution of food stamps redeemable in surplus foods to persons in need of financial assistance but ineligible for relief for reasons not related to actual need, such as residence requirements or employability.

In Missouri, for instance, employability is a bar to public assistance. Yet we had the situation there of 5,000 farm workers, ready and willing to work but without jobs, who were actually going hungry. As farm workers, they were ineligible, too, for unemployment compensation. Fortunately, they will now get some of this food surplus on the State's initiative. But in many States, where residence requirements or other provisions of State or local law prevent some needy families from getting relief, their plight may not be dramatic enough to arouse the State government, but it is serious enough to overtax the resources of private charities. This situation has

been getting increasingly worse as a result of mounting unemployment.

Last month on the floor of the House I made a speech on the sharp increases in the price of coffee. I have been deluged with letters from people throughout the country protesting the anomaly of ballooning Government-owned food surpluses and inadequate or substandard diets for many families not getting enough to eat.

After looking into the deficiencies of the present surplus food distribution system, it seemed to me a food-stamp plan was the best and most efficient way to get some of this surplus food moving out of Government warehouses and onto the tables of those now going without beef or butter or other dairy products the Government owns in such embarrassing abundance.

My bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to issue the stamps, redeemable for such kinds and amounts of surplus foods as he determines, to State or local welfare bodies to distribute to eligible families. It leaves up to the Secretary the determination of the actual food distribution procedures, specifying only that it be distributed in "packaged or other convenient form on the local level at such places as he may determine."

It would authorize the Secretary to establish standards under which the welfare authorities of any State or political subdivision may participate, and to allocate the stamps on the basis of the amounts and kinds of foods to be distributed and the number of persons eligible to receive it.

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

The bill states.

My plan would in no way affect normal food retailing operations, because the only people eligible under my bill would be families now unable to buy the commodities they would get in exchange for food stamps. They are people going without these foods. In many cases, they are actually hungry.

There is absolutely no reason for that situation when the Government is beside itself finding storage space for all the beef, butter, cheese, milk, cottonseed oil, and shortening, olive oil, honey, and other commodities it has been buying up under price-support or other purchase programs.

Rather than run a big bargain basement sale on butter to the Soviet Union, I would like to see some needy American families know what it is again to have an occasional pound of butter.

My bill is not intended as a solution for the farm problem, or even as a solution for the surpluses. It is intended only as a remedy for malnutrition or outright hunger in the midst of the greatest abundance God has ever given to any nation to enjoy.

RELIEF IN DROUGHT AREAS

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which is a companion measure to one introduced in the other body by the two Senators from Missouri, a bill which would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to lend assistance to people in drought areas in restoring their meadows and pastures. It seems that in the drought relief bill, which we passed in 1949 that the authority might exist, but apparently we are not getting the relief which we believe is necessary and is available. I would call attention to the remarks of the senior Senator from Missouri on page 1645 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, which goes into some detail in explaining this bill.

DEMOCRACY VERSUS COMMUNISM

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include an editorial from the Minneapolis Star Journal.)

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, moderate and temperate men of both political parties are deeply concerned with the excesses which seem increasingly to mark our political discussions. The irresponsible and unreasoned claims upon virtue by extreme partisans and their delusive charges of evil against all opponents have disturbed men of goodwill everywhere in this country. It is therefore refreshing and encouraging to find a great daily newspaper, the Minneapolis Star, take issue calmly and objectively with such charges in its editorial columns of February 9. It is all the more encouraging because the Minneapolis Star does not find it necessary to use the tactics of those it attacks in making clear that truth is not the monopoly of any man or party. I commend this editorial to all of my colleagues who are distressed by this new rash of divisive partisanship which threatens both the program of the President and the well-being of the Nation.

The United States has been singularly blessed in that most of its public servants have been honest and upright men who have well deserved the confidence placed in them. We could not otherwise have survived these 160 years which have seen the rise and fall of governments in nearly every nation of the world. We have remained strong and prosperous and our progress continues steadily forward. Surely this is not mere accident, without direction or purpose.

We have withstood the two great evils of our times, communism and fascism, both rooted in atheistic materialism, both denying the dignity and worth of the human person. We have remained a source of strength to the whole free world because we have adhered to the

philosophy which shaped this Republic in its beginning. Our governments, Federal and State, have officially acknowledged our dependence upon divine providence and our Supreme Court has said without contradiction that "this is a religious people." Our Constitution and the constitution of our States have reaffirmed our belief in God and our respect for man made in His image and likeness.

It is disheartening to find men in and out of public life claim all virtue for any political organization and attribute all evil to its opponents. This failure to fix moral responsibility upon individuals and failure of make good and evil a matter of personal virtue or personal sin is actually a tactic of the very totalitarianism they supposedly oppose. Only men who deny the dignity and worth of man can attribute the sins of one man to his whole family, or his whole party, or his whole nation. The rest of us must recognize that because man is made free by his Creator to choose between good and evil, praise or blame is personal. This is the essence and the consequence of free will.

Communism must be reprehensible to any man who believes that the rights of human beings are prior and superior to any government. The Communist technique, thriving as it does on fanatic fervor and delusive promises, may lead some among us to abuse the very rights they share with us in order to undermine the rights of all of us. But to combat this abuse with untruths and destructive charges calculated to destroy the confidence of the citizen in his government is only another victory for the Communists we profess to fight. While hating the evil that is communism, we cannot permit ourselves to be used by Communists in sowing the seeds of distrust among our fellow citizens. We must instead fight the evil with constructive programs which destroy its breeding grounds and which strengthen the freedom it seeks to destroy.

Communism is bent on the dechristianization of human society and wherever it has been accepted men have lost their rights, their property, and their very lives. Recognizing this, we cannot ignore the demands of Christian justice which forbid us to violate the honor of our neighbor by slander, depriving him of something even more sacred than life and property.

I know most Americans are agreed that we must root out the subversive influences in our society without respect for position or party. But I know also that most Americans are agreed that we must maintain and safeguard our respect for the human person regardless of position or party.

The support that many parts of our President's program have received from both Republicans and Democrats should demonstrate that all of us are willing to rise above political labels when the course of good for our country is clear. We may sometimes find it not so clear, but in differing honestly we do not betray the trust placed in us by the people whom we represent. Rather we try to merit that trust by representing as best we can those who have made their wishes known by free ballot. To find extreme

partisans implying lesser motives for empty political advantage is a reflection not only upon the Congress of the United States but upon the integrity of every citizen who fulfills his obligation to vote.

The right to vote is the right to dissent. We can vote for, and we can vote against, and when we are wrong we can correct ourselves. As long as this right remains inviolate, I think we can protect ourselves from the partisans who have so little faith in the American voter that they feel compelled to rewrite history to their own ends. I am personally convinced that the truth will prevail and that those who want to defraud the citizen of his rights must inevitably fail, whether they are Communists or self-appointed judges who use totalitarian techniques against anything they call totalitarianism. Because we are free and strong, I do not think it becomes any of us to resort to fear in debating the great issues of our future.

Because the following editorial from the Minneapolis Star displays that quality of common sense and detachment needed in discussing subjects so distorted by emotion and because it scrupulously avoids fanning the fires of demagoguery with more demagoguery, I think it is worthy of our attention.

JENNER VERSUS LINCOLN

Abraham Lincoln sort of took a beating last night. The occasion was the Lincoln day meeting of the Lincoln Republican Club of St. Paul, but the man they got to speak was Senator WILLIAM JENNER, Republican, Indiana, and you can't rightly say the Senator from Indiana speaks in the measured tones and restrained manner of the man who talked about malice toward none.

Last night JENNER waved the bloody shirt for fair, and no matter how hard you try to see it otherwise, his performance was less reminding of the martyred President—in whose name he spoke—than like those post-Lincoln Republicans who made "reconstruction" a fighting word in the South. It's a little difficult to imagine calm, judicious, honest Old Abe declaiming, as JENNER did, to the effect that an "invading army of alien intellectuals" had "for 20 years . . . plundered our country of its resources . . . debilitated our people . . . tampered with the security of the United States and permitted traitors to bring us close to military defeat."

And a person can't quite make out whether Senator JENNER just has no sense of the ridiculous, or doesn't recognize inconsistency—or whether he's just got an amazing amount of brass. Because after having hurled such epithets as "alien-minded planners," "civilian leaders . . . trading with the enemy" and "Benedict Arnolds"—to mention some of the milder terms—the Senator right piously denounced name-calling (and) denunciation of opponents.

It was in a thoroughly un-Lincolnlite manner, too, that JENNER implicitly accused former Secretary of State Acheson of treason, suggested—through a half-truth—that the late Harry Hopkins was responsible for Russia's atomic successes, and grossly maligned the reputations of Generals Omar Bradley, Hoyt Vandenberg, and Joe Collins, and Adm. William Fichteler as the Joint Chiefs of Staff who let Central Asia fall to the Communists.

President Eisenhower must be embarrassed by the tone of JENNER's Lincoln Day oration—if he's heard about it. Especially by some of the things the Senator praised him for. Mr. Eisenhower, for example, will not like the suggestion that he has freed the

Armed Forces from the kind of overall civilian control which is an American tradition.

A lot of Minnesota Republicans must be embarrassed about their Hoosier orator, too, those temperate ones at any rate who share Mr. Eisenhower's—and Lincoln's—principles and who would like to keep in the GOP fold those independent voters who made possible the presidential victory of 1952.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, although I was nominated by the Republican Party in my district in the last election, I did not receive an invitation to address any group to make a Lincoln Day speech, and I ask unanimous consent that today after other special orders that I may address the House for 20 minutes to make a Lincoln Day speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LOYALTY FIRINGS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if someone on the other side of the aisle wishes to do the Republican Party a real service on Lincoln's Birthday I suggest he call an editorial entitled "Or Whatever," in the Christian Science Monitor of February 11, 1954, to the President's attention. The President scarcely could miss the point in the implied suggestion that someone in the State Department who talks too much and too loosely is a security risk and should be separated from the Government service. I am extending my remarks to include the editorial:

"OR WHATEVER"

R. W. Scott McLeod, Security and Personnel Administrator for the State Department, declares that he does not think the American people are interested in a breakdown of the 2,200 employees fired by the Eisenhower administration as security risks. We question his assumption.

People do not care, said Mr. McLeod in a political speech, whether the dismissed employees were "drunks, perverts, Communists, or whatever—they just want us to get rid of them." But it has been repeatedly claimed by political spokesmen that the vast majority of those fired were subversives, and the American people are surely entitled to know whether this is so.

It is now reliably reported that only 11 out of 534 ousters in the State Department have been for reasons connected with loyalty. Even this small number cannot rightfully be referred to as "Communists," "spies," "traitors," or "subversives," but only as individuals whose loyalty is in doubt but who may be innocent. Mr. McLeod himself has made this point in a more carefully worded and reasoned interview published in U. S. News & World Report.

In his statement quoted above, the State Department officer mentioned two other categories of security risk and added a catch-all phrase, "or whatever." In the published interview he spells out the meaning of this phrase as including cases where "behavior characteristics . . . reflect on the reliabil-

ity and trustworthiness of an individual." This means that a man may be fired for talking too freely as well as for drinking too much, for perverting the truth about his educational background as well as for sex deviations which open him to blackmail.

Certainly all such people are security risks and should be separated from Government employ. But until the situation has been clarified further the suspicion will remain among some people that the Government has indeed been filled with spies and traitors, while others may suspect that the phrase "or whatever" covers even normal resignations, transfers, and economy firings in which some scrap of adverse information has been used to label the affected individuals as "security risks."

REPUBLICAN LINCOLN DAY ADDRESSES

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, "Just how crazy can politicians get?" the St. Louis Post-Dispatch asks editorially in its issue of February 5.

Republican orators have been using the birthday of Abraham Lincoln as an excuse to leave the impression that Democratic administrations for the past 20 years have been guilty of treason. They not only desecrate the memory of Lincoln but they insult the intelligence of the American people.

Have they forgotten so quickly that Dwight D. Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles—not to mention hundreds of other distinguished leaders of their own party participated in the affairs of our Government through those years—that they held high positions of trust and preferment in both the Roosevelt and Truman administrations?

The truth is that had it not been for the service of General Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles in Democratic administrations they would not be where they are today—in the No. 1 and No. 2 positions in our Government.

FASCISTS ALSO INVESTIGATED BY UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COM- MITTEE

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the discussion of a few minutes ago had by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], and Mr. McCORMACK's emphasis upon the desirability of including Fascists and other subversives in any consideration of the subject, I thought I should call the attention of the House to the fact that the House Un-American Activities Commit-

tee, of which I am a member, adopted rule 10, on July 15, as a result of a report from a subcommittee of that committee, of which I had the responsibility of being chairman. The full committee adopted our report and recommendation which expressly sets forth and identifies Fascists as types of persons who should be investigated as being subversives. I thought the House would be glad to have that information.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman include in his remarks a rather complete definition of a Fascist? I suggest the gentleman do that when he revises his remarks, if he does not care to do it now.

Mr. DOYLE. I supposed the gentleman knew what a Fascist was.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I do not, though I may have my own idea. There are altogether too many broad general statements.

Mr. DOYLE. If the gentleman does not, I shall be glad to try.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman will enlighten me, I would appreciate it; and also, if he will include a definition of a Communist.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I herewith furnish for the information of the gentleman from Michigan the following text from the Congressional Library. This is the same information furnished me by said Library before Congress recessed last summer. I supply it now because I told the gentleman from Michigan I would furnish a definition. I did not happen to have it with me on the floor when I briefly spoke; nor, would time then permit to read it if I had had it in my possession then.

COMMUNISM: A SKETCH

The term "communism," derived from the Latin word "communis" does not occur much before 1840. It was coined in the secret revolutionary societies of Paris between 1834 and 1839. In the years 1840-72, the term came to imply revolutionary action for the violent overthrow of capitalist society. Socialism on the other hand, was the term used to describe constitutional activities for the reform of the economic system in the direction of national control of the means of production. Between 1872 and 1917, the term "communism" tended to disappear.¹ Since 1917, the meaning of the word has been narrowed down to denote the interpretation of Marxian doctrine proposed by Lenin when he came to power in Russia as a result of the revolution of November 1917.

The following definitions of communism are found in a 1931 report of the House Special Committee To Investigate Communist Activities in the United States:

"* * * a worldwide political organization advocating: (1) hatred of God and all forms of religion; (2) destruction of private property and inheritance; (3) absolute social and racial equality; promotion of class hatred; (4) revolutionary propaganda through the Communist International, stirring up Communist activities in foreign countries in order to cause strikes, riots, sabotage, bloodshed, and civil war; (5) destruction of all forms of representative or democratic gov-

¹ Beer, Max. Communism. In Encyclopedia of the social sciences. New York, Macmillan, 1931. v. 4: 81.

ernments, including civil liberties, such as freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and trial by jury; (6) the ultimate and final objective is by means of world revolution to establish the dictatorship of the so-called proletariat into one world union of Soviet Socialist republics with the capital at Moscow.

"Communism has also been defined as an organized effort to overthrow organized governments which operate contrary to the Communist plan now in effect in Russia. It aims at the socialization of government, private property, industry, labor, the home, education, and religion. Its objectives are the abolition of other governments, private ownership of property, inheritance, religion, and family relations."²

Bishop Fulton J. Sheen has defined communism in the following manner:

"Basically, communism is * * * a complete philosophy of life, * * * an integral comprehension of the world, different from all other secular systems in that it seeks not only to dominate the periphery of life but to control man's inner life as well. Communism has a theory and a practice; it wishes to be not only a state but a church, judging the consciences of men; it is a doctrine of salvation and as such claims the whole man, body and soul, and in this sense is totalitarian."³

According to Communist theory, the social revolution must be carried out by the proletariat's advance guard, which is the Communist Party, because the people as a whole, including large parts of the proletariat itself, have been educated in the pro-Communist era and, therefore, are unable to grasp immediately the new conditions of life under the new order.⁴ The duty of the Communist Party is first to point out the faults of democracy under a capitalist regime. Then, when the inevitable crisis arises from either depression or war, this well disciplined Communist minority should be in a position to seize political power from capitalist leadership. Once power has been attained by the Communists, a dictatorship of the proletariat will be established under which the essential means of production, including all material resources, will be taken over by the state under a military communism. This organization would continue until the threat of counterrevolution is past. The Communist leadership would undertake the extermination of privileged classes, the education of the masses, and the erection of a highly integrated and closely coordinated economic system.⁵ Communist theory states that the dictatorship of the proletariat is temporary and transitional. The period of dictatorship is to witness the withering away of the state. When the education of the masses is completed, and they are ready for communism, there would be no further need for states to exist. Another principle of Communist theory is that the establishment of communism in one or more countries must be followed by efforts to establish it in all countries, since communism will not be safe anywhere until it has been established everywhere.

To understand the progress and the dangers of the Communist movement, it must

² U. S. Congress. House. Special Committee To Investigate Communist Activities in the United States in accordance with H. Res. 220, 71st Cong., 3d sess. H. Rept. 2290 (Jan. 17, 1931), p. 4.

³ Sheen, Fulton J. Communism and the Conscience of the West. Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill, 1948. p. 58.

⁴ Kohn, Hans. Communism. In Encyclopedia Britannica. Chicago, Encyclopedia Britannica, 1950. Vol. 6: 135.

⁵ Warne, Colston E. Communism. In the National Encyclopedia. New York, P. F. Collier, 1950, vol. 3: 195.

be regarded as a social and political secular religion. This must be the attitude because communism is not exclusively concerned with acquiring power and achieving social and political changes. It demands absolute dominance over every realm of life—spiritual as well as secular.⁶

FASCISM: A SKETCH

Fascism in the broad sense is simultaneously a philosophy and a way of life which requires that its followers serve the state with an unwavering faith and an unquestioning obedience. It makes fanaticism a virtue and weaves ideological concepts about the doctrines of race supremacy, the leadership principle, rule by an elite class, government under a single political party, the acquisition of living space, a totalitarian state, and the use of force as an instrument of national policy. The roots of modern fascism, especially the German, and to a less degree the Italian, may be traced to 19th century thought. However, it is economically a contemporary manifestation of mercantilism; politically an apologia for world conquest; and spiritually a quasi-religious cult with special symbols and rituals.

In a narrow sense fascism is the term used to describe the operation of the political, economic, and social institutions of the Fascist state. That state mobilizes all physical, social, and spiritual resources and activities, compressing them into a regimented whole. Primary emphasis is placed on power.⁷

A Fascist, of course, is one who subscribes to this philosophy and creed of fascism.

Fascism as a system of government originally was an authoritarian Italian movement begun by Benito Mussolini in March 1919. It came to power in Italy in October 1922. Later, fascism became the general name for similar movements in other countries, among which German national socialism became the most prominent example. By 1936, Fascist principles had become accepted to a varying degree by the governments of Austria, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Greece, and Japan as well as in Germany and Italy. By 1940, fascism could be regarded as a form of organization for society and as an attitude of mind which had its adherents in practically every country of the earth.⁸

The term "fascism" is derived from the Latin "fasces"—bundles, clusters, or groups—denoting in ancient Rome a bundle of rods with an ax borne before Roman magistrates as a symbol of authority.⁹

In its beginnings, fascism was not a doctrine and it had no clearly elaborated program. It was a technique for gaining and retaining power by violence. With great flexibility it subordinated all questions of program to this one aim. Mussolini's formula was the following: "Our program is simple: we wish to govern Italy. They ask us for programs, but there are already too many. It is not programs that are wanting for the salvation of Italy, but men and will power." Despite its flexibility, however, fascism was dominated from the very beginning by a definite attitude of mind which exalted fighting spirit, military discipline,

ruthlessness, and action. At the same time, it rejected contemptuously all ethical motives as weakening the resoluteness of will. Fascism thus is power politics in one of its most naked forms. All theoretical considerations are subservient to what is regarded as the inexorable dynamics of the facts of a particular situation. Ultimately, everything depends upon the ever-changing decisions of the leader—decisions which cannot be discussed, but must be blindly obeyed and immediately executed.⁴

The idea of the absolute sovereignty of the state is the very kernel of Fascist social and political theory.⁵ In many ways, fascism can be regarded as an exaggerated and even absolutized nationalism which entirely obliterates both individualism and humanity. The nation becomes the supreme arbiter, its service the one supreme duty. Only actions, thoughts, and sentiments which help to increase the power of the nation can be called good.

Fascism regards itself as a rejection, a complete and uncompromising denial, of the principles of liberalism and democracy as laid down in the English, American, and French Revolutions of the 17th and 18th centuries. It is a return to an authoritarian order based upon the subordination of the individual and the inequality of caste and rank. The liberty of the individual is denied in favor of the state, the inequality of men is proclaimed as immutable and beneficial. The achievements which liberalism had secured beginning with the English revolutions of the 17th century were not only abandoned, but also have been derided and combated as well. From its beginnings fascism has acted as the implacable enemy of democracy and of the rights of man. Its society is to be built strictly upon a hierarchical order. The rulers of the state are not to be elected by, nor are they to be responsible to the people. On the contrary, the people are responsible to the leaders whose appointment depends only upon those above them. Military discipline and blind obedience permeate the whole of civilian life. One of the chief slogans of Italian fascism was "credere, obbedire, combattere" (to have faith, to obey, to fight), and another was "Mussolini ha sempre ragione" (Mussolini is always right).⁶

In conclusion, fascism means the seizure and absolute control of the entire life of the state—economic, social, political, and cultural—by a small group. Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of worship, freedom of public assembly, all are ruthlessly suppressed. Unquestioning obedience to the leader is demanded of all people in the Nation. The least wavering means imprisonment or death. Retribution may be inflicted upon the person's entire family. A fascist regime is necessarily militaristic, nationalistic, dictatorial, and intolerant of opposition. Its ordinary instruments of policy are subversion, terror, war, deceit, and force.

TALK OF DOUBLE TAXATION IS DOUBLE TALK

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the expression which is being so frequently heard today of double taxation of divi-

⁴ Kohn, op. cit., p. 102.

⁵ Von Beckerath, Erwin. *Fascism. In Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences.* New York, Macmillan, 1931; vol. 6: 50.

⁶ Kohn, op. cit., pp. 102-103.

dends is a completely phony propaganda slogan, cleverly deceptive in its implication and totally without truthful basis.

Inspired and sedulously spread by powerful financial groups seeking to lighten their individual tax burden, it is deliberately—though temporarily, I hope—misleading the general taxpaying public as to what is being foisted upon them.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge any Government official, from the lowest to the highest, to point out where under law or regulations the recipient of dividends from stock is taxed twice on the money so received.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. RABAUT asked and was granted permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR TO BE CALLED TUESDAY

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask that it may be in order on Tuesday next for the Speaker to order the calling of the Consent Calendar under the Consent Calendar rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

MIGRATORY MEXICAN LABOR

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 355) pertaining to Mexican labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

INTERIM AUTHORITY TO CLERK AND SPEAKER

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Tuesday next the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate, and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

⁶ Surian, Waldemar. *Bolshevism; an Introduction to Soviet Communism.* Notre Dame, Ind., University of Notre Dame Press, 1952. p. 5.

⁷ U. S. Library of Congress. *Legislative Reference Service. Fascism in action.* A documented study and analysis of fascism in Europe. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1947. p. 1.

⁸ Kohn, Hans. *Fascism.* In *Encyclopedia Britannica.* Chicago, Encyclopedia Britannica, 1950; vol. 9: 101-102.

⁹ De Kay, Drake. *Fascism.* In the *Encyclopedia Americana.* New York, Americana Corp., 1952; vol. 11: 50.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the other day I asked for a special order of 1 hour on next Monday should the House be in session, to commemorate the anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine*. As the House is not to be in session on next Monday I ask that the order previously entered for me for that day be changed to Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

NAME CALLING

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this is one of those happy occasions when I find myself sitting innocently but very interestedly on the sidelines reading the papers and listening to statements from the well of the House and from which we learn that the President has admonished the Republicans to quit being naughty and calling bad names when they refer to their Democratic friends and colleagues.

Tolerance is always an admirable trait.

Last week we were told by the former Speaker of the House, whom we all respect and admire so highly, that the Democratic backs were getting a little sore. I do not know what from—carrying the load of criticism they have been heaping upon Republicans and the Republican administration—or because they are worrying because of their mistakes and so wearing themselves down—I do not know what it is. Whatever it is they have my sympathy. But here is the point I want to make, if I may: Two Members of this body whom I respect and admire very greatly, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], and my good colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAU], have special orders today. As I understood them, they intend to make Lincoln Day speeches. I hope as many Members as conveniently can will stay and listen. It has been a long time since I heard a real good Lincoln Day speech, and if they will be so kind, and if the President will be so kind, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] will be so kind and so considerate as to advise the Republicans just what names the Republicans can use—I do not mean necessarily from a parliamentary standpoint, but just to use outside, for example, what names Republicans can with propriety use when they want to describe the actions of the last two administrations or refer perhaps to legislation or investigations, and to some of the Members on the minority side, that is, the temporary minority side, and not transgress the rules of the House nor of good taste.

At present the way the situation stands and in view of the President's statement as interpreted by members of the opposition, we do not know what to do. Must we avoid all criticism of our political opponents and their doings? Being uncertain as to just what to do,

strange as it may seem, I have not said anything. That shocks you, does it not? It amazes you that I have not said anything at all in this alleged name-calling contest?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think that probably explains why they did not send the gentleman out to make a Lincoln Day address. He has been too nice to us.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman does not know how I appreciate that word. The former majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], is here. The gentleman from Minnesota does not know how much that warms my heart—tends to make me feel I am not altogether unworthy to serve here. I recall what the gentleman from Massachusetts said about me on at least two occasions. He said he had a minimum of admiration for me. That was parliamentary language. I do not know what he meant. I do not know whether he meant I was a Communist, a Fascist, a drunkard, or what. How thankful am I that the good people of the Fourth District of Michigan do not share his views. Someone was talking here about those people who have been discharged for security reasons. As far as I am concerned, I was not bothered much about that. If a man is a Communist, sure, we ought to let him go. If he is a drunkard, we ought to let him go. If he is a pervert, and there were some 200 at one time discharged for that, we should let them go because the Government lacks some degree of security if they are on the payroll. Somebody is apt to get up on the blind side of one and get some secret out of him. Of course, if you want to call him a Communist I think you should have the evidence—the same goes for any other charge that is made.

I have tried to stay within the facts and the parliamentary rules when criticism is offered and I propose to do so in the future.

But maybe sometime I will want to say something in the well of the House which might be slightly critical of the Democratic administrations, the two that have just gone by, or of some things said here, some argument that is made. That is the reason for asking that we be advised just how we can call attention to shortcomings on the part of the opposition, if there be such without incurring the displeasure of our President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN). Did the gentleman address a question to the Chair?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not a question; I just observed he is serving with as much ability and distinction as our elected Speaker. I hope the present occupant of the chair may continue to represent his great district and that he may also be elevated to the position which he is now so capably filling.

I request my colleagues from the Democratic side who intend to speak of Lincoln to make themselves clear, in view of the fact that the President has not told us just what we may with propriety

say. Just what we may with propriety say when we are justified in commenting adversely on their policies and actions. Our former Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, has not told us. But if we do find any fault, probably we will not be able to, with anything you gentlemen on the minority side say or do, tell us how we can call attention to it without offending you because I do not want to offend anyone, not even my Republican colleagues, certainly not the Republican leadership. If you will do that I am sure many a Republican will appreciate it and for myself, may I thank you in advance.

OUR NATION—THE WORLD—NEEDS
THE PHILOSOPHY OF ABRAHAM
LINCOLN TODAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN). Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank you and my colleagues for unanimously granting me this special order opportunity on the floor of this great legislative body to speak of my deep appreciation of, and affection for, what that great citizen of the ages, Abraham Lincoln, did in his all too short lifetime for our beloved Nation.

On this, the anniversary of his birth, on February 12, 1809, as the son of Nancy and Thomas Lincoln, and the grandson of Abraham Lincoln, a distinguished Virginia pioneer who was killed by the Indians, I again find renewed inspiration and guidance by reviewing some of my personal files and library on him who was a member of this very legislative body during the 30th session of this Congress from March 4, 1847, to March 3, 1849.

I recall that upon most of the anniversaries of Abe Lincoln's birth, while I have been a Member of this House during these 8 years, it has been my great pride to have the privileges of this floor and of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to remind Members of Congress and the American people of at least a few of the untarnished, enduring virtues of this God-loving, self-sacrificing, and most humbly born and reared American.

For instance, some of these occasions when I have done so were on February 14, 1949, April 26, 1949, February 10, 1950, February 12, 1951, February 11, 1952, and at page A617 in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 9. With the assistance of the Congressional Library I called attention to verified sayings of Abraham Lincoln as State legislator, as Congressman, and as President. My remarks of February 10, 1950, in observation of the 141st anniversary of his birth was entitled "Our Nation—the World—Needs the Philosophy of Abraham Lincoln." That was 4 years ago. But, Mr. Speaker, would anyone now say that either our Nation or the world does not still need the applied philosophy of Abraham Lincoln? And because the record of many years last past so indelibly marks the fact that his wholesomeness, his inherent honesty, his righteous indignation at wrongdoing, his applied Christianity to

the problems of humankind, and his patriotic devotion on the highest possible level to his public duty, have been my guiding star which I have sought to follow in both my private life and my public life, I ask your understanding indulgence and allowance for me to further observe the fact that I cannot remember when, in my lifetime, the example of Abraham Lincoln's life was not my ideal of American citizenship. But, with this personal remark, I do now continue to recognize that my humble and sincere desire to speak adequately of his matchless service to our beloved Nation, does not give me either ability or wisdom enough to find the words or the language, with which to interpret my appraisal of this former United States Congressman and President of the United States, who has so appropriately been accepted as a citizen of the ages. Therefore, I again this morning, as before, merely undertake to call to your attention some of the instances, occasions, and experiences in connection with his life as a citizen and also as a public servant which are not generally described or referred to, in connection with the observation of this, the anniversary of his birth.

It is related with considerable authority that when Abraham Lincoln was a member of the Illinois State Legislature he exchanged several letters with one Austin Gollaher, one of his early boyhood friends, regarding his birthplace near Hodgenville, Ky., and that when Gollaher, as justice of the peace in the backwoods of Kentucky wrote State Legislator Lincoln and said in his letter:

I don't hold much with sentencing men to jail. Instead I sentence them to go to church regular for 6 months or a year. It works fine.

The Illinois lawyer answered and said:

I like your idea, but I wonder if God enjoys being used as a punishment.

In connection with the apparent fact that Lincoln never joined a church, I have noted in the written record that Lincoln was always reverent to the Divine and always sincerely respectful of Christianity; helpful and sincere in the promulgation of the principles of Christianity. It is established that his father was a member of the Pigeon Creek Baptist Church, and that also Sarah Bush Lincoln, she whom Abe Lincoln adored and in later years called his angel mother, was an active member. Lincoln frequently quoted the Scripture and habitual reference thereto by him was manifestly founded upon his personal acquaintance with the Holy Bible. It was one of his most valuable assets, and gave him faith and wisdom.

In his 1846 campaign for election when his petty political enemies sought to use his nonchurch membership against him, Lincoln answered in writing and said:

That I am not a member of any Christian church, is true; but I have never denied the truth of the Scriptures; and I have never spoken with intentional disrespect of religion in general, or of any denomination of Christians in particular.

In this connection the more I read of his total life, I am more and more convinced that he preeminently knew God.

He evidently experienced no ill effects from this very personal experience.

Having previously urged you, my distinguished colleagues, and all American citizens to visit as many as possible of the Lincoln shrines, especially in Indiana, Kentucky, Illinois, and Washington, D. C., I wish to again renew that emphasis. Because he was what he was, and because his life as a public servant is undoubtedly the one which we who follow him in public service would be most proud to emulate in even the remotest degree, I again urge that not only all adult Americans possible visit these historical Abraham Lincoln shrines, but that they take with them as many American children and American youth and young people as possible. Such activity cannot help but make a definite intelligible contribution to our great Nation's spiritual and material uplift and security.

The last time Mrs. Doyle and I stood at the doorway of the original birthplace cabin of Lincoln in the National Historical Park near Hodgenville, Ky., and there read one of his great sayings, which was delivered by him at Peoria, Ill., October 16, 1854, as follows:

Stand with anyone that stands right. Stand with him while he is right and part with him when he goes wrong.

I also recalled that the aforesaid saying was the one I noticed most frequently on walls of offices in and about the Capitol Building. For instance, recently I noticed it again in the first-aid room. When I asked the nurse why she had it there on the wall of the room, she proudly stated that it was because Lincoln had stated for her the way she believed people should do. Thereupon was another illustration of the increasing awareness of the American people that America would be much better off if, as a daily practice, the applied ideal of daily American experience and practice was to stand with anyone that stands right and to part with him when he goes wrong.

And another of his character-building sayings which will live in the hearts of every sincere, patriotic American who seeks to live nobly and perform his daily duties, was uttered by Lincoln in his great speech at Cooper Institute in New York City, February 27, 1860, is as follows:

Let us have faith that right makes might. And in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it.

During that historical debate with Senator Stephen Douglas, one of the master orators in American public life, in 1858, Lincoln again enunciated the same high principles for American public servants and private citizens when he said during one of those debates in answer to the political cynicism of Senator Douglas as follows:

On the contrary, nobody has ever expected me to be President. In my poor, lean, lank face, nobody has ever seen that any cabbages were sprouting out. These are disadvantages all taken together, that the Republicans labor under. We have to fight this battle upon principle, and principle alone.

So, because the record is so crystal clear in the premises I challenge your

thought to the proposition that no officeholder in this history of our great Nation has ever so tenaciously or clearly spoken and worked on the basis of principle alone as did Abraham Lincoln.

My colleagues, these days when in the stress of and natural desire for political gain and advancement so many of us yield to the temptation to be petty and small; to overstate, exaggerate, and, even worse, toward our political opposition, it is clear as crystal to me that we as American Congressmen must adopt as our guiding motive those words of candidate-for-office Lincoln when he said:

We have to fight this battle upon principle, and principle alone.

When Mrs. Doyle and I last visited the birthplace farm and cabin where Lincoln was born and walked over some of the trails and paths which, no doubt, he had used, and then when we last visited New Salem, Ill., and Petersburg, Ill., these visits again helped us to understand why in Lincoln's message to Congress in 1861 he, amongst other things, said:

The prudent, penniless beginner in the world labors for wages a while, saves a surplus with which to buy tools or land for himself, and at length hires another new beginner to help him. This is the just and generous and prosperous system which opens the way to all—gives hope to all, and consequent energy and progress and improvement of condition to all.

All of my adult life, including these more than 7 years I have now been a Member of this Congress, I have borne in mind what Abraham Lincoln wrote in his first message to Congress when he said:

This is essentially a people's contest. On the side of the Union it is a struggle for maintaining in the world that form and substance of government whose leading object is to elevate the condition of men—to lift artificial weights from all shoulders; to clear the paths of laudable pursuit for all; to afford all an unfettered start, and a fair chance in the race of life.

Is there any amongst you who today would disagree with the aforesaid paragraph in Lincoln's first message to Congress? Is there any of us today who hold contrary to this declaration by Lincoln to the Congress in session when he first became President of this great Nation? Is the purpose of us struggling to maintain in our great Nation that form and substance of Government as of this day and in this present session of Congress different than the content of Lincoln's first message? If any of you believe that the leading objectives of Government for which Lincoln gave his life are different now than when he was assassinated, I would like to have you state those differences.

And this leads me to make the observation that even President Lincoln was not without petty political enemies within his own political party, and within his own executive administration of our beloved Nation. Time does not here permit for me to more than just refer to one most sarcastic and bitter attack upon the President from Halls of Congress. For this instance I relate to a book in our Congressional Library entitled "Lincoln and the Radicals," by Thomas Harry Williams, copyrighted by the University

of Wisconsin, 1941, page 165 thereof, where the author says:

In particular they were infuriated because Lincoln had dared to threaten Congress with a veto before final passage of the bill. This was Executive usurpation of the rights of Congress, they cried. The President was trying to bully the representatives of the people; he was a dictator. Wade blasted Fessenden for "mousing around" the Executive Office to find out the Presidential will. Perhaps Senators were willing to abdicate the powers of Congress, he exclaimed, and crawl before the White House throne: "(We) ought to have a committee on vetoes; we ought to have a committee to wait on the President whenever we send him a bill, to know what his royal pleasure is in regard to it; and whether it contains anything he would like to modify. * * * I am astonished that men should come in here, creeping in at the back door, with vetoes." And the old Jacobin finished with a sneer that only a few favored Senators could secure an audience with the royal presence: "Others, when they go to see the President, find that they are debarred all access to him. Nobody can see him, it seems, except some privileged gentlemen who are charged with his constitutional conscience."

So it is that in these destiny-making days and partisan political contests for advantage and control in the Halls of Congress and the White House, it is well, is it not, that it is clearly remembered that even Abraham Lincoln, so appropriately and effectively referred to, was charged by leading members of his own political party in the United States Congress with having royal pleasure and with doing something which made it necessary for Members of Congress to be creeping in at the back door, with vetoes.

So it is too often true that in the course of conduct in public life in our great Nation, not only to men in high places with thoughtlessness and, yes, sometimes with deliberate design to destroy the usefulness of a fellow American—malign and irreparably damage the character and conduct of fellow-men; these fellow citizens being at least as devoted and as patriotic toward the American way of life as the petty, small brains and voices which attack them. The foregoing instance wherein Benjamin F. Wade and others maligned President Lincoln for their own selfish political aggrandizement is but one of many such similar instances which this great martyred President had before his untimely assassination at the murderous hands of Booth.

Mr. Speaker, in making these informal remarks, with a very clear awareness on my part of my continuing and total inability to do the subject justice by reason of any words or language in my vocabulary or sincere resources, I would feel unworthy of, and ungrateful to, the claims I have made since early childhood of my affection for and personal inspiration gained by reason of the life of Abraham Lincoln. It is he who has always been and is now my highest exemplification of American citizenship and of public service in the interest of the Constitution of the United States and our Bill of Rights.

One of the annual occasions in memory of Abe Lincoln here at the Nation's Capital is the annual program held at

the Ford Theater, where Lincoln was assassinated, under the auspices of the National Park Service and the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia. It has been my pleasure to be personally present at these annual occasions these several years last passed and to actively participate therein. On February 14, 1950, I received the following communication:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., February 13, 1950.
Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: Please permit me to express our appreciation for your cooperation and assistance in serving as chairman of the Lincoln Anniversary Program at the Lincoln Museum yesterday. Thanks to you, it was one of the best programs we have ever had at the museum and it was attended by the largest number of persons. The audience of 485 was probably the largest that has been in the old Ford Theater Building at any time since the night of the assassination of Abraham Lincoln.

We know that you will be with us at our future Lincoln Museum programs, and we will be looking forward with great pleasure to seeing you.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD KELLY,
Special Assistant to the Superintendent.

And then on October 13, 1950, I was greatly pleased to receive advice from the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia, Washington, D. C., that I had been elected to serve 4 years as a member of the board of governors of that nationally known group, the objectives of which, according to its constitution are:

Article II. Objects: The objects of the group shall be (a) the collection, preservation, and dissemination of knowledge respecting the history, biography, and worldwide influence of Abraham Lincoln, and to (b) honor the memory of that great humanitarian by appropriate convocations and exercises.

This Lincoln Group deserves your more active attention and help.

Mr. Speaker, that famous Gettysburg address given by President Lincoln November 19, 1863, has played such an inspiring place and plan in all of my high school, college, and later years that I again wish to give the exact wording thereof:

Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth, upon this continent, a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived, and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of it, as a final resting place for those who died here, that the Nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this. But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow, this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here; but it can never forget what they did here.

It is for us the living rather to be dedicated to the unfinished work which they who fought here thus far so nobly advanced.

It is rather for us, to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that, from these honored dead we take increased

devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.

Following are a few of his always pertinent sayings:

In using the strong hand, as now compelled to do, the Government has a difficult duty to perform. At the very best it will by turns do both too little and too much. It can properly have no motive of revenge, no purpose to punish merely for punishment's sake. While we must by all available means prevent the overthrow of the Government, we should avoid planting and cultivating too many thorns in the bosom of society. (To Secretary Stanton, April 18, 1864.)

Knowing, as I well do, the difficulty that poor people now encounter in procuring homes, I hesitate not to say that when the price of public lands shall be doubled or trebled, or, which is the same thing, produce and labor cut down to one-half or one-third of their present prices, it will be little less than impossible for them to procure those homes at all. (Speech at Springfield, Ill., December 20, 1839.)

All honor to Jefferson—to the man, who, in the concrete pressure of a struggle for national independence by a single people, had the coolness, forecast, and capacity to introduce into a merely revolutionary document an abstract truth, applicable to all men and all times, and so to embalm it there that today and in all coming days it shall be a rebuke and a stumbling block to the very harbingers of reappearing tyranny and oppression. (Speech at Springfield, Ill., April 6, 1859.)

Labor is prior to, and independent of, capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much the higher consideration. (Annual message to Congress, December 3, 1861.)

Let them (workingmen) beware of surrendering a political power they already possess, and which, if surrendered, would surely be used to close the door of advancement against such as they, and fix new disabilities and burdens upon them, till all of liberty shall be lost. (Annual message, December 3, 1861.)

For my part I desire to see the time when education—and by its means, morality, sobriety, enterprise, and industry—shall become much more general than at present, and should be gratified to have it in my power to contribute something to the advancement of any measure which might have a tendency to accelerate that happy period. (Address to Sangamon County, March 9, 1832.)

The fight must go on. The cause of civil liberty must not be surrendered at the end of 1 or even 100 defeats. (Letter to H. Asbury, Springfield, Ill., November 19, 1858.)

Never add the weight of * * * character to charge against (a) fellow man, without knowing it to be true. I believe it is an established maxim in morals that he who makes an assertion without knowing whether it is true or false is guilty of falsehood, and the accidental truth of the assertion does not justify or excuse him. This maxim ought to be particularly held in view when we contemplate an attack upon the reputation of our neighbor. (Letter to editor of Illinois Gazette, Springfield, Ill., August 11, 1846.)

Persisting in a charge which one does not know to be true is simply malicious slander. (Cooper Institute address, New York, N. Y., February 27, 1860.)

A man cannot prove the negative, but he has a right to claim that when one makes an affirmative charge he must offer some proof to show the truth of what he says.

(Statement during debate at Ottawa, Ill., August 21, 1858.)

It used to be a fashion amongst men that when a charge was made, some sort of proof was brought forward to establish it, and if no proof was found to exist, the charge was dropped. (Speech at Jonesboro, Ill., September 15, 1858.)

Truth is generally the best vindication against slander. (Letter to Secretary Stanton, July 14, 1864.)

I believe we need nothing so much as to get rid of unjust suspicion of one another. (Letter to Charles L. Wilson, June 1, 1858.)

Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and, under the rule of a just God, cannot long retain it. (Letter to H. L. Pierce and others, April 6, 1859.)

I do not propose to question the patriotism or to assail the motives of any man or class of men. (Speech at Peoria, Ill., October 16, 1854.)

But we ourselves must not decline the burden of responsibility, nor take counsel of minority passions. (Speech at Bloomington, Ill., May 29, 1856.)

Let us be diverted by none of those * * * contrivances such as groping for some middle ground between the right and the wrong; vain as the search for a man who should be neither a living man nor a dead man. Neither let us be slandered from our duty by false accusations against us, nor frightened from it by menaces of destruction to the Government, nor of dungeons to ourselves. Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it. (Speech at Cooper Institute, New York, N. Y., September 27, 1860.)

In my remarks on February 11, 1952, I closed the same with the very words with which I wish to close these remarks, this 12th day of February 1954.

Mr. Speaker, truly the birth, life, and death of Abraham Lincoln has deservedly achieved an enduring place in the affection of mankind and has miraculously shaped the destiny of mankind more than we Americans realize. So let us take heed of the simplicity, sincerity, sobriety, uncommon honesty, sympathetic generosity, unselfishness, and humility of Abraham Lincoln. I would not mind being able to contact and consciously copy some of his daily traits of habit and character. Would you?

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FORRESTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Tuesday, February 23, 1954, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

LINCOLN DAY AND THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, February 12 is the day which a grateful and loving Nation has set aside to honor the memory of Abraham Lincoln. It is also the day which the Republican Party has

selected for special partisan purposes. On such a special day, I would not presume to speak to members of the Republican Party in my own name or in the name of the Democratic Party. I have attempted, therefore, to avoid this difficulty by trying to imagine what Abraham Lincoln might say to members of the Republican Party if he were addressing them today. I regret that there are not more members of the Republican Party on the floor today.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The regularly elected Speaker is here; the Speaker pro tempore is here.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not mean to protest or criticize. I realize they are away on what they consider a good cause. I notice, however, the gentleman from Michigan has been left here or chosen to remain.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And there cannot be more than 20 of you Democrats here. You have nothing to be out in the country for.

Mr. McCARTHY. The remaining member of the Progressive Party is here. I did notice an old Non-Partisan Leaguer on the floor a while ago. The gentleman from Michigan is in good company today.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am in good company whenever I associate myself with the present minority party.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, if Lincoln were here today, I believe that he would speak to the Republicans somewhat in this manner:

Just as I did not expect the words of my simple address at Gettysburg to be long remembered, neither did I expect that I would some day be chosen—I cannot say as the spiritual leader—but rather as the man to represent and symbolize the spirit and purposes of the Republican Party. This heavy responsibility I bear alone. Whereas, in the other great political party this responsibility is distributed among 4 or 5 past leaders, the Republican Party, for some reason, has chosen me alone.

I did not expect such singular honor for a number of reasons. It is true that I was the first President elected as a Republican, and in my first term, served as a Republican during the difficult years of the War Between the States. I was not elected to my second term as a Republican but as the candidate of the Union Party, reluctantly supported by an important segment of the Republican Party. It was not left to me to carry on the difficult task of binding the wounds left by the great war or of reuniting the family of our Nation in peace and love as its political house had been rejoined by force of war. I do not know whether I would have succeeded even partially in this work had I been left to attempt it. I regret that my successor, Andrew Johnson, was not supported in his efforts to restore and rebuild what was destroyed and devastated in the war. On the contrary he was harassed and abused and subjected to the indignity of impeachment by the members of the party

which is now called the party of Abraham Lincoln.

I do not repudiate that party. If the memory of me can serve the cause of justice and of peace in my country, and in the world, through its use as the instrument of a political party, I offer it without condition or limitation. My hope is that the best of me, of my life, will be used as the guide and example of the party that claims me.

History has certainly not proved that all of my practical political decisions were right. I have become less certain of the wisdom of some as time has passed. I will not, therefore, advise you on immediate and practical problems today. I will speak to you of principles of personal and political conduct, for of these I have become more certain.

I wish, first, to reaffirm my often quoted, and often contradicted, statement that the "legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do for themselves in their separate and individual capacities"—Springfield, Ill., 1854.

You must not bind yourselves to the changing as though it were fixed and unchanging. You must now, as the party in power, accept the responsibilities of that position, the responsibility for decision, as I was forced to accept it. I am the only Republican President who has made the hard decision to engage the citizens of this country in a major war—and, more particularly, war against other citizens of this country. This was not an easy decision. I knew, however, before my election, that it might have to be made. The words of my message to Congress, in December 1862, are applicable today. Then I said:

The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew.

Also:

But we ourselves must not decline the burden of responsibility, nor take counsel of minority passions. (Bloomington, Ill., 1856.)

Let us be diverted by none of those * * * contrivances such as groping for some middle ground between the right and the wrong; vain as the search for a man who should be neither a living man nor a dead man. (Cooper Institute, New York, N. Y., 1860.)

You are suffering some, I know, from certain excesses of the last campaign. This is done. For the future let me advise that—

No party can command respect which sustains this year what it opposed last. (Letter to Scott Galloway, 1859.)

We must remember that—

We must not promise what we ought not, lest we be called upon to perform what we cannot. (Bloomington, Ill., 1856.)

You are, of course, honestly concerned over the opposition party. I cannot ask you to treat the Democratic Party with charity, but I urge you to act without malice and with justice toward it and its individual members. The abuse and opprobrium which was heaped upon me by my political enemies did me no lasting

harm. I cannot be sure that it did not hurt them—my enemies or the Nation.

It is important that you guard against accusation without foundation.

I believe it is an established maxim in morals that he who makes an assertion without knowing whether it is true or false, is guilty of falsehood, and the accidental truth of the assertion does not justify or excuse him. This maxim ought to be particularly held in view when we contemplate an attack upon the reputation of our neighbors. (Letter to Illinois Gazette, August 1846.)

Persisting in a charge which one does not know to be true is simply malicious slander. (Cooper Institute, New York, 1860.)

The use of words and method of argument is of great significance.

A man cannot prove the negative, but he has a right to claim that when one makes an affirmative charge he must offer some proof to show the truth of what he says. (Ottawa, Ill., 1858.)

It used to be a fashion amongst men that when a charge was made, some sort of proof was brought forward to establish it, and if no proof was found to exist, the charge was dropped. (Jonesboro, Ill., September 15, 1858.)

I believe, as I stated in my letter to Charles Wilson in June 1858, that we need nothing so much as to get rid of unjust suspicion of one another.

The procedural rights of citizens must be preserved and protected.

All honor to Jefferson—to the man, who, in the concrete pressure of a struggle for national independence by a single people, had the coolness, foresight, and capacity to introduce into a merely revolutionary document an abstract truth, applicable to all men and all times, and so to embalm it there that today and in all coming days it shall be a rebuke and a stumbling block to the very harbingers of reappearing tyranny and oppression. (Springfield, Ill., 1859.)

The fight for civil liberty must go on.

The cause of civil liberty must not be surrendered at the end of 1 or even 100 defeats. (Letter to H. Asbury, Springfield, Ill., 1858.)

This is not a special responsibility of the Republican Party, but one which is shared by all members of the Democratic Party as well. The War Between the States did not eliminate division and disagreement. The bitter memories of the war, and even more of the abuses of the postwar period, when my party—our party—held power, remain to plague both parties. We cannot escape responsibility for having permitted, in some cases prolonged and even promoted, injustices and abuses which nurture bitterness. Neither can the Democratic Party escape responsibility for having emphasized, perpetuated, and, to a degree, exploited this bitterness.

As in the time of my term of office, doubt and uncertainty, anxiety and fear are about in the land. I cannot resolve all of your doubts or allay all of your fears. I cannot promise the fulfillment of all your hopes. I can, and do, urge you to proceed with humility and trust in God. You shall make mistakes. Let those mistakes be the consequence of too much trust rather than of too much mistrust and suspicion; of truth and frankness rather than of deceit; of too great leniency rather than of too severe restraint; even of running the risk of being

betrayed and destroyed rather than act the betrayer.

The political system which we have received from the founders of this country does not ask less of its citizens than do other political forms—rather more. It demands a measure of dedication, an inspired confidence that citizens of a democracy can progressively achieve a more perfect order, based upon justice but also on freedom. What we seek is not only an external and legal order of justice, but also an internal order based on justice freely accepted and written in the hearts and minds of all citizens.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My only purpose was to express my personal, and I think I may add, the appreciation of my colleagues for the very interesting, very instructive statement that the gentleman has made. Of course, we all know that the words of Lincoln are always inspiring, and I was wondering if the gentleman, although he did once or twice refer to members of his own party, would not accept the statement that those words of advice which he has given us should be addressed too to the members of the minority party at this time as well as to the majority members.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the members of the minority party would profit from them, but this is a day which is dedicated to the Republicans, and I thought that they might be particularly receptive on this occasion.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I hope we are, but I hope that the Democrats do not mind sharing with us in the inspirations and the sayings that Lincoln gave us.

Mr. McCARTHY. I certainly agree with the gentleman in that hope.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I recollect my history, some of the remarks that the gentleman has quoted as coming from Abe Lincoln were directed at the vicious, bitter attacks made upon him and upon the Republican administration during those days by the Democrats.

Mr. McCARTHY. Not so much by the Democrats as by members of the Republican Party. There were some Democrats who participated, too. The severest critics, as I recall, were members of the Republican Party.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, there were severe critics among the Democratic Party, too, that brought about his comments.

Mr. McCARTHY. Lincoln spoke from experience, and I think that lends strength to his words.

POLITICS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as you know, in California we have a rather peculiar political situation in comparison with the rest of the States of the United States, and that is with respect to election laws which allow Democrats to file as Democratic candidates and also to file as Republican candidates and vice versa. This leads to some strange situations in California where men who are registered Democratic, such as myself, receive the Republican nomination, and a gentleman who registers Republican receives the Democratic nomination. This double filing occurred in the six times I have been a candidate for office in the House of Representatives. Three times in my own case I have been chosen by the Republicans of my district as their nominee, and the Democrats as their nominee.

Of course, when that happens, we have no opposition in the primaries unless some splinter party or independent party puts in someone against you. So, it is tantamount to election when you receive those two nominations.

Now, I do not particularly approve of this method and I have made speeches all over my State in opposition to this particular method. I feel that a Democrat should be a Democrat, and a Republican a Republican, and I have the highest respect for those two parties. I believe that it is necessary for there to be two good, strong parties in our Nation. I think one of them, of course, should be the Democratic Party, and I think that one should be the Republican Party. I am not one who believes that splinter parties should occur in these United States and put our democracy in the condition of the constitutional Government of France where so many splinter parties are found that it takes a coalition of parties of divergent views in order to have a working majority. I believe the stronger type of democracy is a type which has two strong parties.

Now, in order to have those two parties, we have to have men of good will on both sides and we have to get men on both sides who respect the men of the other side and respect the integrity of the two-party system. Attacks against either party, whether they be made by Republicans or Democrats, in the nature of an attack challenging the integrity or the loyalty or the patriotism of that party is, in my opinion, a very dangerous procedure. If the Democrats were successful in destroying confidence in the Republican Party through making unwarranted attacks, through making attacks which were not directed against the principles that the Republican Party believes in, but were directed at influencing the people of the Nation to believe that the Republican Party was a party of treason, that the members of the Republican Party were in league with communism or with fascism or any other subversive movement, then you would be striking at the very basic foundation of the strength of constitutional government. That would not be political partisanship, that would be descending far below political partisanship into the mud of the gutter, into the ratholes of political

ideology, into what I consider an un-American practice, because it is striking at an American principle which is basic to the foundation of our democracy and to the continuation of our democracy.

We have observed in the heat of campaign oratory people on both sides of the aisle departing from these high principles and the dedication to these basic philosophies of government. It is to be regretted that sometimes in the heat of partisan campaigns members of both parties do that which they are sorry for afterwards. But we are not in the heat of a campaign at this time. This is 5, 6, 10 months before a primary or a general election campaign.

A pattern seems to be evolving in one of the great parties where their speakers go throughout the Nation and give speeches with titles such as "Twenty Years of Treason," and casting opprobrium and epithets at Democratic officials, even to the point of questioning the loyalty of a past President of the United States.

In all of the criticisms throughout the years that I have heard of the Hoover administration I have never heard one Democrat stand up in a public forum and say that President Herbert Hoover was not a loyal American. I am serving on the Commission for Governmental Organization, by the appointment of our beloved Speaker MARTIN, with the former President of the United States, Mr. Hoover. Although I may differ with him on some of his philosophies of government, and I do, I also happen to agree with some of his objectives, it would never, however, occur to me to cast by imputation, implication, or direct allegation, a sentence or a word against this man's patriotism as a great American.

I have too much respect for the office of the President of the United States regardless of whether it is my President or your President. When they are elected to that office I know they are great Americans and that they have a consecration, a devoted sacred consecration to what is best for the welfare of the United States, the people of the United States. If they make mistakes or if they advocate policies with which I cannot agree, I do not impute disloyalty to them, or treason. I would rather say I thought they had made a mistake, or I wish they had not done that, that I think they have been ill-advised.

This, in my opinion, comes within the category of constructive criticism. You do not criticize the office of the President of the United States and say that the man who has occupied it or now occupies it is doing something which is done deliberately with knowledge and intent to commit treason against the people of the United States, for when you do that you destroy not the President, not the man against whom the allegation is brought, you destroy the confidence of the people of the United States in our form of government and in the devotion and sacred consecration to trust which every President from George Washington down to our own beloved President has possessed. That is the danger of the type of speeches that are being made

against parties and holders of public office today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. From a political angle, I am not at all disturbed about these speeches that are being made because the individuals who are making them are overextending themselves and are showing the American people plainly their motives. So, from a political angle, I say, it does not disturb me, but it does disturb me when I think of what it is doing to the American people. The two great political parties may have their differences. They may talk about one another, but we respect one another. I respect the Republican Party. I believe in the two-party system from a practical angle as the best means of placing responsibility upon a particular party and their public officials under our form of government. But, when any member of a political party undertakes to accuse all members of the other political party as guilty of treason, either directly or indirectly, that is not simply un-American, it is politically unmoral. It is not even politically immoral, it is far beyond that, it is political unmorality. It only tends to divide our people. As I see it, it does not hurt the Democratic Party, because people realize the motives and the sinister purposes involved, and they cannot convict the Democratic Party any more than some individual member of the Democratic Party could convict the Republican Party, because over and above our party politics, we are all Americans. So, when these individuals go around the country talking that way, they are only injuring our country because they are engaging in political unmorality and bringing about disunity.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is making a fine speech, and I think on this Lincoln's Birthday he might, if he has not already said so, suggest that the members of the majority party could well follow Lincoln's admonition when he said, "With malice toward none and with charity to all." That would be good advice for them to follow.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I just ask the gentleman to yield so that I might ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] if he knows of anyone on either side of the aisle—of course, it would now be on the Republican side—who has charged all members of the Democratic Party with any particular thing. I do not recall any such statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. Has the gentleman been reading the newspapers recently?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, I have. I do not mean that I have read everything and I was not out to the box

social so I do not know what they said there.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the box social is a perfectly proper thing, and that is regular party organization. I think it is perfectly proper. There is nothing wrong with that. I think it was good, sound, party organization. We have our meetings and it is perfectly proper for the Republicans, and that is a very fine idea.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was not criticizing, I just said that I was not there.

Mr. McCORMACK. As long as my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, has purged himself of that I feel happy.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish that I might proceed so that I might use the rest of my time.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman simply has to read the newspapers. He can go out in the lobby now and read the Associated Press dispatch. Just today a newspaperman showed me additional charges that have just been made.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California declines to yield further.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have whatever time he wants, if that is a proper request, not to exceed 30 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I believe the time I have remaining is sufficient.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California has 8 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank my chairman. I always appreciate his kindness and thoughtfulness.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My question is this: Mr. Speaker, I asked the gentleman to yield to suggest to him as he proceeds that he name the statements which were made. I know that I can read the newspapers, as the gentleman from Massachusetts suggested, but I was asking for some specific statement wherein someone—some Republican—charged all members of the Democratic Party with something that was wrong. That was all.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have the utmost respect for the rules of the House, and, incidentally, for the rules of comity existing between both branches, to answer that question; because if I answered the gentleman's question I would probably violate the rules of the House, and I would never intentionally or knowingly want to do that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would accept that as my own answer to the gentleman from Michigan. I have always tried since becoming a Member of the House to abide by the rules of the House. I would not want at this time to make known the names or the lists of names of these people. They are in the public press. Everyone knows who they are. I will give the names to the gentleman off the floor of this House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Fortunately, thank God, we are living under a government of laws and not of men. The rules of the House of Representatives are the law of this body, so far as I am concerned and so far as any other individual Member is concerned. I respect the law. I want my friend from Michigan, who is my dear chairman of my committee, to realize that. I am a firm believer in a government of laws and not of men.

What disturbs me is the action taken by Mr. McLeod. I say this in no unkind sense at all, nor in any extremely partisan sense. Mr. McLeod is going around the country making speeches, when he is personnel and security officer of the State Department. A member of the Civil Service Commission says that he is violating the Hatch Act. Somebody else says he is not.

I see here my friend, the chairman of the House Administration Committee, Mr. LECOMTE. Perhaps he, or somebody else, can decide whether or not there is a violation of the Hatch Act. Somebody ought to decide that. I think of the poor 21 or 22 employees of the Boston office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue who were prosecuted under the Hatch Act. And then I think again of Mr. McLeod who lifts himself above the law and then, as I have said, I think of these poor employees of the Boston office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue who were prosecuted for violating the Hatch Act.

Now, what about this gentleman? Is he above the law?

I could not very well answer the question of my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] without violating the law of the House, and I know he would not want me to do that and under no conditions would I do it.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one observation?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I cannot refuse to yield to my colleague from California, and I am very glad to do so.

Mr. YOUNGER. While we are celebrating the memory of Lincoln, I think we might refer to Shakespeare, as I am reminded of one of his admonitions: "I think the gentleman protesteth too much."

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman always makes a very fine contribution to a discussion. May I now proceed in the time which has been allotted to me—

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to his very dear and beloved chairman?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman. I know that he will make a contribution which will go down in history as something that should be referred to by our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for that sarcastic remark; I appreciate it. My only point is this—

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I hope my friend, after I kindly yielded to him, would not impute sarcasm to me.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is an admirable quality, I understand, and one of the methods Lincoln used to impress his views upon the people.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at point, while I do not intend to interrupt the gentleman, even though I yielded to him, I should like to say this.

In a speech at Peoria, Ill., on October 16, 1854, President Abraham Lincoln had this to say—

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is the gentleman finishing his speech now?

Mr. HOLIFIELD—

I do not propose to question the patriotism or assail the motives of any man or class of men.

I ask my friend to consider that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. After I kindly yielded to the gentleman I did not think it well of him to assail my motives.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I never question the gentleman's motives. I would not do such a thing as that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I accept the gentleman's explanation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman has me wrong. My point is this. I understood the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], and also the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] to say that certain individuals who spoke in behalf of the Republican Party were guilty of unmoral conduct, because they had charged the Members of the Democratic Party with some reprehensible conduct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, if gentleman will yield for just a minute, I would like to have the RECORD corrected. I did not say "unmoral conduct." I said "political unmorality." That is different. Unmoral conduct may go far beyond that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I accept the gentleman's explanation of the difference, but I would like to know what is the difference between political unmorality and unmoral conduct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to defend the reputation of those I had in mind when I defended the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, if I may be pardoned for referring to myself, the gentleman now addressing the House was born in Kentucky, and this great man whose birthday we honor, Abraham Lincoln, was also born in the little town of Hodgkinsville, Ky. If I may go even further I might say that the older members of my family tell me that the Hanks family—Nancy Hanks was the mother of Abraham Lincoln—was a relative of my ancestors in the early days.

And now, having made my reference to that point I want to say that that is not the cause of my admiration for one of the greatest Presidents that we ever have had, but it is because of the principles that he stood for; and I want to give you one other principle that he stood for, because Abraham Lincoln was also a great admirer of another great President, Thomas Jefferson. He honored Thomas Jefferson for his contribution to American history. In a speech at Springfield, Ill., in 1859, Abraham Lincoln said:

All honor to Jefferson—to the man, who, in the concrete pressure of a struggle for

national independence by a single people, had the coolness, forecast, and capacity to introduce into a merely revolutionary document an abstract truth, applicable to all men and all times, and so to embalm it there that today and in all coming days it shall be a rebuke and a stumbling block to the very harbingers of reappearing tyranny and oppression.

He referred to Thomas Jefferson because he knew that Thomas Jefferson was a man who stood for the great principles of the common man; he knew that he stood for all the principles of the common man; he knew that he stood for all the principles of freedom, not only bodily freedom, but freedom of the mind. There is also this great truth in the words of Jefferson:

I have sworn eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man.

Because my colleagues, there is a tyranny of the mind the same as there is a tyranny of the body, and it is the tyranny of the mind, an ideological tyranny which some seek to impose and which was imposed in those totalitarian nations across the sea, not only the slavery of the body, but also the slavery of the mind. And how are you going to keep not only the body of man free, but also the mind of man free unless you respect the principles of freedom? Freedom to have difference of opinion, the freedom to take a position, to take it fearlessly and honestly in the open forum, not in a conspiratorial underground cellar, but in the open forum, to take a position and to support that position with all the strength of your mind and your body. And that is the tyranny which we have had to guard against. We have had to guard against the imposition of that tyranny of the mind that is done by making people afraid to speak, and by labeling them as left wingers, Socialists, Communists, appeasers of treason, associates of Soviet tyranny, and all of these other terms that have been used lately.

Mr. Speaker, when either party, or the orators, or the public officials of either party, stoop to this type of politics we go back to the days of political mire, the days of defamation of character that existed at the time that Abraham Lincoln was President in the White House; the members of the opposition party; yes, and members of his own party who refused him the second nomination—because the Republican Party did not nominate him for his second term; the American Union Party nominated him. The Republican Party of that day fought him with the most vicious type of defamation of character, all types of malicious character assassination, all types of literature which they put out against him. They even unjustifiably questioned the legitimacy of his birth. I could go on and on over the vicious things that were said against him in public. But the point I want to make is that that is not the way to build a strong America.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Do I take the gentleman to mean that when our opposition refers to the members of the

Republican Party as tools of the big interests, and refers to the program of the administration as give-away, that, of course, there is not such possible untimely implication in them? Do I take the gentleman to mean that those things are all right to say, but that only the things the gentleman has listed are the things that we should not have said?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman, whom I respect very highly, knows very well where the line of personal attack upon motive and patriotism occurs and where the difference of opinion occurs in the area of economic philosophy. He knows that without me telling him.

I may say to the gentleman that I differ with the gentleman's party on many economic positions. I do consider that some of those positions which the gentleman's party takes are not for the best interest of all the American people, but I do not impute any disloyalty or treason to the gentleman because he happens to differ with me on that point of view. I will give the gentleman his point of view.

There has been \$29 billion worth of rapid tax amortizations granted, some of them by the former administration; I opposed them. For the present administration I opposed them equally as strong. But I did not impute either treason or lack of proper motive to either side in a case of that kind. At the same time that these rapid tax amortization certificates have been granted, it has been decided by the gentleman's party that we cannot raise the minimum wage from 75 cents to \$1.25 an hour. Now, I happen to differ on that proposition. I do not impute any bad motives to the gentleman or his party.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The gentleman has raised a couple of points here that would require some little time to answer; but on the first, regarding the tax-amortization matter, the gentleman, I think, would leave the impression that it is all bad and has no useful purpose. I think that should be debated further.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I intend to make a speech on that subject. I do not say it is all wrong. I say it might be advisable, but I doubt very much the advisability of selecting special corporations for rapid tax amortization and not giving a blanket amortization to the little man as well as the big man. That is the point on which I differ with the gentleman.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. If the gentleman will yield for one further observation, I will not ask him to yield further. I have been present this afternoon and I have heard various speeches which complain about certain statements. I assume the complaint is accurate. The general idea being that the Democrats and all Democrats are accused in some way because this administration has lately announced that some 2,000 or some such number of people have been dismissed from the payrolls of the Federal Government. I think that the present speaker and others who have spoken on this subject are taking too much unto themselves. I feel pretty certain that all of those people who have been dismissed were employed by our Government under civil service and I think it is

unnecessary—maybe this is magnanimous—for the gentleman's party to claim that all of those people were Democrats. I doubt that very much. I therefore think some of this complaint is really not justified.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, 3 months before Pearl Harbor, in 1941, a very dramatic vote took place in this House, the extension of the Selective Service Act. It passed the House by a vote of 202 to 201. Every Republican Member of the House at that time but 21 voted against the extension of the law. I never impugned the motives of anyone of those Republican colleagues who voted against it. I disagreed sharply with their judgment, and in or out of the House of Congress, back home when I made speeches I said that they were just as good Americans as I, but in the exercise of their judgment in voting against the bill I disagreed with their judgment, which I had a right to do. But I never attacked their honesty, their motives, or their patriotism. I think that is the key—the difference between disagreeing on judgment and attacking motives or patriotism.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I believe that the words of Abraham Lincoln as written in a letter to Charles L. Wilson on June 1, 1858, are words that we may well take to our hearts today. In conclusion I want to give them to you, and I give them to you because I believe that we should have a strong America in this day of peril; that this is the time when we should be united; that this is the time when we need a united force against any of the proponents of tyranny, whether it be from the extreme left as practiced by the Communists or the extreme right as practiced by the Fascists.

So, I say in order to get that united force that we need to present as strong a combat force as we can against the dangers that beset us in this world, where the ideologies of slavery and freedom are in a death-grip struggle at this time, we might take the words of Abraham Lincoln as penned in that letter when he said:

I believe we need nothing so much as to get rid of unjust suspicion of one to another.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WOLVERTON.

Mr. BURDICK in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois (at the request of Mr. JONAS of Illinois).

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana.

Mr. METCALF.

Mr. PATTEN.

Mr. OAKMAN (at the request of Mr. KNOX).

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. SIKES) in two instances.

Mr. TEAGUE (at the request of Mr. SIKES).

Mr. DOYLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRANAHAN (at the request of Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania).

Mr. PRICE.

Mr. BYRD.

Mr. RABAUT in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MILLER of Kansas (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), until February 22, on account of official business.

Mr. CLARDY (at the request of Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan), indefinitely, on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 666. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands and rights-of-way in the State of Wyoming to the town of Jackson, Wyo.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1184. An act to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers from exceptions taken to payments pertaining to terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Department of State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 1381. An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1386. An act to amend section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, relating to the meaning of the word "commodity"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1990. An act to strengthen the investigation and enforcement provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2313. An act to amend the Commodity Exchange Act in order to include wool among the commodities regulated by such act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution to request the International Joint Commission on United States-Canadian boundary waters to make a survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 16, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1258. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1954 in the amount of \$11 million for the Housing and Home Finance Agency (H. Doc. No. 321); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1259. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the

fiscal year 1954 in the amount of \$1,831,909 for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (H. Doc. No. 322); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1260. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1954 in the amount of \$150,000 for the National Mediation Board (H. Doc. No. 323); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1261. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands to be benefited in the Corning Canal area, Sacramento canals unit, Sacramento River division, Central Valley project, California, has been completed as part of the investigation required in the formulation of a definite plan for project development, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1262. A letter from the Postmaster General, relative to a request for reimbursement for the cost of handling franked mail, pursuant to Public Law 286, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

No. 1263. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to facilitate the entry of Philippine nationals for certain purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

No. 1264. A letter from the secretary, United States Olympic Association, transmitting the report of the United States Olympic Association pertaining to balance sheets and other financial statements for the calendar year 1953, pursuant to Public Law 805, 81st Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

No. 1265. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting certain information relative to a list of names involving suspension of deportation, and requesting that they be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

No. 1266. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

No. 1267. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Board and Administrator, Maritime Administration, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administration for the fiscal year 1953; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1268. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 9, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of the Ohio shoreline of Lake Erie, Euclid to Chagrin River, appendix XI, prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 324); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with four illustrations.

1269. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 1, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of Hampton Beach, N. H., prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended

and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 325); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with six illustrations.

1270. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 15, 1951, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of Kalamazoo River, Mich., with particular reference to Battle Creek, Mich., and vicinity. This report is submitted under the authority for a review of report on the Kalamazoo River, Mich., with a view to determining whether flood control improvements along that stream are advisable at this time, with particular reference to Kalamazoo and Battle Creek, Mich., and vicinities, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, adopted on June 24, 1947; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3413. A bill to grant oil and gas in lands on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., to individual Indians in certain cases; with amendment (Rept. No. 1198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE of Michigan: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 355. Joint resolution amending the act approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461-1468), as amended, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico; without amendment (Rept. No. 1199). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 7839. A bill to aid in the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 7840. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 7841. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 7842. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to provide for the imposition of nominal charges or fees by the Commission for inspections, certificates, registrations, licenses, permits, or applications issued or provided by the Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 7843. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit certain employed persons to be paid annuities under such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 7844. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 7845. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the computation of net capital loss and net capital gain; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIES:

H. R. 7846. A bill to make affiliation with the Communist Party unlawful; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 7847. A bill to amend and supplement the reclamation laws to provide for Federal financial assistance in non-Federal projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 7848. A bill to grant longevity pay-step increases to Federal employees on an equal basis upon the completion by them of 10, 13, and 16 years of service, respectively; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7849. A bill to include all types of compensation paid to officers and employees of the Federal Government by the Federal Government within the scope of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska:

H. R. 7850. A bill to make the United States Naval Postgraduate School a depository for Government publications; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HEBERT:

H. R. 7851. A bill to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-incurred disability of loss or loss of use of both buttocks; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H. R. 7852. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, relating to emergency feed and seed assistance to farmers, ranchers, and stockmen in connection with major disasters; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 7853. A bill to permit retired policemen, firemen, and teachers of the District of Columbia to waive all or part of their annuities, relief, or retirement compensation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 7854. A bill to authorize modification of the existing project for Bellingham Harbor, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7855. A bill to authorize certain modifications in the existing project for Port Angeles Harbor, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7856. A bill to authorize certain modifications in the existing project for Quillayute River, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7857. A bill to authorize the improvement of Shilshole Bay, Seattle, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7858. A bill to authorize improvement of Blaine Harbor, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7859. A bill to authorize certain modifications in the existing project for the Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7860. A bill to authorize certain modifications in the existing project for Everett Harbor, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 7861. A bill to provide that the maximum age at which certain individuals may be inducted under the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall be 24; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 7862. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 7863. A bill to safeguard the rights of certain land owners in Wisconsin whose title to property has been brought into question by reason of errors in the original survey and grant; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 7864. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 7865. A bill providing for the refund of employment taxes paid by farmers on services performed between January 1, 1951, and July 12, 1951, by agricultural workers recruited from Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7866. A bill to establish an effective program for the planning and construction of needed public works and to create the Office of Public Facilities Administrator; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. R. 7867. A bill to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands acquired in connection with the Demopolis Lock and Dam project of certain mineral interests in such lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 7868. A bill to increase the amount of articles acquired abroad by residents of the United States which may be brought into the country without payment of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 7869. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 7870. A bill to provide for the distribution of certain surplus food commodities to needy persons in the United States, by use of a food-stamp plan; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 7871. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Quillayute River in the State of Washington in order to improve facilities for navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7872. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for Port Angeles Harbor in the State of Washington in order to provide for a mooring basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7873. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for Bellingham Harbor in the State of Washington in order to provide for a small-boat basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7874. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for Everett Harbor in the State of Washington in order to improve facilities for navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska:

H. R. 7875. A bill to authorize the President to use agricultural products to improve the foreign relations of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 7876. A bill to authorize the President to use agricultural commodities to improve the foreign relations of the United States, to relieve famine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. J. Res. 373. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the 7-day period beginning June 27, 1954, as National Amateur

Radio Operator's Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIER:

H. J. Res. 374. Joint resolution providing that a study be made to determine the most appropriate methods and the estimated cost of reconstructing Ford's Theater in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. J. Res. 375. Joint resolution providing that a study be made to determine the most appropriate methods and the estimated cost of reconstructing Ford's Theater in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. Con. Res. 200. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the arrest, trial, and imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty of Hungary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VELDE:

H. Res. 442. Resolution authorizing additional copies of the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities entitled "Organized Communism in the United States" for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities and Members of the House; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 443. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities entitled "Annual Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities for the Year 1953" (H. Rept. 1192, 83d Cong., 2d sess.); to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 444. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of parts 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities relative to investigation of Communist activities in the New York area; and additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of the hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities relative to investigation of Communist activities in the Los Angeles area; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

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

By Mr. HART: Memorializing the Congress of the United States to continue the maintenance of the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the general court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts urging Congress to pass legislation to prevent the Government of the United States from engaging in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to provide for Federal housing projects in the west, south, and north ends of Boston; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to reduce the age requirements of recipients of old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to reduce the age requirements of recipients of old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to expressing its firm opposition to the projected St. Lawrence sea-

way and particularly to any cooperation in this venture on the part of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 7877. A bill for the relief of Mid-Continent Distributors, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 7878. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Esposito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7879. A bill for the relief of Albert Hermann Lehmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 7880. A bill for the relief of Norman J. Sarrat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 7881. A bill to validate a conveyance of certain lands by Southern Pacific Railroad Co., and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., to Morgan Hopkins, Inc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7882. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Sinatore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H. R. 7883. A bill for the relief of Sister Leonia (Luigina Toresan); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Kansas:

H. R. 7884. A bill for the relief of Rural High School, District No. 6, Highland, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 7885. A bill for the relief of Sohan Singh Rai and Jogindar Kaur Rai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE (by request):

H. R. 7886. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cecil Norton Brody; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 7887. A bill for the relief of William Henry Diment, Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment, and Mrs. Gladys Everingham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 7888. A bill for the relief of James H. Stumbaugh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 7889. A bill for the relief of Garrett Norman Soulen and Michael Harvey Soulen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:

H. R. 7890. A bill for the relief of Alma K. Wetzstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 7891. A bill for the relief of Miss Christine Haas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 7892. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on any and all claims in law or equity, which Maquinna Jongie Claplanhoo, of Neah Bay, Wash., may have against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

503. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of post-office clerks and carriers of Wellsboro, Pa., in support of legislation granting increase in pay; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

504. By Mr. HART: Petition of the Jersey City (N. J.) Chamber of Commerce, urging Congress of the United States to give serious attention to certain amendments to the Taft-Hartley law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

505. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition of EUB Church of Merville, Iowa, protesting the sale of liquor in military installations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

506. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Frank Severa, New Jersey State Prison Farm, Rahway, N. J., relative to stating a grievance relating to imprisonment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

507. Also, petition of the Chairman, Committee on Mindanao and Sulu Manila, Philippines, relative to requesting American and United Nations aid for the rehabilitation of

the abaca industry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

508. Also petition of A. F. Levy, 1806 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., relative to an inquiry being made into the office of the United States Attorney General for relief of those suffering the deprivation of the equal protection of the law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Improved Benefits Under the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H. R. 7840, a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. Hearings on this bill before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will begin at an early date.

This bill is jointly sponsored by all standard railway labor organizations. It provides for the liberalization of benefits to retired railroad workers, their widows and children, and increases the daily benefit rate for unemployed railroad workers. A summary of the changes proposed by this bill is as follows:

First. Widows benefits at age 60: Under present law aged widows are not eligible for survivors benefits until age 65. The bill reduces the eligibility age to 60.

Second. Disability work clause: Under present law, a disability annuitant is deemed recovered if he earns more than \$75 in each of six consecutive months. The bill provides for withholding the annuity in any month in which more than \$100 is earned. This will remove hardships on the one hand, and eliminate abuses on the other.

Third. Survivor's benefits for disabled children and widowed mothers: Under present law, a widowed mother and her child cease getting survivor's benefits when the child reaches age 18 even though the child may be completely disabled for any employment. The bill provides that if the child is permanently and totally disabled, the survivor's benefits to the widowed mother and child will continue beyond age 18.

Fourth. Maximum creditable and taxable compensation: Under present law, the maximum compensation that is taxable and creditable for both railroad retirement and unemployment insurance purposes is \$300 per month. The bill increases this maximum to \$350 both for tax purposes and for credit toward benefits under both the railroad retirement and unemployment insurance systems. In connection with establishing the new benefit rates for crediting this

additional compensation under the Unemployment Insurance Act, it is also provided that the daily benefit rate shall not be less than one-half the last daily rate of pay at which he worked in railroad employment, but with a maximum of \$8.

Fifth. Crediting of compensation earned after age 65: Under present law, compensation earned after retirement age is used in computing the annuity even though through lower earnings in later years this operates to reduce the annuity. The bill provides for disregarding such compensation—though crediting the service—if using such compensation would reduce the annuity.

Sixth. Receipt of both survivor annuity and retirement annuity: Under present law, a widow who has had railroad employment and is eligible for a retirement annuity in her own right and who would also be eligible for a survivor annuity by reason of her husband's employment has the latter offset against the former and cannot receive both; the bill provides for both to be paid.

Seventh. Delegates to convention: Under present law, service as a delegate to a labor organization convention is covered employment. These conventions frequently include delegates from units outside the railroad industry or outside the country who have no other covered employment. The accumulation of these trifling credits is of no substantial value compared with the nuisance of recording it and collecting the taxes on it. The bill excludes such service from coverage where the individual has no other covered employment.

Mr. Speaker, I have received the following letter from representatives of all the standard railway labor organizations in behalf of this bill. I am happy to note that all these organizations are in full agreement in supporting this legislation.

RAILWAY LABOR EXECUTIVES' ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., February 12, 1954.

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
Chairman, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is to advise that all the standard railroad labor unions, including the four train and engine service brotherhoods and all the organizations identified with the Railway Labor Executives' Association, are in full agreement and in support of the draft bill which has been delivered to your office by Messrs. Johnson and Kolanda, which would amend the railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance systems. For your ready reference, these recognized standard railroad labor organizations are listed.

Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen; Order of Railway Conductors; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; Switchmen's Union of North America; The Order of Railroad Telegraphers; American Train Dispatchers Association; Railway Employees' Department, A. F. of L.; International Association of Machinists; International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers, and Helpers; Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America; Sheet Metal Workers International Association; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; International Brotherhood of Firemen & Oilers; Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express, and Station Employees; Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees; Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America; National Organization Masters, Mates & Pilots of America; National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association; International Longshoremen's Association; Hotel & Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union; Railroad Yardmasters of America; Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

The above organizations represent substantially all the railroad workers in the United States. We will be very grateful to you if you will introduce this bill and do all you consistently can to expedite its prompt consideration.

Respectfully yours,

LAWRENCE V. BYRNES,
Assistant Grand Chief Engineer and
National Legislative Representative,
Brotherhood of Locomotive
Engineers.

A. M. LAMPLEY,
Vice President—National Legislative
Representative, Brotherhood
of Locomotive Firemen and
Enginemen.

W. D. JOHNSON,
Vice President and National Legis-
lative Representative, Order of
Railway Conductors.

HARRY SEE,
National Legislative Representative,
Brotherhood of Railroad Train-
men.

A. E. LYON,
Executive Secretary, Railway Labor
Executives' Association.

The "Treason" of Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago this month when a so-called people's court in Budapest, Hungary—a Communist kangaroo court with no more resemblance to a court of justice than a

Communist people's democracy resembles a real democracy—handed down the infamous verdict of guilty and sentenced Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty to life imprisonment, the free world was shocked and dismayed.

To any who had even a lingering doubt as to the depths of Communist depravity and barbarity, this made-in-Moscow decision was the final convincing evidence that free men and Communists do not mean the same things by the same words.

Cardinal Mindszenty was adjudged by his Communist captors and persecutors as guilty of treason. Did they mean treason to the people of Hungary? Of course not. The charge was treason to the principles of atheistic inhumanity, of animal-like cruelty, of degradation of the rights and dignity of mankind.

Yes, there can be no doubt that Cardinal Mindszenty was guilty of despising communism, of hating injustice and persecution and slavery, of fighting against the conquest of religion, of refusing to be a party to the degradation of the human spirit.

Farce though it was, his trial was the inevitable end product of Communist domination of his homeland, for men like Cardinal Mindszenty and the Lutheran Bishop Lajos Ordass who preceded the Cardinal in the prisoner's dock of the Communist court in Budapest stood in the way of Communist control over the minds of the Hungarian people.

On that sad day 5 years ago when a brave churchman stood before his tormentors and thanked God that his conscience was clear, this House was moved to action to protest the farce and cruelty of his arrest and sentence, and I am proud that I was privileged to vote for that resolution.

I am proud, too, that our Secretary of State at that time, Dean Acheson, promptly and in the name of the United States, labeled the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty and the persecution of Lutheran Bishop Ordass as attempts to discredit and coerce religious leadership in Hungary in order to remove this source of moral resistance to communism. He added that the people of the United States are sickened and horrified by these developments and fully comprehend the threat they constitute to free institutions everywhere.

The words spoken then are truer than ever today. The Cardinal thrust into a prison cell to live out his life in cruel confinement is today more than ever a symbol of the conscience of mankind in resisting the designs of communism to enslave the minds of men and banish religion from the face of the earth.

For Cardinal Mindszenty, this has been no new experience. On February 9, 1919, 35 years ago, he suffered for the first time the indecent affront and hardship of arrest by totalitarian rulers of his homeland. Then, too, it was by a Communist regime—that of Bela Kun. He was at that time held many months without trial as a hostage. It was as a man of 27, a priest for only a few years, that he first experienced the aggression of totalitarian rulers against religion. He learned then that those who would

rule men's minds by force and violence feared religion and thus sought to destroy it.

The lesson learned then was repeated in 1944 when he was again arrested and jailed—this time by order of the Nazis, pursuing a similar goal of shackling or destroying religion. Then, more than 5 years ago, he began his third period of imprisonment by totalitarian criminals seeking to crush religion in Hungary.

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles accurately described the true meaning of Cardinal Mindszenty's role in history last month when he said, on the anniversary of the Cardinal's arrest in December, 1948:

The case of Cardinal Mindszenty, a defender of the faith and of human freedom against both of the great tyrannies of our time, is not closed. It is actively before the conscience of his countrymen and that of free peoples throughout the world. The prolongation of his unjust incarceration adds daily to the moral poverty of his captors.

Mr. Speaker, though Cardinal Mindszenty remains convicted under Communist theories of justice of the crime of treason, it is well to note on this fifth anniversary of that tragic occurrence that his guilt consisted of refusing to commit treason to his God, to his religion, to his countrymen or his fellow humans on this earth. His crime was to uphold decency. To communism, of course, no crime is worse. But to those who believe in God and practice His word, his actions stand as a true symbol of nobility of the human spirit.

Postal Employees and the Cost of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, through the years Congress has established, by law, certain basic rights for postal employees. Notable among these rights is the concept that postal workers are entitled to compensation which will enable them to support themselves and their families in a manner consistent with American standards. This concept has been of great importance to the group of Americans who man the postal services.

When living costs rise, the postal workers, with their fixed income, are placed at a disadvantage. Their weekly earnings tend to cover less and less of their expenses. Previous Congresses have recognized this fact and have adjusted post office salaries upward when conditions warranted.

At the present time the average postal employee is again at a disadvantage, and he is slowly being squeezed by the daily demands which exceed his income. In this respect, and to emphasize how the postal employee is being caught under the relentless lever of higher costs, I am

including a recent letter from one of my constituents in the postal service:

BECKLEY, W. VA., January 25, 1954.

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am requesting your continued support in effecting increased salaries for postal employees. After working 13 years in the Beckley, W. Va., post office I find myself living by a stricter budget than ever before.

Realizing that more pay is the old, old complaint, here is a brief résumé of my position:

	Monthly
Married, family of 4	
Take-home pay.....	\$303
Modest home payment.....	55
Food.....	125
Utilities.....	22
Total.....	202
	101

The above is figured roughly, but leaves \$25.25 each week for clothing, school expenses for one, life and fire insurance, doctor and dentist bills, operation of 1949 Chevrolet, and the many incidental expenses that always pop up out of nowhere. Saving account was not listed, such items are now nonexistent for me.

The large majority of employees here work an extra job, or their wives work. This is far from ideal for a contented home life, or for best performance while on the job.

Surely an employee's welfare should be considered on at least an even basis with a corresponding dollar mark in the so-called postal deficit.

I do not consider myself, or my organization, particularly greedy. We were voted a salary increase July 1, 1951, which has definitely not kept us abreast of rapidly rising living costs.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL R. FEAZELL.

I call on Congress to recognize and act on this matter as previous Congresses have done. It is clearly the duty of this legislative body to remove the inequity which has befallen the people of the postal establishment over which they have no control. Only through congressional action can this situation be corrected. I therefore propose that a general pay increase be awarded our postal workers. Let no class of personnel be excluded.

The cost of living affects every worker from the lowest to the highest levels. We must, in all propriety, include postmasters who are the local managers of this great communication system, and who deserve to be given full consideration in this matter.

It is entirely proper that we should grant pay increases to those who labor daily to handle the mail. As a group, and a large group at that, they are widely noted for their loyalty and conscientious service. The postal carrier invariably commands the respect and confidence of his fellow citizens.

It is proper from an additional standpoint that we so act. The Post Office Department has developed into a great institution through the years. In general it has never been considered a moneymaking venture. Rather it has stressed service to the general public, and humanitarianism toward those who comprise its personnel. If we are to keep

the faith of this loyal group of men, and of our predecessors in these Halls of Congress, we must act to close the gap between the pay of the postal workers and their living expenses.

Sign Alaska Statehood Discharge Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, discharge petition No. 7 is now at the Speaker's desk. I trust it soon will have enough signatures so that the House of Representatives may proceed to consider H. R. 2982, the Alaska statehood bill. That bill was favorably reported by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on June 26, 1953 by a vote of 19 to 4. There is no sound reason why it should not be considered promptly, and every good reason why it should. This House last year passed the Hawaii statehood bill but we have had no opportunity to debate and vote on the companion measure for Alaska. As one who has always favored statehood for Hawaii and who has voted for it, I appeal to my colleagues to accord Alaska the same consideration Hawaii has had. I am convinced that if the Alaska bill were voted upon it would be passed by a substantial majority. In any event, we should have the opportunity to work our will on the statehood bill. I do not like to suggest that political considerations are involved here in denying Members of the House the privilege of considering Alaska statehood, but frankly I know of no other explanation.

It is true that the Truman administration endorsed, and enthusiastically, statehood for both of our organized Territories. It is likewise true that neither the state of the Union message in 1953 or in 1954 made any mention of Alaska statehood. That omission, however, sets up no barrier which we cannot surmount. We can do so by signing the discharge petition presented by the gentleman from California, Representative CLAIR ENGLE, and thus give ourselves an opportunity to pass on the merits of Alaska statehood, just as we already have done regarding Hawaii.

I should like to present to you the words used by General Eisenhower, before he became President, when in a speech made at Denver in 1950 he was quoted as saying that the granting of statehood to Alaska and Hawaii would serve the people of the world as a practical symbol that America practices what it preaches. For one, I am willing to stand on those words.

When this House passed the Alaska statehood bill in 1950, the Territory had 128,000 people. Now, according to official estimates, the population has passed that of the least populated State. The population gain between 1950 and 1952 was more than 44 percent, thus making Alaska the fastest growing area in the

country. Its estimated population in 1952 was over 182,000.

Statehood for this great Territory should not be considered on a partisan basis. Partisan politics has no part in such a cause. I should like to remind you that both the Democratic and Republican platforms of 1948 and 1952 endorsed statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii. I should like to point out that when the Alaska statehood bill was passed by the House in 1950, it commanded bipartisan support. With your cooperation expressed by signing Discharge Petition No. 7 we shall have the Alaska statehood bill on the floor again and I confidently predict to you that it will be passed and that it will command strong support from both sides of the aisle. I hope you will sign the petition before leaving this Chamber today.

B-N-G, a Remedy for Burns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the last session of Congress I inserted an article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD referring to the new burn remedy, B-N-G, manufactured by the Worth Pharmacal Co., Oak Lawn, Ill. Mr. Speaker, a number of Congressmen in the last session referred to this product with high praises as to a number of instances that they had used it for their own families. I would again like to be one of those Congressmen to give a small report on my activities in connection with this product and call it to the attention of the House, and also to the attention of the National Research Council subcommittee on burns.

Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 7, a member of my family scalded her hand with some hot grease. The burn was severe and would have been a handicap to us as we were being entertained that afternoon. My wife happened to have a bottle of B-N-G in the medicine cabinet and applied it to the hand immediately and in a few minutes there was no pain and after 30 minutes the blisters had subsided. That night when she returned home there was no trace as to where she was burned. I would like to be the first to bring it to the attention of the House and the country that for some 9 years this company has been trying to obtain a burn test by the National Research Council subcommittee on burns.

It certainly looks like the National Research Council should approve testing this product for burns since it is my understanding they have approved research on the Kinsey report.

For the past 5 years, through its regional distributor, Mr. William W. Vaughn of 510 Arlington Village, Arlington, Va., former aide to Vice President Barkley, samples of this product have been distributed freely throughout the

Washington area. Therefore, it has fallen in the hands of quite a number of people. I understand now that somewhere in the neighborhood of 100 physicians in the Washington area are familiar and have used it for burns. We think that this company should have a fair and equal test on burns by the National Research Council subcommittee on burns or under the supervision of the American Medical Association. For your information this company has been turned down a number of times in the last 9 years for a burn test by the National Research Council subcommittee on burns. Most everyone who has had any experience with this product for burns praises it highly for the results it has given. Mr. Speaker, this product is also good for treating dermatitis and also poison oak, poison ivy, and sunburn. At the close of my remarks I would like to include a letter from one of the outstanding skin specialists in the Washington area. The letter speaks for itself:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 6, 1954.

Mr. WILLIAM VAUGHN,
Arlington, Va.

DEAR MR. VAUGHN: Relative to my letter of July 29, 1953, I wish to say that I have continued to use mung bean sprout extract (B. and G. tryosinase solution) in several hundred cases of dermatophytosis (fungous infection) of the feet.

These cases have done well. Clinical cures have been exceptionally rapid.

I am convinced that there is great merit in this product and believe that further medical research should be done to explore the possible uses of this extract in the treatment of other diseases.

Sincerely,

JAMES Q. GANT, Jr., M. D.

Utilization of Reserve Officers in the Regular Establishment as Enlisted Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to submit a lengthy, well-written letter from Hon. John A. Eannah, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower. This letter relates to the utilization of Reserve officers in the Regular Establishment as enlisted men, and the letter follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., January 19, 1954.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BROOKS: This is in reply to your letter of December 22 in which you question further the propriety of permitting individuals who were given direct Reserve commissions to be inducted for enlisted service.

First, I wish to emphasize that the problem does not involve a mistake on the part of any military department in awarding Reserve commissions. At the time that the individuals in question were commissioned, there existed in the active forces a justified procurement objective for officers possessing their qualifications.

Failure to order these individuals to active duty in a commissioned status was not a matter of the service refusing to accept them on a voluntary status. Rather, reductions in personnel strengths necessitated by budgetary and manpower limitations required severe curtailment of officer procurement programs, as well as the involuntary release from active duty of large numbers of officers who wished to remain in the service. Those individuals awarded Reserve commissions direct from civilian status could have been accommodated on active duty only at the expense of releasing involuntarily additional experienced officers.

The fact that such Reserve officers cannot be utilized at this time on active duty and thereby remain liable for induction, would not justify termination of their commissions. The Armed Forces must maintain sufficient numbers of qualified Reserve officers, either in an inactive duty status or on active duty as enlisted men, to meet mobilization requirements. The individuals in question possess qualifications which make their retention as Reserve officers for this purpose highly desirable.

There is a further important reason why the commissions of these officers should not be terminated. As you know, those individuals given direct appointments who were under age 26 upon accepting commissions, acquired under provisions of section 4 (d) (3) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act an 8-year military obligation. The termination of their commissions prior to their entry on active duty would constitute fulfillment of their Reserve obligation. If subsequently inducted, they would have no further obligation for membership in a Reserve component following completion of their national service active duty requirement.

Since my letter to you of December 16 regarding this matter, the Air Force has made special provision whereby those draft-eligibles holding direct Air Force Reserve commissions may enlist for a 2-year term in the Air Force in lieu of being inducted for Army service. Individual notifications to this effect have been dispatched to these officers. This will enable the individuals to fulfill their national service active duty requirement in enlisted status and retain their commissions.

Utilization of Reserve officers as enlisted men is not without precedent. Many fine officers of World War II were individuals who had earned and held Reserve commissions while they were Regular Army enlisted men, and today there are many Regular Army and Air Force enlisted men who hold Reserve commissions in their respective services, including a considerable number who enlisted following their release from active duty during the recent reduction in force.

In the light of the factors outlined above I feel that the solution adopted in this matter is the one which under present circumstances best serves the interests of all concerned.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. HANNAH.

Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for Secretary Hannah's logic and reasoning. The matter, however, impresses me differently to the way it seems to impress Secretary Hannah. Many of the people in the Regular Enlisted Establishment to whom he refers as having Reserve commissions are people who are willing to accept enlisted noncommissioned status in order to remain on active duty although those people hold Reserve commissions.

I can understand that these people may wish to remain on active duty in order to continue uninterruptedly their

military career and for retirement purposes. Even in these cases it is not a healthy situation that is produced when the Defense Establishment will permit commissioned officers to serve in non-commissioned grades.

The argument is far stronger in the case of Reserve officers to which I refer. I have in mind, for instance, the case of a Reserve officer who is drafted into the armed services because he is within the draft-age group. These men have offered to serve the Military Establishment in Reserve commission grades. They have been rejected by the Armed Forces because it is stated that they are not needed. The draft laws permit, and the Defense Department cooperates in, the drafting of these Reserve officers, forcing them to serve in enlisted grades against their will.

The matter is worse than this. A Reserve lieutenant in the Army may be drafted and placed in the Navy as an enlisted man. A Reserve officer in the Air Force may be drafted and sent to the Marine Corps as an enlisted man. This action shows, in my judgment, scant respect for a Reserve commission. It is not conducive to a buildup of pride and enthusiasm of the Reserve, whether it be an enlisted or commissioned Reserve, to realize that the Reserve commission is treated with scant consideration by the agency which awards it.

Commissioned officers in the National Guard are not treated in this way, and they should not be so treated. A fortiori, commissioned officers in the Reserve establishment, should be assured that their Reserve commission is a badge of honor and a symbol of pride, and we from the Congress, and Secretary Hannah from the Defense Department, should join in making the service in the Military Establishment fair and acceptable and should encourage our young men to enter on active duty with pride and enthusiasm.

The President Sets Us Right on Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, while I have criticized the President on occasion—especially on his farm program—in the spirit of fairness I have on many occasions given him full credit for what he has done and said.

His latest statement in regard to sending troops to Indochina will be applauded by most Americans. He stated, "I cannot conceive of a greater tragedy than for the United States to become involved in a war in Indochina or anywhere else."

That is what the people of the United States have been waiting to hear. That is what will mark this administration as differing from the past administration. This policy, if pursued, will have the overwhelming approval of the voters of the United States.

If this administration can think this policy through and eliminate some of the billions we are spending on other people's troubles that will be another milestone in preserving this country.

I believe in self-defense, but I have been fearful that we were spending so much of our wealth and the lives of our men in rummaging around the world to stop every backyard cat fight, that in the end we shall not be able to defend ourselves. After all, if it ever comes to the point of fighting for the preservation of the United States, I know of no country that would come to our rescue. If they so desired, many countries would be unable to aid us, and many of the nations that have been living off us will not be inclined to help us.

We have made few friends by our excursion in spending billions, scattering it throughout the world, and on the contrary, we have made enemies. Our wild expenditure of money has caused the people of many countries to feel that our purpose is conquest, when that is, and always has been, contrary to the intent of the United States. Therefore, this country should be strong, and remain strong. Our natural resources, the greatest in the world, should be preserved; our Armed Forces should remain strong, and the people of the United States relieved from this extra, arduous, and in most cases, useless expense. We cannot afford to lose thousands of our best men.

The fear that Russia is about to pounce upon us from the air is a war scare invented by Russia to keep us spending, just like we have been doing. We need not fear Russia, as no country on earth like the dictatorship now existing in that country, can ever hope to have the support of her people. Less than 5 percent of the Russian population participate in their government. This 5 percent rules the other 95 percent. The conditions existing in Russia today, if continued, will never make the Russians a united force in any war. In this country it takes a majority of the voters to bring into being any administration; and if war comes it will not be fought by a majority of the people of the United States, but by all of them. This powerful country, with that kind of support, should abandon this war scare, and pursue its regular way. Kipling had this pretty well thought out when he said:

If you can talk with crowds and keep your virtue,

Or walk with kings—nor lose the common touch;

If neither foes nor loving friends can hurt you;

If all men count with you, but none too much;

If you can fill the unforgiving minute

With sixty seconds' worth of distance run,
Yours is the earth and everything that's in it,
And which is more—you'll be a man, my son!

Mr. Speaker, the efforts of the one-worlders in the United Nations to build a world government is a dangerous move. These advocates readily concede that the United States must give up some of its sovereignty in order to form this organization, but this country cannot afford, ever, to give up any of its sovereignty, as

it is the only government on earth that is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. The idea of having treaties of the United Nations attempting to hamstring our Constitution is an example of this "giving up some of our sovereignty."

My advice to the American people is to keep our defenses strong; preserve our form of government as it is, and then defend it against any power or combination of powers in the universe. Do not rely on others to come to our aid, but rely upon ourselves, and ourselves alone, to preserve the greatest government yet to appear on the face of the globe.

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES G. OAKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 145th anniversary of the birth of one of the most illustrious Members this body has ever known—Abraham Lincoln. It is, therefore, most appropriate that we recall the life and character of this great American. This day calls, too, for a reflection of America as a nation. It calls for a return to the belief of our forefathers and their fervent faith in Almighty God. We must rededicate ourselves in order to find new strength to complete the tasks confronting us.

Last Monday I introduced in the House of Representatives House Joint Resolution 371, to amend the pledge of allegiance to the flag by adding the words "under God" following the word "indivisible," making the pertinent phrase "one nation indivisible under God."

Our forefathers recognized the inherent truth that any government of and by the people must look to God for divine leadership in order to protect itself against tyranny and despotism. In the year 1620, when the first Constitution for the complete self-government of the people under its jurisdiction was devised in America, the Mayflower compact, in its opening sentence, declared: "In the name of God. Amen." This was open recognition of the need for the official conjunction of the laws of God with the Constitution and laws of the land.

On July 4, 1776, our freedom-loving forebears composed one of the world's great political masterpieces—the Declaration of Independence. It said, in part:

When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

The same document speaks of men being "endowed by their Creator" with unalienable rights and appeals to the

"Supreme Judge of the World" that this Nation be free.

Later, at Gettysburg, on November 19, 1863, Abraham Lincoln in a 2-minute dedication speech said:

That we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.

Throughout our history, the statements of our great men have been replete with references to God. Our Presidents have never failed to recognize man's subservience to his Master as the only form of servitude which assures life, liberty, and happiness.

It was William Penn who said:

Those people who are not governed by God will be ruled by tyrants.

Four years before the Declaration of Independence, we find George Mason arguing to the General Court of Virginia that—

All acts of legislature apparently contrary to natural right and justice are, in our laws, and must be in the nature of things considered as void. The laws of nature are the laws of God, whose authority can be superseded by no power on earth.

It was during the Presidency of Abraham Lincoln that Congress passed an act on April 22, 1864, directing that the inscription "In God We Trust" be placed on our coins. This avowal of faith has been imprinted on billions and billions of coins during the last 90 years.

Records show that under date of November 20, 1861, the then Secretary of the Treasury addressed a letter to the Director of the Mint, stating, in part:

No nation can be strong except in the strength of God or safe except in His defense. The trust of our people in God should be declared on our national coins.

If this recommendation has been followed in a material symbol such as our coins, should not the same idea be infinitely more appropriate in relation to the pledge of allegiance to our flag and country? The Pledge of Allegiance is not a confession of faith. It is an affirmation of loyalty to a nation symbolized by its flag.

The tough moral fiber which has characterized this Nation's growth to a position of world preeminence must not deteriorate. It was fed on the belief that our destiny was bound to the will of God. It cannot survive unless this spiritual fuel is maintained.

Last Sunday, the President of the United States and his family occupied the pew where Abraham Lincoln worshipped. The pastor, the Reverend George M. Docherty, suggested the change in our Pledge of Allegiance that I have offered.

Dr. Docherty delivered a wise sermon. He said that as a native of Scotland come to these shores he could appreciate the pledge as something more than a hollow verse taught to children for memory. I would like to quote from his words. He said:

I could sit down and brood upon it, going over each word slowly in my mind. And I came to a strange conclusion. There was something missing in the pledge, and that

which was missing was the characteristic and definitive factor in the American way of life. Indeed apart from the mention of the phrase, the United States of America, it could be the pledge of any republic. In fact, I could hear little Muscovites repeat a similar pledge to their hammer and sickle flag in Moscow with equal solemnity. Russia is also a Republic that claims to have overthrown the tyranny of kingship. Russia also claims to be indivisible.

Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. Docherty hit the nail squarely on the head. One of the most fundamental differences between us and the Communists is our belief in God. Communism rejects God. The spiritual bankruptcy of the Communists can be the very weapon we need to triumph in the struggle for men's minds. I say it can be, for the effective use of this weapon presupposes a firm code of spiritual and moral values. We take pride in the new look we have given our powerful military machine. I believe we need a new look just as urgently in our spiritual armor, and I am recommending one means of achieving it.

After attending church services last Sunday, President Eisenhower participated with churchmen of the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths in an American Legion radio and television program that was part of that organization's back to God movement. The President said that this country needs now, as it ever has needed, "positive acts of renewed recognition that faith is our surest strength, our greatest resource." The President went on to say:

Whatever our individual church, whatever our personal creed, our common faith in God is a common bond among us. In our fundamental faith, we are all one. Together we thank the power that has made and preserved us as a nation. By the millions, we speak prayers, we sing hymns—and no matter what their words may be, their spirit is the same—in God is our trust.

On this same program, Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, one of our most eminent Protestant clergymen, declared:

Our country will remain strong only as we remain religious.

Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, a leading prelate of the Roman Catholic Church, said:

If we are to keep our rights and liberties, then we must also keep our God.

And, finally, Rabbi Norman Salit, one of the Nation's outstanding Jewish leaders, stated:

If we can teach our children to live by the concepts of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, we can redeem them from moral failure.

I would like to take but a minute to answer beforehand the two principal arguments I anticipate in opposition to my amendment.

The first concerns the relationship of church and state. The phrase "under God" is all inclusive for all religions and has no reference whatever to the establishment of a state church. The first amendment of our Constitution prohibits Congress from passing laws respecting the establishment of a religion. One can pledge one's allegiance to a flag symbolizing a state founded upon a belief in God and, at the same time, accept the

doctrine of a separate church and state. A distinction exists between the church as an institution and a belief in the sovereignty of God. The argument that this amendment might be a breach of the separation principle cannot be material.

Secondly, the argument may be made that the proposed amendment violates the right of a person to disbelieve in God, a fundamental of a free democracy. However, there is a vast difference in making a positive affirmation on the existence of God in whom one does not believe, and on the other hand making a pledge of allegiance and loyalty to the flag of a country which in its underlying philosophy recognizes the existence of God.

I cannot accept either of these contentions as valid, if indeed they are at all. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the joint resolution I have introduced will place a new meaning on all the truths which this Nation holds so dear, enabling us to regain our reverence for God in this 20th century America, and making it possible for us to rediscover our own value and the solid basis upon which it rests. Then we, too, can say with Lincoln—"this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom."

H. R. 7530, To Make Tax-Free the Gain on the Sale of a Personal Residence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, I introduced in the House the bill (H. R. 7530) to amend section 112 (n) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that gain from the sale or exchange of the taxpayer's home will not be taxed whether or not he replaces it with another residence.

This bill is intended to correct a situation which now places an unjustifiable financial burden on the mothers and fathers of our population. The home-buying experience of most American families usually follows this pattern.

The young married couple rents an apartment. Then, as children come along and they need more space, they purchase a small home. As the children move on to high school and college age, more livable space is required and the family moves again to a larger home. This is the general pattern.

The whole panorama of family life unfolds within these walls. This home is the scene of birthday parties, graduations, courtships, weddings, and when these events are but memories, the old home has served its purpose for this family.

Now the parents have completed the lifelong task of rearing the family and they desire to take a smaller home or move to an apartment. Then it is that the full force of the present unjust state of the law is felt. Uncle Sam steps in

with a whopping tax bill on the total profit realized from the sale of the former residences.

This is the treatment the Government affords to parents who, in the rearing of their families, have played a tremendously important part in the progress and the economy of the Nation, and at a time in their lives which inevitably comes to most of us, when they want to retire to a smaller home or apartment to enjoy their just reward of peace and rest.

Such a state of the law penalizes these parents for the fulfillment of their family obligations; in effect that law punishes them after they have sent forth from the old home the families of the future, the bedrock strength of America.

This situation demands correction, and I hope the principles of my bill will be approved by the Ways and Means Committee.

Can We Afford To Prepare for Every Conceivable Kind of War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the risk and danger which the American people are voluntarily expected to assume as a result of the new look defense policy are implicit in a statement by Deputy Defense Secretary Roger M. Kyes. He said last November 12 that—

We must reassess our strategic planning and logistics in the light of technological advances, and have the courage to discard the outmoded procedures and weapons which will no longer serve more than tradition.

We can no longer afford to prepare for every conceivable kind of war. * * * We can no longer afford the luxury of the status quo in strategic planning.

I am impressed with the sentence: "We can no longer afford to prepare for every conceivable kind of war."

I submit that here is the very core of the weakness of the new look defense policy.

Our Nation's safety must rest on defense plans which will prepare us for every conceivable kind of war.

History provides innumerable examples where nations have failed to prepare for every conceivable kind of war. Twelve years ago France prepared to fight a defensive war in the Maginot Line and was not prepared for the kind of air war and the war of armor and movement brought to it by Germany. In our own Nation's Revolution, England was well prepared to fight a naval battle and an orderly encounter between highly disciplined and well-trained soldiers but was not prepared to meet the kind of war the "rag tail, bob tail" Revolutionary Army had learned from its experience in Indian warfare. Today, France is adequately equipped to deal with a sizable military force on ordinary terrain, utilizing conventional air power, armor, and

mobile troops, but it is hopelessly bogged down in the kind of war it is fighting in the jungles and rice fields of Indochina. It is too much to ask of the enemy that he satisfy the Defense Department's own concept of defense and fight the kind of war for which his adversary is conceivably prepared.

The administration has committed itself to a calculated risk which it chooses to call its "new look" defense policy. In essence, the administration defense policy springs from political and budgetary considerations. Imprudent as it may have been, in 1952, the Republican office-seekers promised the American people a balanced budget. A balanced defense effort now becomes subordinate to the political implication of an empty campaign promise.

The administration has sent to Congress a budget in which 73 percent of the cuts are in national-security items. The Army, and to a lesser degree the Navy, bear the brunt of these cuts. The following are some of the effects of the military cut:

Army expenditures cut \$4 billion—23 percent—from \$14.2 billion to \$10.2 billion.

Navy expenditures cut \$800 million—7 percent—from \$11.3 billion to \$10.5 billion.

Army divisions cut from 20 to 17 divisions by June 1955.

Total military manpower cut from 3.4 million now to 3 million June 1955.

Army manpower cut from 1.5 million now to 1.164 million June 1955.

Marine manpower cut from 250,000 now to 215,000 June 1955.

Navy manpower cut from 770,000 now to 688,900 June 1955.

No new authority for Army procurement and production is being asked for.

Seven Navy combat ships to be put in mothballs—including 1 battleship and 1 cruiser.

Along with the budget, the Congress receives the suggested bromide: "We have an outstanding military expert in the White House. Who are we to question his judgment?"

I cannot, and I hope that the Congress as a whole will not, accept this neat escape mechanism.

The Congress must make a searching inquiry and the American people must know the extent of the calculated risk they are expected to accept.

Political promises of the administration and the insatiable desire of the top 2 percent of the Nation's business and industry for more tax cuts should not stand between this Nation and preparation for every conceivable kind of war.

The new-look concept of defense may be characterized by reliance on fleets of long-range bombers carrying atomic and hydrogen bombs to the military and industrial targets of an enemy nation, with minor consideration given to the use of ground and naval forces. It must be borne in mind that the new Air Force budget is a total reversal of last year's cutbacks. Last year the administration cut the Air Force budget by \$5 billion, canceled orders for 1,000 planes, and cut Air Force goals from 143 wings to 120 wings. In an about-face, the new budget increases the Air Force budget by

\$600 million and raises the Air Force goals from 120 wings to 137 wings. The result is a loss of 1 year in Air Force buildup. Compare this to the statement by Presidential Candidate Eisenhower on September 25, 1952:

We need a new administration . . . that will call a halt to stop-and-start planning; an administration that will not demobilize and then hurriedly remobilize.

Let me make it crystal clear that I am not playing off the Air Force against surface forces. We must have a strong retaliatory Air Force and adequate homeland defense. In addition, we must have a strong ground force.

Let me describe two conceivable kinds of war we might be forced by the Soviets to fight. Needless to say, we will be forced to fight the type of war for which we are least prepared. I ask you to consider in the case of each whether the new-look defense concept of the administration meets these threats.

AN ALL-OUT GLOBAL CLASH

The air war is joined. Washington, New York, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago smoulder in ruins. Millions of Americans are dead, wounded, or homeless. Our warming potential is seriously crippled.

In turn, a dozen of Russia's major cities and industrial targets are in rubble. Both nations convulse and gasp from the terrible punishment.

Russia, no longer able to sustain a continued effort from her homeland, sends her ground forces in all directions.

A weak European defense army is under assault.

Yugoslavia and Greece are neutralized by Rumania.

Turkey is fighting to save her own territory.

Japan cringes before the threat of Red China.

Chaos reigns in Korea, Indochina, British Malaya.

Italy is neutralized internally by Communists from within.

France is paralyzed.

London is in ruins and the British Commonwealth of Nations is powerless to render aid.

The United States stands in peril of losing its forces in France, its air bases, and great quantities of munitions.

The Russian submarine force harasses our shipping around the world.

As Russia overruns Germany and France, the United States is confronted with the decision of dropping atom bombs on the major cities of its Allies.

Russia consolidates its gain in Asia, France, Germany, Italy, and draws strength for its massive land forces which are surviving off of the substance of conquered countries.

At this stage, where does our new look concept turn the tide?

What I am saying is simply this: We could easily have an atomic standoff and lose a war as the result of the balance of power held by Russia in its enormous land armies.

Let us consider the other conceivable kind of war in relation to the new-look concept.

TWENTY YEARS OF COLD WAR CLASHES AROUND THE WORLD, PERPETUATED BY PUPPET REGIMES

No peace in Korea. We are faced with the indefinite necessity to maintain troops there or must assume perpetual support of South Korean military forces.

Indochina is lost to France.

Trouble is revived in Malaya.

Italy has voted itself a Communist form of government.

France is gripped by internal paralysis.

Japan is weak and Communists are gaining strength.

Red China has stepped up pressure on Formosa and threatens an active military campaign.

Communist gains are noted in the Arab States.

Communists are active in Africa.

Europe as a whole is apathetic to the threat of communism, and anxious to trade with the Reds.

Asia is all but lost.

Russia is systematically arming its new satellites.

Where, in the face of this picture, do we deliberately initiate an all-out atomic war? With what do we intervene to turn the tide? Unless we choose to initiate atomic war, we fight on the ground and in the manner of the enemy's own choosing. We must be prepared for more Koreas, and preparation must not be so meager that a commitment in the future comparable to Korea will leave us without reserves and incapable of defensive retaliation on the ground and on the sea, as well as in the air. Congress must recognize the necessity for a strong ground force and a Navy capable of delivering and sustaining it.

Lincoln and the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the memory of no other man has had the unifying influence for this Nation as that of Abraham Lincoln. There are many things for the South to recall in tenderness and appreciation but the utterances and actions of none arrayed against us in 1861-65 compare with those of the man who "though the leader against her in war can never be justly said to have been her enemy." These were the words of J. G. de R. Hamilton, of the University of North Carolina, in 1915, and he also said of Lincoln:

With the rest of the united Nation the South will not only honor and revere but will cherish the name of her son, the first American.

The author probably meant that in Lincoln new and historic forces produced for the first time a distinctively American type of statesmanship. Jefferson might be regarded as occupying that position but if we consider influences

with roots entirely in the New World, the tribute would doubtless be accepted without reservation, particularly since the South's great orator, Henry W. Grady, made use of the same language in his eloquent reference to Lincoln:

From the union of these (northern and southern) colonists, from the straightening of their purposes and the crossing of their blood, slowly perfecting through a century, came he who stands as the first American, the first who comprehended within himself all the strength and gentleness, all the majesty and grace of this Republic—Abraham Lincoln.

The sources of the South's feeling are found in the great human qualities of Lincoln. When others misunderstood the South he seemed to know the mind and purpose of our people. When others expected humiliating admissions of error which the South could not give he asked only that we take our place as restored and honored members of the Union. To Mr. Adams in 1861 he gave instructions "not to indulge in expressions of harshness or disrespect or even impatience concerning the seceding States, their agents, or their people" and further to remember that the people of the South "throughout all political misunderstandings and alienations, still are and always must be our kindred and countrymen."

These are examples of the kindness of Lincoln in a period of intense bitterness and are evidences of his greatness of soul and loftiness of character. Surely, reflections upon Lincoln's use of the cement of charity should inspire us to conquer present-day divisiveness and march together regardless of party or sectional loyalties.

There are other reasons beside the charity of Lincoln for the South's cherishing his memory. Our years of reflection upon the forces which brought the rupture in 1861 has produced a clearer judgment regarding the impersonal character of those forces and has emphasized the fairness of Lincoln and the soundness of his policies for readmitting the South. Wisdom and fairness, as well as charity, won the South's affection. His sense of fairness often found expression in his speeches, as, for example, his message to the Congress on December 1, 1862, dealing with compensated emancipation:

It is no less true for having been often said that the people of the South are not more responsible for the original introduction of this proposition (slavery) than are the people of the North.

Lincoln and Grant were kind to Lee as the great ordeal neared its close and the South could never forget a kindness to its most beloved son.

Lincoln's democracy, his simplicity, his appreciation of the common man—these were qualities which found a response in our hearts. In reverencing the memory of Lincoln we would not detract from the possessive feeling which is rightfully the North's and our pride is sufficiently served in recalling that he lived during the first impressionable years under southern skies and that he spoke feelingly of his southern heritage.

The South does not question that Lincoln shared our suffering in the war. To

his friend, George P. Floyd, the hotel keeper at Quincy, Ill., he said:

I have not suffered by the South, I have suffered with the South. Their pain has been my pain. Their loss has been my loss. What they have gained, I have gained.

This was one of the deep and moving sentiments of his nature and partially accounts for the high place he holds in the affections of the South.

Such a life helps us to pierce the mystery contained in the beautiful flesh of St. John: "And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us." Many of us carry the impressions gained in boyhood from those who could speak from personal memory of the work of this great man. From their accounts as from the pages of recorded history we conclude that the idea of human sympathy and limitless good will for a little while became flesh and dwelt among us.

House Joint Resolution 243, To Amend the Pledge of Allegiance To Include the Phrase "Under God"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in the first session of this Congress, on April 20, 1953, I introduced in the House, Joint Resolution 243, to amend the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

That resolution would insert in the pledge the words "under God," so that the pledge would then read:

I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

I have been most pleased to note in the press a report of the sermon of the Reverend George M. Docherty at the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, the church at which Abraham Lincoln worshipped. The sermon was delivered on February 7 with President and Mrs. Eisenhower seated in Lincoln's pew.

Lincoln in his Gettysburg Address used the words "under God" and Dr. Docherty seized the opportunity to urge the phrase be added to the pledge. Without these words, he said, the pledge ignores a definitive factor in the American way of life and that factor is belief in God. Without that phrase, the pledge could be the pledge of any republic.

Relating how his children once described with strange solemnity the ritual of the salute to the flag, he added:

I could hear little Muscovites repeat a similar pledge to their hammer and sickle flag with equal solemnity.

For Russia, he pointed out, also claims to be a republic, indivisible, with justice and liberty.

Dr. Docherty and I are not of the same Christian denomination, but I may say that in this matter he has hit the nail

right on the head. You may argue from dawn to dusk about differing political, economic, and social systems, but the fundamental issue which is the unbridgeable gap between America and Communist Russia is a belief in Almighty God.

From the root of atheism stems the evil weed of communism and its branches of materialism and political dictatorship. Unless we are willing to affirm our belief in the existence of God and His creator-creature relation to man, we drop man himself to the significance of a grain of sand and open the floodgates to tyranny and oppression.

An atheistic American, as Dr. Docherty points out, is a contradiction in terms.

This country was founded on theistic beliefs, on belief in the worthwhileness of the individual human being which in turn depends solely and completely on the identity of man as the creature and son of God. The fraudulent claims of the Communists to the role of champions of social, economic, and political reform is given the lie by their very own atheist materialist concept of life and their denunciation of religion, the bond between God and man, as "the opium of the people."

As Mr. Docherty so eloquently pointed out, the American way of life is more than the material total of baseball games, hot dogs, Coca-Cola, television, deep freezes, and other gadgets. "It is," he said, "a way of life that sees man as a sentient being created by God and seeking to know His will, whose soul is restless till he rests in God."

It is, therefore, most proper that in our salute to the flag, the patriotic standard around which we rally as Americans, we state the real meaning of that flag. From their earliest childhood our children must know the real meaning of America. Children and Americans of all ages must know that this is one Nation which "under God" means "liberty and justice for all."

The Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, yes; it was 44 years ago—February 1910—that this great organization, the Boy Scouts of America, was incorporated. Do not think for a moment, though, that that was the beginning of scouting. Dan Beard and Ernest Thompson Seton and many others had groups of boys learning scouting here in America long before that, and so had Sir Robert Baden-Powell and others in Africa and England and Europe. When Baden-Powell was asked whence he drew the principles for the great international family of Scouts, to which we are proud to belong, he listed traditions both worldwide and centuries old, such as the code of the boy knights of Cuchullain, the ancient Irish hero, the Bushido code of

Japan, the code of King Arthur's Round Table, traditions of the American Indians, of the Zulus, and of the Pacific islanders. Scouting reflects also the Athenian and Spartan systems of training boys, and Baden-Powell's own system of training men in the South African constabulary.

What we celebrate, therefore, is not a beginning, but a culmination. Forty-four years ago, we drew together into one organization, one member of a great international brotherhood, all the scattered groups in this country that were working with boys in widely varied ways. Some groups stressed Indian lore, some woodcraft, some the pioneer tradition, some the legends of Arthurian chivalry, some religion, some athletics. It is inspiring to read, in the history of the Boy Scouts of America, how, one by one, each of these groups gave up its separate existence and contributed its special interests and qualities to the vast whole that is American boy scouting today. The leader of each such group then would take a place among the high officers of the Boy Scouts of America, and, in helping to lead the organization, would contribute his own special knowledge and abilities. Though Ernest Thompson Seton stayed with the Boy Scouts of America only until 1913, his contributions in planning the program were invaluable, and American scouting still bears the impress of his personality and interests. Daniel Carter Beard, too, a leader of long and faithful service, seems present in spirit wherever Boy Scouts get together. He stands to us as the ideal of American boy scouting, as Baden-Powell stands as the ideal of worldwide boy scouting. Let us never fail to honor the enthusiasm and devotion of such men as these and Livingstone and Boyce and the hundreds of others, in large or small positions, who joined wholeheartedly in the common cause of bringing the ideals of scouting to all American boys.

On such an occasion as this, too, it is fitting to recall how early and how enthusiastic was the support of church groups. The YMCA entered into the formation of the Boy Scouts of America so thoroughly and wholeheartedly that at first it was difficult to make it clear to the public that the Boy Scouts were not a sort of branch of the YMCA. Catholic and Protestant churches and Jewish synagogues have taken a leading part in sponsoring Scout groups and aiding Scout activities since the early days, recognizing the value of the Scout ideals of reverence and religious tolerance. The Mormon Church has promoted scouting with such vigorous enthusiasm that hardly any Mormon boy does not go through his period of scouting. The churches know that the Boy Scouts of America will always hold up before the youth of America the two ideals, basic to all religion, of service to God and service to our fellow man.

When a boy becomes a Scout, he begins to develop the best qualities of a man. Whether he is a Lone Scout, a member of a neighborhood patrol, or a member of a troop, he learns to take care of himself in all circumstances, to be independent and unafraid, to act on his

own initiative. While he is learning independence, he is at the same time learning to follow orders and directions accurately, and to work and play well with others. He is learning to work for concrete achievements and public recognition, as in the earning of badges and in working up the higher degree in scouting; but at the same time he is held constantly to the high ideal of at least one good deed to be done every day, without reward, record, or public notice. He learns to value his own rewards more for the recognition they bring to his patrol and troop than for any personal prestige. He learns, too, one of the most valuable lessons in life, that the real fun and joy of living always comes from struggling against difficulties, overcoming fears, and facing dangers, either alone or in a team with a few good friends.

Democrats and Republicans, we are all together in supporting the Boy Scouts of America. It is a nonpolitical organization, always counting among its honorary presidents and vice presidents the President and ex-Presidents of the United States, and among its most fervent supporters many of the most eager workers of both parties. So I think I, as a loyal Democrat and a good Scout, can close my remarks in no more appropriate way than by quoting the words of a rock-ribbed Vermont Republican, Calvin Coolidge. Speaking of the principles embodied in the Scout oath and Scout law, Coolidge made this simple and magnificent statement:

It would be a perfect world if everyone exemplified these virtues in daily life.

Conviction of Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, on January 13, 1953, I introduced House bill 1574 to succeed House bill 451, introduced in 1951, and House Joint Resolution 383 in 1950. This bill provides:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby declared to be a felony for any Member of the Congress of the United States of America to accept or receive, directly or indirectly, any part of the salary or compensation of an employee whose compensation is paid by the United States, employed by him to carry on his official duties.

Sec. 2. Within 10 days after the close of any session of Congress, every Member of the Congress shall file a written statement, under oath, with the Secretary of the Senate or Clerk of the House (to which body the Member belongs) giving the names of those employed by him during such past session, the salaries or compensation received, and what part of said salary or compensation the Member has accepted or received, directly or indirectly, for any purpose whatever. Such reports shall be open for public inspection.

Sec. 3. It shall be unlawful for any Member of Congress to accept any money or any other thing of value from any person, firm, association, or corporation to enable such

Member to maintain himself while acting as a Representative of the people, and those who offer and contribute to the maintenance of a Member of Congress shall be guilty of an unlawful act, and shall be liable to prosecution for a felony.

Sec. 4. When any Member of Congress files his statement under oath, as provided by section 1 of this act, he shall give a list of any contributions made to him while acting as a Member of Congress and said statement shall include the names and addresses of persons so contributing and the amount thereof.

PENALTY

Any Member who shall file a false statement as herein provided, or who accepts or retains any part of the salary of an employee, directly or indirectly employed by him in the discharge of his official duties, or who accepts money or any other thing of value from any person, firm, association, or corporation to maintain himself while acting as a Member of Congress, shall be guilty of a felony and shall be punished by a fine equal to twice the amount of the salary, compensation, or gratuity unlawfully accepted or received, and shall be subject to removal from the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, since I proposed the bill set forth above, two Members of Congress have been convicted of unlawfully withholding part of salary paid to actual or imaginary employees. If this bill had been in effect neither one of the convictions would have taken place, because I do not believe you would ever find a Member who would walk up and deliberately swear to a statement that was untrue.

Is it not better for Congress itself to direct its membership than to have the public courts clean up what Congress should do?

Every time a Member is convicted, it reduces the prestige of Congress with the people. When the people find out that the integrity of a few Members is being impeached by these convictions, it cannot help but reduce the respect which the people ought to have for the membership of Congress. I will try again to get action on this bill.

A Tribute to the Lithuanian Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago John Hvasta, a man who has known Communist oppression and has lived to tell about it, declared to his cheering Hillside, N. J., friends that he was able to survive the long months of confinement in the prisons of Communist Czechoslovakia and the arduous trials of a fugitive in a foreign land only because—as he said—“I always kept my faith in the American people and my faith in God. Had I lost that faith, I would have lost myself.”

In these inspiring words, there lies a profound lesson for all of us, especially at this time when the division between the free and the slave world has been fast becoming more and more crystal-

lized. Simply stated, it is that America must continue to give faith and hope to the many millions of John Hvastas who are now caught up in the awful grip of Soviet tyranny.

On this anniversary of Lithuanian independence it is fitting that the case of John Hvasta, to advance whose welfare I had never ceased my efforts, be singled out as an example of what can be done by a few individuals to keep alive the spirit of a man whose spirit might well have otherwise succumbed to the counsels of despair. That the same can be done for an entire nation, I have not the slightest doubt. Nothing is impossible in this world so long as the spirit and the will are vigorous and firm to press on to their conclusion dedicated objectives.

To the nearly 2 million Lithuanians now under Soviet domination, let America, therefore, pass on to them with resounding declaration the priceless and inspiring words of faith and freedom. Never can the present servitude of this great people be accepted with equanimity; never shall that nation and her courageous people be left in oblivion without hope, to expire as a nation in the awful solitude of forgotten history. America—as indeed the entire free world—has faith in the Lithuanian people that one day freedom shall be theirs.

Restoration of Ford's Theater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in the House of Representatives today a resolution which I hope will lead to restoring Ford's Theater where President Abraham Lincoln was assassinated on April 14, 1865. The joint resolution provides:

That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to make a study to determine the most appropriate steps which could be taken to preserve and interpret Ford's Theater, in Washington, D. C., as it was on April 14, 1865, and to determine the estimated cost of reconstructing the stage, boxes, and scenic setting. The results of the study, together with the recommendations of the Secretary with respect thereto, shall be submitted to the Congress as soon as possible after the study is completed.

The Secretary of the Interior shall include in his report to the Congress under the first section of this joint resolution an estimate of the cost of reinstalling the famous Oldroyd collection of relics in the Ford Theater building or in another suitable museum building to be erected on land to be acquired immediately adjacent to the Ford Theater building.

Ford's Theater has become a shrine visited annually by hundreds of thousands of people. Many express a regret that the theater has become a “warehouse museum.” It seems to me appropriate that a measure looking to the theater's restoration be introduced on the birthday of the Great Emancipator.

Ford's Treater is owned by the United States and as Melvin D. Hildreth, Democratic national committeeman for the District of Columbia, pointed out recently, "Its restoration should be carried out by the United States."

Lincoln, the man of the people, belonged to all Americans. He is not the exclusive property of either political party nor faction of a political party.

Those who glibly proclaim themselves the political heirs of the Republican Party which he carried to victory in 1860 seldom quote what Lincoln said, and never match his clarity. As an example, this from his annual message to Congress on December 3, 1861:

Labor is prior to, and independent of, capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much the higher consideration. Capital has its rights, which are as worthy of protection as any other rights. Nor is it denied that there is, and probably always will be, a relation between labor and capital, producing mutual benefits.

Nor is it likely that the Great Emancipator would have been a party to turning away one of the great musical organizations of this Nation—the Howard University choir—from the doors of the Lincoln Day rally on February 5, 1954.

The man who said "A house divided against itself cannot stand" would take a dim view of the present efforts of extremists in his party to turn neighbor against neighbor, to sow suspicion, to divide our country into warring factions.

When Lincoln finally succumbed to the wounds he had received, Secretary Stanton said, "Now he belongs to the ages." It is fitting and proper that the scene of one of the greatest tragedies in our history should be a permanent memorial to this great American.

Thirty-sixth Anniversary of Republic of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the impending commemoration of the 36th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania, on February 16, 1918, gives fresh meaning to the lesson which the free world should have learned from the destruction of free government in that country. The world cannot attain a lasting peace without adherence to those principles of justice and morality by which free men must always be governed. We can achieve nothing lasting when in the name of expediency we conveniently forget the very fundamental truth upon which this country was founded, that "Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." It is an appropriate time for us to affirm our belief in this principle and

in the consequence which flows from it, the right to self-determination which exists for all nations, large and small.

February 16 marks the 36th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania, as a modern nation under a constitutional government. Lithuania as a national group, however, had existed from time immemorial, a people with its own language, its own culture, and its own traditions. These people are not related to the Russians or to any of the other Slavic peoples, but descend from an ancient people of a distinct nationality. How, then, can the seizure of this land by Soviet Russia be justified?

On June 15, 1940, in flagrant violation of existing treaties, which had been freely entered into, the Soviet Union occupied Lithuania. To give a show of right to this seizure, Russian representatives, supported by the Red army, staged mock elections, but 24 hours before the polls closed, Moscow announced the results of the elections. With this farcical background, the elections were null and void, and, from the point of view of international law, Lithuania is still an independent country. The great democracies of the West have never recognized this illegal act of Soviet aggression, and the Lithuanian people and the Lithuanian legation in Washington have never recognized the puppet regime installed and maintained by the Soviet Union. The Lithuanian people have not accepted the Soviet system and are stubbornly resisting it by means of an underground and by open resistance.

The Soviet authorities have taken from the farmers their land and everything that agriculture produces, pauperizing not only the farmers but the entire population of the country. The people are deprived of all human rights; religion is persecuted, and the many closed churches have been converted into antireligious meeting halls. Men and women under the slightest pretext or suspicion are thrown into prison, and without trial are deported to Siberian slave-labor camps. At least 10 percent of the total population of 3 million people have been deported to the Siberian wilderness.

Soviet rule is rule by the clubs and guns of the secret police, not by the people. By this brutal despotism, the Soviets have dominated Eastern Europe, building vast armies, organizing a strongly unified economic system which is subordinated to the aggressive plans of Moscow, regimenting the people and working toward communizing the younger generation and liquidating the upper and middle classes.

Poised behind its ring of buffer peoples, Soviet Russia constitutes an ever-growing threat to the security and well-being of the free world. It has become increasingly apparent that the policy of the United States toward the cause of Lithuania's independence was far too soft and mild.

In the past year, the Baltic committee, under the chairmanship of the Honorable CHARLES J. KERSTEN, has done much to reveal the nature of the threat to all liberty throughout the world, which is implicit in the subjugation of this brave people. Through the work of this group,

of the Voice of America, and of voluntary organizations which seek to penetrate the Iron Curtain with the news that the cause of freedom has not been abandoned, the people of Lithuania will receive renewed hope. Strengthened by this hope, they will stand firm in their trust that someday they will once again take their place among the free nations of the world. And while this hope lives, they will remain a thorn in the side of the Soviet Union, to play a significant role in the eventual downfall of the Communist tyranny.

Lincoln's Devotion to Duty Prompts Suggestion for Republican Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in a speech at Cooper Institute, New York, on September 27, 1860, Abraham Lincoln, whose memory is honored by our Nation on this anniversary of his birth, set forth a principle which is especially applicable in the situation today.

Neither let us be slandered from our duty by false accusations against us—

Said Lincoln—

nor frightened from it by menaces of destruction to the Government, nor of dungeons to ourselves. Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it.

In the sincere conviction that President Eisenhower observes this same dedication to duty, I am today asking, on the floor of this House, that he demand the resignation from office of the chairman of the Republican National Committee, Mr. Leonard W. Hall.

I believe the President wholly missed the point in his press conference of February 10 when he decried what he called extreme partisanship in the current dastardly and back-alley attacks by certain high officials in his administration and party against the Democratic Party and the loyal Americans who comprise it.

These vituperative orators are guilty of far more serious sins than extreme partisanship and it is incredible to me that the President could so underestimate their actions. Even so, he said in his press conference that he expected his subordinates in the executive branch and Chairman Hall to follow a more temperate view in the future.

So far as I know, there has been no response from Mr. Hall to the President's remarks and other Republican orators have repudiated the President's advice.

I am now asking the President to put some teeth into his words, to show by his actions that he means what he says. The President has no direct control over Republican Members of Congress nor over some of the divisive demagoguery now going on, but it is a plain political fact that the chairman of the Republican

National Committee would not have his office and could not long hold it if the President, the leader of the party, opposed him.

Mr. Hall's part in this plot to brand millions of Americans as traitors makes him the logical object of any firm action by the President to enforce his views.

Mr. Hall and his committee have sponsored the current nationwide tour of Republican luminaries whose disgusting antics have gagged the throats of every decent American citizen.

There is clear evidence in the record of the heavy hand of Mr. Hall and the Republican committee in the planned attack against former President Harry Truman, of which Attorney General Brownell was the mouthpiece.

Mr. Hall and his committee sponsored the Republican box-supper affair here in Washington at which Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams accused the Democratic Party of political sadism.

Mr. Hall has indicated his direct opposition to the President on the question of whether communism will be an issue in the 1954 congressional elections.

The real issue here is whether the President is actually the leader of his Party, whether he is the person with those admirable qualities of leadership which were endorsed by the majority of voting Americans in 1952. The time has come for the President to take his stand and grasp the reins of control. The vitriolic campaign of Republican oratory which Mr. Hall has sponsored and enthusiastically supported can lead to a division of the American people that will seriously weaken our Nation in this hour of crisis. Now is the time for the President to act. He can prove his dedication to the principles of Abraham Lincoln, to the principles of decency and fair play, by summarily dismissing Republican Chairman Hall.

Seven Great Pillars of Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of February 16, 1954, many of the Members of the House and Senate of this great Congress were the pleased and honored guests of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States at a sumptuous and beautifully appointed annual banquet here at the Nation's Capital. At each of our reserved places at the tables was a magnificently printed and prepared booklet in colors entitled "Seven Great Pillars of Civilization."

The appropriate words by this distinguished patriotic order were as follows:

May this brief sketch of mankind's spiritual and intellectual evolution serve as a reminder of some of the historic figures and events that shaped western civilization.

These strong pillars became a part of the structure of our Republic at its founding—symbols of the rights of man, for which the VFW was proud to fight on foreign soil,

in hostile waters, and in the air. Today, all that America stands for is challenged.

May we resolve to meet this ominous challenge in the heroic spirit that preserved our Nation in other days of peril; a dedication to the principle "that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth." (Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.)

The introduction to the booklet was as follows:

This is dedicated to promotion of America. To better perform this service we should become more appreciative of our own product, so that we can ward off the siren songs of our competitors, who, for the past 6,000 years, have been most successful at keeping the majority of their peoples starved and naked, and eternally desolated spiritually, morally, and physically. Also, and even more important, we have tried to design this booklet in such manner as to bring an awareness of the many pillars that go to make up our way of life, of which seven of the great ones are here set up—with a few thoughts as to how they could be effectively torn down.

And then on the pages following in beautiful color and arranged with great artistry and simplicity was the following text:

MAN, THE IMAGE OF GOD

God created man in his own image. So it is written in the Book of Genesis. Man is an individual. There can be none beside him to say otherwise; no mandate other than from God to make him stay put.

"Man, the image of God," means that no other label can be put on him; neither can he hide under another label, for man must always live with himself; it is the price he pays for his individuality. It is the still small voice that comes in the night—the conscience.

God created man in his own image. God is life, life is energy. Man, as all living things, must struggle for existence. Therefore, man must depend upon his own energy and convert it to human needs. His energy cannot be obstructed by another, neither can he be deprived of the fruits of his labor. This is the first great pillar of civilization. To topple it most effectively, deny man his individuality and replace it with a number; take his energy out of his control and circumscribe it by edict, involuntarily.

Opposite the foregoing Pillar of Civilization there was printed in beautiful color, magnificence, and artistry a drawing entitled "The Creation of Man," followed by the words:

This drawing is taken from a painting by Michelangelo, in the Sistine Chapel, Rome, and shows the divine spark of life passing from the Creator to the listless hand of man.

MOSES AND THE LAW

"1. Thou shalt have no other gods before Me.

"2. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath. Thou shalt not bow down to them or serve them.

"3. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.

"4. Remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thou hast to do; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. In it thou shalt do no manner of work.

"5. Honour thy father and thy mother.

"6. Thou shalt not kill.

"7. Thou shalt not commit adultery.

"8. Thou shalt not steal.

"9. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.

"10. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, nor anything that is thy neighbor's."

If the individuality of man is the first great pillar of civilization, then the second is the Ten Commandments. They afford him his greatest opportunity: the option of choosing good or evil, for it is reasoned that man cannot know good without knowing evil. The choice is his. Man walks with freedom on one side but with responsibility on the other.

To work for the common good is ideal, but it can be no longer common or good if personal responsibility is placed in, or usurped by, manmade gods. There is no greater incongruity than the spectacle of man and law shuffling their feet to the tune of a man-made god who, under the guise of expediency, can today call lies the great truths of yesterday.

To destroy this second great pillar first convince man that he has no worth as a human being—admit to no external truths such as the Ten Commandments.

Opposite this pillar was a replica of a painting entitled "Moses Shows the Commandments to the People," followed by the words:

Moses is here shown as he came down from Mount Sinai after being summoned for the divine revelation of the law. In his absence, the people set up an idol in the form of a golden calf.

CHRIST AND THE GOLDEN RULE

Two thousand years after the great documents already touched upon were revealed to mankind, Christ came on earth. One of His great contributions to the world was a new commandment: "Love thy neighbor as thyself. Do to others as you would be done by. For whatever you do to the least of human beings you do it to mankind and yourself."

Although a gentle teacher and philosopher, Christ also was a fighter whose sword of truth defended the dignity of man as an individual, fought against the surrender of freedom, and attacked all combinations that stood between direct contact of man with his Creator.

So Christ lifted up into place the greatest of all the pillars of civilization—the importance of human brotherhood. The destruction of this pillar is the aim of the police state, accomplished by pitting human against human—blood brother against blood brother.

Opposite that page was a drawing entitled "The Good Samaritan," followed by the words:

Love thy neighbor as thyself—do unto others as thou would have them do unto you.

MOHAMMED, THE PRACTICAL PROPHET

In the year 570 A. D. the Prophet Mohammed was born. He believed that man must be judged but not controlled; each individual is free but responsible.

Drawn by this great freedom of spirit and brotherhood, the greatest minds of the Middle East and the Orient formed the Saracen culture.

In this culture, education flourished openly. Adapting the experience of others, they laid much of the groundwork of our modern science, medicine, agriculture, and personal hygiene. They invented, among other things, the zero (0), that concept in numerology without which engineering, chemistry, and measurements used in inventions and mathematical findings cannot exist.

There is no denying the Saracen contribution to civilization. The attempt to establish man as a brother, and to further the unhampering of man's thoughts and acts, raised yet another great pillar—most quickly undermined by relieving man of the opportunity of making his own ideas work.

Opposite this page was a drawing entitled "A Saracen University." The words below this drawing were:

There is no enrollment, and no diploma in these seats of learning, found in the mosque; the tuition is based on a voluntary agreement between teacher and student.

WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR

In the year 1066 A. D. William of Normandy defeated the Saxon King Harold at Senlac and became the conqueror of England. People accepted his kingship as coming from God. Secure in his seagirt island, he developed a tolerancy that enabled him to organize the ancient Anglo-Saxon heritage of the "moot"—that local liberty in which the community assembled to give its assent to their leaders' deliberations. In this manner free courts, speech, and the dignity of the individual were encouraged, so that soon the peasantry came to regard themselves as allies of the Crown. Thus we see the beginning of parliamentary institutions, with the conquest becoming the starting point of English freedom, and bringing into being a constitution upon which, 700 years later, we were to form our own great written document. In the conqueror's Domesday Booke we find the basic protection of life and property.

So rises another great pillar—a symbol of law and order, an impartial third party.

A very magnificent drawing opposite this page was entitled "William the Conqueror Being Lifted Up at Westminster" with the following notation:

On Christmas Day, 1066, William was lifted upon the shoulders of his knights so that all men could see, and therefore recognize their king.

JEFFERSON AND THE RIGHTS OF MAN

In 1776, Thomas Jefferson, in company with many American businessmen and farmers, drew up a document dealing with the rights of man, and thus created the cause of the American Revolution. In this new Republic no official would ever be permitted to think, decide, act, or judge as one man; a government was devised to divide these responsibilities of man into three parts: a Congress to think and decide; a President to act; and a Supreme Court to be referee. This Government was handed, by the people, a list of particulars which it must not do. This was the first document of its kind ever written. The Government was servant, and

not master, and the Constitution is designed to make it stay that way.

Here, then, is that of which the sixth great pillar of civilization is made: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

An inspiring drawing of the Jefferson Memorial here in the Nation's Capitol appeared opposite this "pillar" stating, "Let everyone ascribe the faith and merit he chooses."

FREEDOM OF HUMAN ENERGY

"A wise and frugal government which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them free otherwise to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government." (Excerpt from writings of Thomas Jefferson.)

Down through the ages many human beings have starved. Many were intelligent people, and with fertile lands of great extent, and yet they were unable to get enough to eat. Modern nations have not been any exception for in Jefferson's day the French people were dying of hunger, and today, even in countries rich in ancient philosophies, famines kill millions. China and India are continually ravaged and in the 1930's thousands died of starvation in the richest farmlands of the Soviet Union.

How, then, are we to account for such abundance in America that the pangs of hunger are unknown; there has never been a famine recorded in this country.

Human beings still live in hovels with no windows, floors, chimneys. We, in America, take these features for granted, and regard electricity, and all its appliances and equipment as everyday necessities, easily available for our use. The forces of nature are harnessed for the use of humblest citizens; sanitation, hygiene, and other services are accepted without questioning, and are not even regarded as luxuries today.

These are facts. Why is it so? The answer is so clear that it will stand up under any scrutiny; simply put, it is this: Possession of freedom, which in turn produces freedom of possession. Without possession one cannot improve; if one cannot improve one has no incentive—no will, or purpose, to improve. Owning something is the first requisite for creating something. The impossibility of Edisons, Fords, and men like

Dr. Bell cracking such technical problems of science and engineering, and converting them to human needs, in an authoritarian form of highly centralized government becomes evident when it is realized that the station of these men in such a government would deny them the greatest of all sources of invention and research, namely: incentive.

This booklet does not propose to show Americans as inheritors of a master race, and, as such, superior beings. We only have to remember that the direct ancestors of the people who brought this Government into being were Anglo-Saxons, and they starved alongside all the other nations. One thing they did have, however, was an instinctive sense of personal freedom. What this booklet has striven to show is the truth and the rightness of all the things that have contributed to our present form of civilization; that if we are to be a productive people we must have life, and if we are to have life we must be productive, and this life must be as free as the sun and the air that go to make up our world itself. Thus our seventh great pillar is dedicated to individual man; only he can create productivity, and only man can control the productivity he creates. To destroy this pillar, simply withhold from man the fruits of his own labor.

Following this, on the opposite page, was a magnificent drawing of a stained-glass window entitled "The Fruits of Freedom," which had been dedicated to science and invention.

Mr. Speaker, while the great and continuous patriotic services and contributions made by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America to the Nation's security and happiness are almost universally known and recognized by the appreciative millions of Americans, the printing and distribution of this very appropriate booklet, which was graciously presented to each one of the guests in attendance at the banquet, was only one of the occasions, I am informed, when the booklet is distributed in large and small quantities to leading citizens and public officials throughout the Nation.

In this connection I highly recommend that every thinking patriotic citizen obtain a copy thereof at the earliest possible date.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, February 8, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God: Conscious of the faults and failures which mar and stain the past, we are grateful that each new week brings us to the land of beginning again. May we receive new weeks and new days as Thy gifts, bringing new vigor, new hope, new opportunities to be strong and kind, patient and understanding, faithful and true. As we here seek a solution for the Nation's baffling problems may we not be found unwilling to pay the price of better things. Teach

us the vanity and futility of a quest for salvation which leaves ourselves unchanged.

Direct our steps, guard us from error, deliver us from all evil. Help us to sit where others sit, seeing life's tangled skein through the eyes of those less fortunate than ourselves. So make us faithful ministers of this fear-haunted and stricken generation. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 11, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were commu-

nicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, February 15, 1954, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 15) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— RETURN OF BILL

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (H. R. 4254) for the relief of Aneta Popa.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MILLIKIN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate this week.