

own. It means working with other Americans of every race, creed, and ancestry to solve the many problems that confront us from day to day. These are not empty phrases; they represent a way of life that has brought us prosperity and power, made us the envy and the hope of the world.

Remember, we are not Americans simply because we live in America and call it our country. Nor are we Americans simply because we were born of American parents or of naturalized American citizens, or merely accepted the path of citizenship as you are doing today. No. We are Americans because we have something in common with the Americans of the past who put the seal of their spirit and the imprint of their hands on this blessed land.

But the innermost meaning of American democracy is something that goes deeper than refuge from tyranny. It is an affirmation of human dignity as against the contempt for man, which is felt and expressed by those who espouse the political philosophy of communism. It affirms the divine worth of the individual human being. I believe that America rests on a religious conviction concerning the worth of man. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are not blessings men can give; or that a ruler can take away. These are gifts with which we have been endowed by our Creator. They are, therefore, inalienable rights. It is a religious conviction which undergirds our democracy and is its strongest safeguard.

Do you like quiz shows? Here is the \$64,000 question for today. On what statue will you find these stirring words engraved?

"Give me your tired, your poor  
Your huddled masses longing to breathe free,  
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore  
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed,  
to me;  
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

If your answer is the Statue of Liberty, you're absolutely right. And these words, written by Emma Lazarus, a Jewess, have special meaning today as we salute you new citizens. For more than 300 years, people from all over the world have brought to these shores the energy, the vision, the many different skills that have made our country the greatest nation on earth. You new citizens are the inheritors of this proud tradition. Of all races and all religions, you are now equal partners in this mighty Union.

I am confident that you will fulfill the faith that your country is placing in you. I have faith that you will help your fellow Americans to transmit, unimpaired, the great values of which we of this generation are but trustees. I warmly extend to you my hand and my heart in welcoming you to the brotherhood of America.

### Our Lives, Our Fortunes, and Our Sacred Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

**HON. STYLES BRIDGES**

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD an editorial by William Loeb, publisher of the Manchester Union Leader, Manchester, N. H., entitled "Our Lives, Our Fortunes, and Our Sacred Honor."

I consider this an excellent editorial, as is the article to which it refers and which appeared in the American Legion magazine. It is a very timely commentary and I highly recommend it to my colleagues as well as to the American people as a whole.

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

#### OUR LIVES, OUR FORTUNES, AND OUR SACRED HONOR

As is customary, tomorrow, the Fourth of July, the entire front page of this newspaper will be devoted to the greatest document in the history of this Nation, the Declaration of Independence.

This editorial today is written to bring to our memory something about the signers. For many of the facts we are indebted to a splendid article, They Signed for Us, by Merle Sinclair in the July issue of the American Legion magazine, of which Manchester's own Jimmy O'Neil is publisher.

At the end of the Declaration is the great phrase: "And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." History proves that these were no empty phrases.

Let us take the case of Francis Lewis, whose fight for freedom cost his wife her life. Because he signed the Declaration, his Long Island home was ransacked by the British, his books and papers destroyed, and his family forced to flee. His wife was captured and held in a filthy barracks for months. She refused a release that would have been given her if her husband agreed to desert the Revolution. Finally she was liberated but died 2 years later as a direct result of her mistreatment.

Then there is the case of Thomas Nelson, Jr. He was the wealthy Governor of Virginia when he signed the Declaration. He mortgaged all his property and raised \$2 million, virtually overnight, with which to help the fighting in his colony. The day after he signed the Declaration his home in Yorktown was occupied by Cornwallis' personal staff. When rebels took the offensive, Nelson visited their firing lines. He watched the patriots' artillery raze all the houses of the neighborhood except his own.

He asked: "Why do you spare mine?" "Out of respect to you, Governor," he was told.

"Give me the cannon," Nelson ordered. Whereupon he fired and destroyed his own house. Thomas Nelson, Jr., gave his entire fortune to his country. He was never paid a penny of it back. Dying penniless, he was buried in a nameless grave.

Then let us take Rev. John Witherspoon, of New Jersey, who had been president of Princeton College for 10 years. Needless to say, this was in the days before Princeton believed in inviting Alger Hiss to the campus. When a southern delegate to Congress opposed ratification because "we are not ripe for revolution," Rev. Mr. Witherspoon rose to his great height and shouted, "Not ripe, sir? We are not only ripe but rotting for want of it."

Oldest signer of the Declaration was Stephen Hopkins, of Rhode Island, who was suffering from palsy so badly that he could hardly hold his hand still when he signed. Said Hopkins: "My hand trembles, but my heart does not."

Hopkins was 10 times Governor of Rhode Island, chief justice of its supreme court, and first chancellor of Brown University. He must be rolling in his grave when you consider the attitude of Barnaby Keeney, present president of Brown University. Keeney, it will be recalled, called J. Edgar Hoover an anti-intellectual.

Then there was Caesar Rodney, of Delaware, suffering from a cancer which had already affected half his face. He was on his deathbed, 80 miles from Philadelphia, when he was told that his vote was necessary for ratification. Rodney rose from his bed, in fever and pain, and rode the 80 miles in a thunderstorm, arriving in the Halls of Congress in Philadelphia as the voting on the ratification of the Declaration of Independence was going on and just as the name "Delaware" was called. "I vote 'yes,'" said Rodney as he sank, exhausted, to his seat.

Carter Braxton, of Virginia, was the richest of all the signers. He died in debt, a broken-hearted man. His fortune had been in ships. All were captured by the British.

John Hart, of New Jersey, another signer, was a farmer. His wife lay dying when Hessians reached his farm, a few months after he signed the Declaration. He was driven from her side. His property was ruined and his 13 children fled, and he never saw his wife alive again. He was almost 70, but he joined Washington's army as a private.

Finally, we come to Lewis Morris, of New York. As he was about to sign he received word that the enemy was at the gates of his Long Island home, but that his property would be spared if he would withhold his vote for liberty. Said Morris: "There are plenty of homes, but only one country."

What do the signers think about today as they view conditions in the present-day United States? What will they think tomorrow if pitifully few American flags are displayed in the State of New Hampshire? Furthermore, what would they think of the craven and cowardly foreign policy of the United States today?

### Federal Assistance to States for School Construction

SPEECH  
OF

**HON. HUGH SCOTT**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7535) to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, difficult problems compel difficult decisions. Under this bill the State of Pennsylvania will be required to contribute about \$30½ million and will receive back about \$25 million. We are interested in what happens to the \$5½ million for which we get no return other than the satisfaction of seeing that it is justly and fairly administered and distributed. If this money were to be distributed by States which had levied taxes for it, those States might well say that we should leave the entire matter to them. But if the money is to be raised by other States and distributed by the Federal Government then I think we should be bound by the Federal law and by the decisions of the Supreme Court.

It was shocking to me to hear the distinguished Vice Chairman of the Democrat National Committee argue against the Powell amendment. The opposition to the Powell amendment of ex-President Truman and the Democrat National Committee exhibits continuing determination to kill civil rights measures. This is not the first time Harry Truman has tried to pull the rug out from under civil rights legislation.

(Mr. SCOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

## Federal Assistance to States for School Construction

SPEECH  
OF

**HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY**

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7535) to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, the proposal of the gentleman from New York is a basic one. If adopted it can well mean the death of this legislation, if not in the House most certainly in the other body.

My position is well known, Mr. Chairman. Some years ago I assisted the gentleman from New York in getting a fair employment practices bill out of our Committee on Education and Labor by a 13-to-12 vote. I assisted him in the fight on the floor even though it was a losing fight. I am still sympathetic toward minority groups.

The Supreme Court has ruled on two occasions, once in 1954 and again in 1955, that the group he seeks to aid is no longer a minority group in the field of educational affairs. I must oppose his amendment on the ground that it has no place in this legislation.

He is not satisfied with equality; he wants the Congress to give special treatment to his race. He wants us to pick them up now that they are on a basis of equality, pick them up as a considered group over and above everybody else who is on a basis of equality, and pass legislation to punish somebody.

It is not the purpose of the Congress of the United States, it is not the function of the Congress, to pass punitive legislation; it is the function of the Congress to pass legislation that is for the general welfare and that bears equally on everyone.

It is the function of the courts to administer punishment and the courts are open to him just like they are open to all the rest of our citizens.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman explain to the committee whether or not the Committee on Education and Labor considered this amendment?

Mr. BAILEY. We did.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. What was the result?

Mr. BAILEY. I think the vote was 17 to 10, as I recall it. If I am wrong, I am sure the clerk of the committee can correct me. I think that was the vote in the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit at this time for inclusion in the RECORD a wire I just received from the National Education Association in session at Portland, Oreg., as follows:

JULY 2, 1956.

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,  
United States House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.:

The 2,200 delegates representing over 550,000 classroom teachers in these United States meeting today at their annual business meeting in Portland, Oreg., urgently request the defeat of the Powell amendment and the passage of H. R. 7535 to meet the urgent need of classrooms for our Nation's children.

ELIZABETH YANK,  
President, Department of Classroom  
Teachers, National Education Association.

Here is another telegram from West Virginia, as follows:

The executive board of the West Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs representing 20,000 West Virginia women in session in Charleston ask for your support of the school building construction bill without the Powell amendment.

MRS. PHARES E. REEDER,  
President.

DUNBAR, W. VA.

Here is a telegram from the secretary of the National Education Association in session at Portland, Oreg.:

Respectfully urge you be on House floor to oppose and vote against Powell amendment.

WILLIAM G. CARR,  
Executive Secretary, National Education Association.

JOHN LESTER BUFORD,  
President, National Education Association.

Mr. Chairman, I also have the following letter from James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, as follows:

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION,  
Washington, D. C., June 26, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: National Farmers Union urges you to support the school-construction bill, H. R. 7535. More than ample justification for enactment into law has been given the Labor and Education Committee in lengthy hearings.

Rural farm States in particular are in need of assistance. Since the beginning of the industrial revolution, wealth has flowed from farm to metropolitan-industrial areas. Migration of rural youth, settlement of estates with off-farm residents, and payment of interest and rent to off-farm interests all contribute to the loss of wealth in rural areas. Wealth from farms will continue to move in this manner with an increasing amount flowing across State lines. The only means we as a Nation have to protect the right of our children to equal educational opportunity is to provide through the Congress the taxing of wealth where it is and the use of funds so derived to help children where they live.

The many long-standing programs of federally aided education have operated under universal local control. National Farmers Union strongly supports local control of educational programs at every level. We do not believe approval of federally aided school construction will violate this principle of long standing.

National Farmers Union strongly believes the bill will give greatly needed aid to children both in urban and rural areas. We hope that you will support H. R. 7535, opposing any crippling amendment when it reaches the House floor for debate and vote.

Sincerely,

JAMES G. PATTON,  
President.

Then I wish to submit also the following news item from the National Education Association, which includes a speech by Eric Johnston made at the Annual Convention of the National Education Association in Portland, Oreg. This news item is as follows:

ERIC JOHNSTON, FORMER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE PRESIDENT, ENDORSES FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

PORTLAND, OREG., July 2. Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America and former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, declared here tonight that there is no crisis in education that money won't cure and that some of the money—"perhaps most of it"—must come from the Federal Government. Mr. Johnston's endorsement of the use of Federal funds for education and more specifically of passage of the school construction bill now being debated in Congress comprised a major part of the speech delivered at the National Education Association annual convention being held here this week.

"At the outset," he said, "I would like to offer one personal conviction. I am for Federal financial responsibility in American education. I say this unequivocally. I know and you know that we cannot buy one new classroom or hire one new teacher with a tax cut. Personally, as a businessman, I would favor postponing any cutting of corporate or income taxes until we deliver adequate funds for restoring our national educational system. . . . I firmly believe that Federal support for education can be supplied without disturbing the autonomy of our Nation's schools in our local communities."

Mr. Johnston pointed to congressional approval of an expenditure for highway construction that could amount to some \$3 billion annually for the next decade. "I favor this expenditure. We need the roads," he continued, "but if we can afford \$3 billion of Federal funds each year to improve our roads, why can't we afford \$3 billion to improve our schools?"

"I know full well," he stated, "that an additional \$3 billion for our schools must come from taxes, not tax cuts. Now some people say we must cut taxes to stimulate business. As a businessman, I am sure we can also stimulate business through a Federal school construction program."

"It's not hard to offer new ideas," he concluded, "It's always harder to work them out. One reason for this is that our society is always in motion—and today it is moving at breakneck speed, with the accelerator down to the floorboard. The status-quo people will undoubtedly argue that large-scale Federal support for education is at least upsetting, possibly radical, probably dangerous. But status-quoism is an old-fashioned and fairly common disease. We've cured it before. We can cure it again. And we shall also cure the diseases now besetting education."

AN ADDRESS BY ERIC JOHNSTON BEFORE THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, PORTLAND, OREG., JULY 2, 1956, MULTNOMAH STADIUM

The theme of your convention this week is "Be Proud To Teach." It's a fine theme. But pride is not enough. I have not come before you this evening to talk as a professional in the field of education. I don't pretend to be one. I have come to talk to you as a businessman and taxpayer who is interested in the welfare, growth and prestige of our country.

You have talked and I presume will continue to talk during your entire session on the crisis in education. I want to say to you as a businessman that there is no crisis in education—that money won't cure.

And that is why I say that pride is not enough? To be proud of your profession, your profession must have a proper status in our society. This will cost money.

At the outset, I would like to offer one personal conviction. I am for Federal financial responsibility in American education. I say this unequivocally.

I know and you know that we cannot buy one new classroom or hire one new teacher with a tax cut. Personally, as a businessman, I would favor postponing any cutting of corporate or income taxes until we deliver adequate funds for restoring our national educational system.

At the same time, I would like to add that I am against the Federal Government telling our schools what they should teach, or how they should teach it. I firmly believe that Federal support for education can be supplied without disturbing the autonomy of our Nation's schools in our local communities.

• • • We've heard the nature of our educational crisis recited many times in many ways—inadequate schools for our growing population, inadequate salaries and status for teachers, inadequate recruits for the teaching profession, inadequate recognition of gifted students, inadequate opportunities for students to proceed to the limit of their talents, inadequate opportunities for students to become acquainted with our complex world—both at home and abroad.

Some of these problems have been with us for years, but never have they been more acute. Let me anchor this fact with a statistic. In the 20 years between 1930 and 1950 our school enrollments remained about the same. Today our school enrollments are increasing by 1¼ million students every year. If we weren't prepared for our new students in the 1940's, how well prepared do we think we are in 1956?

With that disturbing question, I hope to put aside the problems and consider some of the solutions. I don't think it will be hard to find workable solutions—if we are willing to pay for them. As we all know, free education is free only to school children. Someone has to pay for it.

At this moment in our history, we're getting our nickel's worth of education—perhaps even a dime's worth for a nickel. But if we want a dollar's worth, we're going to have to spend a dollar. There is no bargain counter price for education in this or any country.

This year our States and communities are spending almost \$10½ billion annually for our public elementary and high schools—which amounts to about 3 percent of our gross national income. How do we spend it? According to our public ledgers, we are now paying about \$2½ billion annually for new school buildings, about \$5 billion for teachers' salaries, and about \$3 billion for all additional school costs—books, pencils and paper; heat, light and water; and the salaries of clerks, cooks and janitors.

This amount is simply not enough—neither for our school system today nor for the expanded school system we will require tomorrow. How much more do we need and

where will it come from? As a rough figure—a kind of target figure to shoot at—we might consider an additional sum of \$3 billion a year for education. I don't intend to stand here tonight and tell the Congress of the United States what it should appropriate—as to the final precise amount, even educators will disagree.

Where the increased funds must come from, however, is a rather simpler question. Some of it, perhaps most of it, must come from the Federal Government. In the gas-light era of our recent past, the States and communities collected 75 percent of all tax revenue and the Federal Government collected 25 percent. Today the States and communities collect only 25 percent while the Federal Government collects 75 percent. If our schools need more tax money today, and they do, they have to go where the tax money is.

Our Congress this year has considered an expenditure for highway construction that could amount to some \$3 billion annually for the next decade. I favor this expenditure. We need the roads. But if we can afford \$3 billion of Federal funds each year to improve our roads, why can't we afford \$3 billion to improve our schools?

I know full well that an additional \$3 billion for our schools must come from taxes, not tax cuts. Now some people say we must cut taxes to stimulate business. As a businessman, I am sure we can also stimulate business through a Federal school-construction program. I am opposed to cutting taxes generally until we put our schools in order.

How do we arrive at our target figure of an additional \$3 billion a year for education? First of all, we must have more classrooms because we have more children to put into them than ever before and because we have neglected to build enough classrooms for the past 20 years. Today more than a million children can't be properly educated—unless you have no objection to such emergency schoolhouses as war-weary barracks and empty garages.

I am no expert in this field, so I called on the experts. The Federal Office of Education, which has more dedication to its work than funds to carry it out, tells me we must build at least 95,000 classrooms a year for the next 5 years to meet our present needs and increasing enrollments. Their experts say we are now building only 67,000 classrooms a year and that unless we expand our construction program, we will have to stretch the very walls of our schoolhouses to crowd in the avalanche of new students.

I asked how much more we needed, at a minimum, for school construction. With their hearts as well as with their slide rules, they set the figure at \$1½ billion annually.

It's not hard to offer new ideas. It's always harder to work them out. One reason for this is that our society is always in motion, and today it is moving at breakneck speed, with the accelerator down to the floorboard. The status quo people will undoubtedly argue that large-scale Federal support for education is at least upsetting, possibly radical, probably dangerous. But status quoism is an old-fashioned and fairly common disease. We've cured it before. We can cure it again. And we shall also cure the diseases now besetting education.

No nation on earth is more devoted than we are to a system of universal free education. After all, we invented the idea. But in recent years, we've neglected our responsibility and now we must give more than lipservice, we must dig into our own pockets. That may hurt a bit, but the rewards will be enormous, for ourselves and the generations to come.

With the funds we need we can restore our educational system to the status it deserves; we can relieve the shortage of skilled people in this country; we can provide an adequate school plant for the children we're raising,

an adequate staff to instruct them, and a status for the teaching profession to rank among the highest in America. When that day comes, one truly may be proud to teach.

## Bridges Warns on Foreign Aid

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

## HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Bill Cunningham, an outstanding columnist for the Boston Herald and radio and TV commentator, entitled "Bridges Warns on Foreign Aid." This article appeared in the Boston Sunday Herald of July 1, 1956.

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

### BRIDGES WARNS ON FOREIGN AID

(By Bill Cunningham)

"Let us bear in mind that every American compromise, however it may be explained, is multiplied in other countries into surrenders. Our job to ensure our own security, and to secure the survival of freedom on this earth, is to galvanize the stragglers, the fearful, the intimidated, by examples of moral valor and spiritual dedication. Such is the rule of leadership which, though we never sought it, we can reject only at our peril."

So said New Hampshire's Senator BRIDGES, as he approached the conclusion of a hard-hitting speech on United States foreign policy on the floor of the Senate last Wednesday afternoon. His absolute conclusion went as follows:

"That, my friends, is what I meant when I said that attitudes and basic principles are no less decisive than actions and policies. An attitude of compromise on essentials, phony friendships with gangsters at any price, leads to one set of decisions.

"It is precisely these underlying considerations which must be examined in the debate on foreign policy which will develop in the forthcoming election campaign. We can excuse and make up for failures of particular policies. Those reflect the mistakes of fallible men in a complex situation.

"We dare not excuse a failure of nerve and a failure of principle, for those witness a weakening and threaten a collapse of our whole moral structure. If the present drift to cynical grayness, where once we knew the difference between black and white, is not arrested and reversed, we shall lose our ability to defend ourselves. Indeed, we shall have little left that is worth defending."

This address, entitled "The Moral Crisis in American Foreign Policy," was part of the great debate on foreign aid, although beyond questioning the value of further contributions to Tito and Nehru, it had little to say about foreign aid as such. Rather it was intended to serve as a reminder and a warning of how far we've wandered from the real point of it all, how fuzzy much of our official thinking has become, and how foolish it is to be taken in by the new Russian pose.

### SOMETHING OF A REBUKE

Whether it was meant to or not, it came as something of a rebuke to an emotional address previously delivered by the veteran Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, in which he appealed to the Senate to raise "the best