

about 125 miles of main rivers, besides the alteration or rebuilding of over 1,500 bridges, reconstruction of weirs, etc. The work will take about 10 years to complete, and is estimated to cost about \$6 million, entirely defrayed from state funds.

The acreage of cereal crops in 1954 was 1,193,300 acres, as against 1,117,500 the year before. Wheat, in particular, showed a gain of 137,900 acres. The growing of sugar beets has had a remarkable development. In 1926 the first beet-sugar factory was built, at Carlow. Three additional factories have been built since, in other localities, with extensions in 1952. All belong to the Irish Sugar Co., which contracts with the growers, through their organization, for the season's price. Cooperative groups—of which there were in 1954 157, a gain of 35 in 1 year—are buying the most modern farm machines, to be used by the small farmers. The 4 factories can handle 1 million tons of beets, yearly, producing 140,000 tons of sugar. Last year, records were set in the amount of beets produced—808,625 tons—in average yield per acre and in sugar content. Beets are now the third largest money crop—surpassed only by wheat and potatoes—and seventh in acreage. The retail price of sugar, 7d., is estimated the lowest in any country, except Norway.

Probably no Irish product is better known in this country than bacon. Hence it is interesting to read that during the first quarter of 1955, the bacon factories received 297,895 pigs, compared to 277,348 and 219,855 in the 2 previous years. The figures furnished by the Irish Minister of Finance show, too, a remarkable gain in the export of cattle last year, rising to 216,000 cattle, valued at \$35 million compared to 141,000 valued at \$21 million the year before. Agricultural prosperity is reflected in the wages of farm workers, the index of which stood at 313.8 in July 1954, against 299.1 in 1953. This has halted, at least temporarily, the decrease in farm workers; and the industry is hoping that the changing trend may continue. During 1954, also, purchases of agricultural machinery from abroad increased 40 percent, including 5,377 tractors, against 4,360 the year before. In the fall of 1954 a meeting of 1,200 farmers from all parts of Ireland laid plans for a new national organization, to promote the efficiency of Irish agriculture. It is gratifying to know that each summer recently, boys from American 4-H Clubs and corresponding Irish clubs have traveled to each other's countries and observed each other's methods of work and ways of life.

Next to farming, the traditional occupation of the Irish has been fishing. Familiar to American audiences through the Man of Aran and other films, deep-sea fishing off the rough west coast, and salmon and other game fishing on inland lakes and streams plays a prominent role in Irish life, and has attracted to the country multitudes of visitors. Every effort is being made to improve and stabilize the fishing resources of Ireland. In 1952 a sea fisheries board was established by law, to take over the work of a cooperative association started in 1931, whose problems had been intensified by World War II, causing difficulties in procuring proper boats and tackle. The board has recently launched a new power trawler, better than heretofore in use. Last year, the Government made an appropriation for furnishing new boats to fishermen, who, if they are "competent, able, and willing to work hard," can obtain the new boats without prepayment or deposit. A survey of salmon and sea-trout fishing is being sponsored jointly by the Government and Guinness Brewers.

While it is not intended that Ireland will or should become industrialized to the degree that England is, it is realized that, for her own safety as well as to reduce the unfavorable balance of trade, the country's resources ought to be handled so as to make her people

more self-dependent, and to increase her sales of manufactured goods, especially to the dollar area. Many avenues are being explored, with gratifying results. During recent months contacts have been made and markets opened in various countries for the sale of Irish goods. These include gypsum wallboard, to the U. S.; transformers, to India; cornflakes, to Portugal; lightweight tweeds, jams, and chocolates, to Canada, besides Waterford cutglass, the whole exhibit of which, at the Toronto Fair, was bought by one firm. A trade mission just returned from the British West Indies reports that a display held in Port of Spain, Trinidad, was opened by the Minister of Commerce, and awakened wide interest. Agents were appointed for more than 60 Irish firms. Irish products most in demand are meat and dairy products, stout, and prune wine. New contacts were arranged for confectionary sisal matting, Irish mist liqueur and Waterford cutglass.

In Ireland itself, factories recently established include a cotton mill in Sligo, a tannery in Kerry, and a factory for substitutes for sole leather in Cork. The Government has announced that an oil refinery is planned, three companies agreeing to join in its direction and operation. As a result of such activities, the industrial output of the country rose from \$323 million in 1951 to \$352 million in 1954. The number of factory workers—about 228,000—set a new high, and the index of their wages rose from 249.7 to 263.1. "Wholesale prices fluctuated little, and the index of retail prices was unchanged since August," stated the minister of finance, in introducing the budget in the Dail (Parliament), in May 1955.

As previously noted, Ireland is a debtor country, and hence makes every effort to reduce her trade deficit. Her success is shown by figures cited by the minister, viz, "Imports, last year, amounted to * * * almost \$8,400,000 less than in 1953, while exports were \$2,800,000 more * * *. We earned a slight surplus with the dollar area, which though it may be purely temporary, is a phenomenon without precedent in our records. * * * There is obviously much room for expansion of direct trade with the dollar area."

The promotion of industry and the expansion of trade involves the improving of means of transportation; and toward this end the Irish Government and people are devoting their best efforts. Ireland has numerous good harbors, including the magnificent harbor at Galway, the nearest European port to the United States. The chief ports at present are Dublin and Cobh, the harbor of Cork. The port of Dublin is being constantly remodeled, its deep-water berthage being now five times what it was as late as 1939. This improvement cost over \$3 million and the work of deepening the bar, which took 2 years, was completed in 1951, at a cost of \$1,400,000. Cork harbor is being provided with a new turning basin at the North Kuays, through a grant of \$1,200,000 from the National Development Fund. To modernize the railway system, a new public loan was floated this year by the CIE (Gaelic for the Irish Transportation System), to provide money for 94 diesel engines, and the first of these have already been installed. It is intended to have all CIE rail services operated by diesels by June 1956.

Progress in air transportation is steady and encouraging. The airport of Dublin, from which the Aer Lingus Lines fly to Britain and all parts of Western Europe, and the great port of Shannon, the first eastern point of contact for Americans going to Europe, are a source of pride to the Irish, and statistics show that they are immensely successful. Aer Lingus carried 297,000 more passengers in the fiscal year 1954 than in the year before, and collected about \$4¼ million in fares. Its freight increased 28

percent, its expenditures 4 percent, and its gross revenue 6 percent. It still operates at a loss—which is borne by the Irish Government—but the loss declined to only \$175,000 last year. In May of this year, weekly services to Biarritz and to Barcelona were begun. Better known to Americans is the Shannon Airport, close to the historic city of Limerick. The number of landings at Shannon grew from 4,993 in 1951 to 8,208 in 1954; the number of passengers practically doubled, and the business transacted showed a healthy increase, including a good volume of typical Irish goods. The Esso organization has just installed there a hydrant refueling system, the largest and most modern in Europe. The Minister of Commerce says that the Government prides itself on the service furnished to passengers and on the technical assistance to aircraft; it is now studying the possibilities of developing the customs-free facilities of this port. An interesting example of the growing importance of Shannon was the beginning there, in January last, of transatlantic service by the German Luft-hansa.

Ireland's recent progress is due in large part to the energetic development of her power resources, both from water and from the peat bogs, which exist in many parts of the country. While these bogs have always furnished a main source of fuel in the country districts, it was realized only recently that the peat is a valuable source of power. The Bord na Mona (Peat Development Board) has been entrusted by the Government with the task of milling peat into briquettes, which was first tried at the Bog of Allen in 1933. The work has been so successful that the whole future program of using peat in power stations is to be based on it. The Board proposes to use some sixty to seventy thousand acres of bog for developing electricity, thus changing the bogs from permanent distressed areas into a source of strength to the country, furnishing employment and helping the rural electrification program. This program, according to the Minister for Industry, speaking in the Dail in the spring of 1954, is "The most ambitious * * * development ever undertaken in this country." It began 8 years ago. The number of rural homes electrified each year is some 33,000, and it is hoped to complete the scheme in 6 more years. As of last year, it was announced that 36 percent of the rural population had access to electricity, and that in the completed areas 67 percent of the dwellings were connected. Most of it was used for domestic purposes, and a steady rise in demand for the larger appliances, such as cookers, water heaters, and washing machines, is shown. One of the four national power stations, that at Ferbane in Offaly, uses only milled peat for fuel. The peat is obtained from the bog of Boora, nearby, which not long ago was a treacherous swampy waste, but in which more than 3 million yards of drains and narrow-gauge railways have been laid. When in full production the plant will have its own railway system, with about 35 miles of track, over 400 wagons and 400 tractors. Nearby a whole village of 104 houses has been built to house the married workers.

Housing is under the care of the Irish department of local government, and, thanks to its initiative, many of the picturesque but outmoded dwellings that used to draw unfavorable attention have disappeared. In their place we find new modern houses, of which about 42,000 had been completed between March 1947 and May 1955. Six thousand more were being built, 3,000 bid on, and over 10,000 sites were available. Even in remote parts, such as the island of Achill off the west coast, modern villages have been built up. The money spent on housing during 1952 was about \$19 million—a substantial sum for so small a country. Aiding in the success is the fact that in 1954 Ireland

became self-sufficient in making its own cement.

Health and hospitalization have made spectacular advances in the country since independence came. Irish hospitals have received considerable publicity in America, on account of the Sweeps takes plan which partly supports them; hence, it will not be surprising to learn that the country is well equipped with hospitals of most modern construction and equipment. Under a new building program started after the late war, 11,000 beds in new or reconstructed hospitals are being installed, and in the 6 years, 1947-53, over \$32 million was provided by the Government from the hospitals' trust fund for construction of hospitals; an example is the new Galway Regional Hospital of 486 beds, costing over \$4 million.

Less talked about, but probably of greater permanent importance, is the striking gain in the control of diseases which formerly took great toll in Irish lives and efficiency. Due in part of the climate, in part to bad health habits, and not least to lack of care, the Irish people always suffered heavily from tuberculosis. Between 1947 and 1953, the death rate from this national scourge fell nearly 70 percent, the mortalities in this latter year being 1,900, or four-tenths per thousand. The numbers undergoing treatment have increased steadily, and many of the counties now have enough beds to take prompt care of all cases requiring institutional treatment. The total number of patients in institutions rose from 5,444 in 1950 to 6,870 in 1954. Tuberculin testing, BCG vaccination of the young, mass radiography, and blood banks are spreading.

Dental care, long neglected in Ireland, is stressed in the schools. Nearly 107,000 pupils received dental treatment in 1953, and pressure put on local authorities to increase their dental staffs led to the engagement of 24 new dental surgeons, which, of course, is only a beginning. Mental health service and reduction of infant mortality are other activities which are setting new records for the country. As concrete evidence of all this, the lowest death rate ever recorded in Ireland—11.8 per 1,000 population—was returned for 1953. The cost of the local authority health services was estimated at \$31,496,400, one-half being paid by the Nation, the rest by local taxes.

Education, including the school system and all media of information, is progressing satisfactorily. School attendance in 1954 registered 476,000, an increase of 8,500; secondary schools 50,000, a gain of 2,000; there are about 20,000 in vocational schools. One of the early acts of the Irish Government was the appointment, in 1924, of a commission to inquire into and advise upon technical education for the country. Swiss and Swedish experts served on this commission, which issued its report in 1927. Legislation followed, resulting in two technical schools in Dublin, and the city of Cork also provides courses. University College and Trinity College, both in Dublin, conduct summer sessions, for which modest scholarships are offered to foreign students. Radio Eireann provides a comprehensive program of entertainment, sports, education, and news, which is heard over the whole country, and, in cooperation with the British Broadcasting Corp., is available in the other island. It is worthy of note that during 1954, 7,500 miles of additional trunkline telephone cable were laid in Ireland; and that the telephone traffic increased by 10 percent over the previous year.

Despite this strenuous domestic program, the Irish people and Government—no matter which party is in power—are showing on every possible occasion a healthy and vigorous interest in world affairs, to which they feel that they have much of value to contribute. While Eire has thus far been vetoed from the United Nations, and while she is

prevented from joining NATO by the requirement of accepting the validity of the British occupation of her northern counties, she maintains the most friendly relations with all the free world. It is not forgotten that her great leader, Eamon de Valera, made his mark as President of the former League of Nations. Ireland is affiliated with many of the specialized agencies of the United Nations, especially with the WHO. Within the past 2 years, many international bodies of scholars and businessmen have met in Dublin—among them the European Broadcasting Union, the World Medical Association, an international optical conference and the International Astronomical Union. Irish delegates go regularly to similar meetings in other countries, such as the TB Conference in London, the Iserlohn Festival and the recent bicentennial of Columbia University. Next to England and Scotland, both of which countries have large groups of Irish residents, Ireland's closest ties are, as they have been for over a century, with the United States. Thousands of Americans, mostly of Irish descent, visit Ireland each year; on 1 day—December 11 of last year—10,000 bags of Christmas mail arrived in Dublin from America. But the hospitable Irish people have a strong desire to have non-Irish Americans go to see for themselves the Ireland of today.

An English economist who was for years London editor of the Montreal Daily Star recently made a very keen observation on the present position of Ireland, comparing her opportunities with those of Canada of a few years ago. He pointed out that the process of change from an agricultural economy to a balanced one does not eliminate recessions and other problems. But, "every recession in Canada has been followed by a spurt into a new high level of prosperity," yet, "Ireland today is paradise to the eye of the constructive economist who has seen the growing pains of Canada." He said that it is only lately that practical men have fully realized the great advantages that Canada, a young nation, enjoys, and that to many of them the discovery came too late. He warned that this should not be true of Ireland, "a land of tomorrow," offering to young men especially great advantages, which will benefit most those who first seize them. In view of such facts as are here presented, it seems obvious that Ireland is destined to enter upon an era of prosperity which will come as a just reward from the vision, energy, and resourcefulness that have made her in these past 30 years the "new sod."

Government Secrecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech made by Clark R. Mollenhoff before the Washington chapter of Sigma Delta Chi Fraternity on May 23, 1956, relating to the work of the House Government Information Subcommittee.

Mr. Mollenhoff is a distinguished correspondent for the Des Moines Register and Tribune and the Minneapolis Star and Tribune. He is a winner of many newspaper awards, the most recent being the coveted Raymond Clapper award. He has been following closely the work of

the House Government Information Subcommittee, which is headed by Representative JOHN E. MOSS, of California.

As a former newspaper editor, I, too, have followed the excellent work of Mr. Moss' subcommittee in exploring the very important question of the availability of information from Federal agencies.

Mr. Mollenhoff's speech follows:

The Moss subcommittee has performed a great service for the press. With a minimum of politics, the subcommittee has accomplished these things:

1. It has put Government agencies on record on their information policies, and has compiled a book containing the answers each agency has given to a questionnaire.
2. It has served as a place for the press to register complaints, and has given the authority of a congressional committee to the follow-up on those complaints.
3. It has heard witnesses from the press, the scientific fields, the legal field and from the agencies on the specific problem of Government information policies.
4. It has obtained some changes in information policies in such agencies as Treasury, the Federal Power Commission, the Civil Service Commission, the Post Office Department, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Agriculture Department, and the General Services Administration.

There is enthusiasm for what the Moss subcommittee has done among many who have been active for years in the fight against Government secrecy. Among those who have felt the Moss subcommittee has made a substantial contribution are Red Newton, head of the SDX freedom of information committee; Russ Wiggins of the Washington Post; Jimmy Pope of the Louisville Courier Journal; Kenneth MacDonald, editor of the Des Moines Register and Tribune; and Harold Cross, attorney for the A. S. N. E.

The enthusiasm these men express is not an endorsement of all of the committee's actions, it is merely an appreciation for an official body working toward the same basic end that they have worked for. These men have battled against Government secrecy for years. They know the frustrations of fighting to stay even in the fight against big government. They know the press needs all the help it can get if it is to make any real progress.

Some of these men while applauding the Moss subcommittee, have at the same time criticized it for not doing more about opening up more of the secret sessions of congressional groups. Measuring the Moss group against the ideal, we might find much to be desired. Measuring it against reasonable standards, I do not think it is overstating the case to say the Moss subcommittee has performed a great service for the press.

If the Moss subcommittee on public information never does another thing from this day forward, it will deserve our thanks. That thanks should be extended not only to Representative JOHN MOSS, the chairman, but to all of the members of the committee and to the staff members. Politics has been kept to a minimum, as it certainly should be when a committee goes into such an important problem as the rights of the public, the press and the Congress to information from our executive agencies.

Both Representative HOFFMAN and Representative Dawson have been around Congress a long time. They have had personal experiences where executive agencies headed by Democrats or Republicans have sought to bar the Congress from access to information on Government operations. Both men have been infuriated by what they considered to be arbitrary action by the executive agencies that interfered with their rights to information. They have been aware of the way

1956

the press has been frustrated in its quest for facts.

I think that an examination of the statements of Representative HOFFMAN and Representative DAWSON on the right of the public and press to access to Government information will find them both in essentially the same position. Although they are poles apart politically, both favor this general position:

The Government is meant to serve the people, and is not the property of those who happen to be in control of the executive agency at any given time. The people, the press and the people's representatives are entitled to the maximum of information on how laws are being administered and enforced, and what factors are influencing the administration and enforcement of those laws. The burden of proof should be on the executive agency to give good and sufficient cause in those cases where it is felt information should not be made available to the public, the press or the Congress.

Fortunately, the Moss subcommittee has been able to take up the problem of information policy outside of the framework of any of the philosophical disputes that tend to split Democrats and Republicans into opposite camps and cloud any basic problem of the public's right to know.

I am hopeful that the nonpolitical atmosphere will continue, and that the Moss subcommittee will do even more worthwhile work. However, this is an election year and anything can happen to a congressional probe in an election year.

I would be hopeful that all members of the subcommittee would continue to handle this subject on the theory that "The best politics is no politics." I would like to see the Democrats keep any criticism of the Eisenhower administration in perspective, and avoid any partisan overstatement. I would like to see the Republicans on the committee take the farsighted approach, and try to convince the administration to make the reasonable changes in information policy that Republican Congressmen would like to see set as a precedent for any future Democratic administrations to follow.

Out of it all, I would like to see the Sigma Delta Chi or the Moss subcommittee come up with a policy statement on public information that could be made a part of both the Democratic and Republican platforms in this election year.

Platforms may not mean anything, but I would like to see both major political parties stuck with a comprehensive information policy. I'd want it specific enough in its pronouncements, that it could be jammed down the throat of any public official who sought to hide his errors, his frauds or his policies behind some vague claim that his actions are "confidential."

I don't believe that this unqualified "confidential" claim can be properly asserted by anyone except the President in his relationship with his Cabinet and other members of his immediate staff.

Moving from what the Moss subcommittee might do to what it has done, I again assert that if the Moss group does another thing from this day forward, it will be deserving of a thanks from the press.

It is possible to name several agencies that have changed or modified their policies on information as a result of the Moss subcommittee action. In some cases, the agency had considered a change but the lethargy of big government slowed action to a walk or had even stopped it. In other cases, agency heads weren't just sure what their information policies were until they came under the scrutiny of the Moss subcommittee. They had to be put on the spot.

Momentarily leaving aside the specific changes in individual agencies, I would like to discuss the one thing the Moss subcommittee has done that I know will have last-

ing value. The subcommittee sent a questionnaire to every Government agency requesting answers to basic queries on the agency's information policies. The answers given by the agencies have been put together in one printed volume that should be required reading for the Washington Press Corps.

If you don't care to search through it for stories on the information policies on the agencies with which you are familiar, it should be kept as a handy reference book when an information problem presents itself.

The accumulation of the statements of the agencies on their information policies was a starting point for the Moss subcommittee. It should be our starting point when a Government agency refuses us information that we feel we should have.

This volume does not solve your information problems, but it gives you something concrete. It gives you the agency's own position as related to the Moss subcommittee. It is something in black and white to use in comparing with the views of officials who seek to frustrate your requests for records.

Many of the things the Moss subcommittee has done, or will do, we could probably have done for ourselves if the press had been industrious enough and single-minded enough on one issue.

However, it took a congressional committee to put authority behind the questionnaire.

In answering the questionnaire, the executive agencies have been forced to go on record. If the answers they have given present a reasonable information policy, the press can use their own position against them if they seek to be arbitrary and change the position at some future time.

If the answers to the questionnaire show an unreasonable or public-be-damned information policy, the agency has made itself a fixed target for criticism until it changes those policies.

It is important that our targets be fixed. Most of you have had the experience of going to a governmental agency for information and having the request turned down on one ground. And if you have been successful in demolishing the law or logic put up at the first refusal, you have undoubtedly seen the agency shift to a new defense against giving up information that might be embarrassing.

This is what I call the shifting target approach of some public information folks that I think the Moss subcommittee has done a lot to nullify.

Another important function of the Moss subcommittee has been the accumulation of testimony from experts in the scientific field to give their views on the impact of Government secrecy on the exchange of information and scientific development.

Legal experts appeared before the Moss subcommittee in the last 2 weeks to discuss secrecy in the executive branch of the Government, the legal rights to keep certain things secret, and the court decisions and opinions of the Attorney General on this subject.

I was particularly impressed with the testimony of the legal experts, and I think that every reporter here would benefit from reading that testimony. In fact, I will go so far as to say I think every newsman in Washington owes a duty to himself and his publication to read that testimony.

I would suggest that you first read the April 27, 1956, report of the House Government Operations Committee entitled "The right of Congress to obtain information from the executive and from other agencies of the Federal Government." The report was prepared by Associate General Counsel William Pincus.

We must always face the fact that the right of the press to obtain information can

never be any better than the rights of the Congress, and that our rights in this field are necessarily tied to theirs.

After reading that report, read the testimony of the lawyers who appeared before the Moss subcommittee. I would call special attention to the testimony of Prof. Bernard Schwartz, of New York University, and Harold Cross, attorney for the American Society of Newspaper Editors, who has specialized in the field of press access to information in Government agencies.

In my opinion, this report and the testimony of these lawyers completely demolishes the Justice Department's recent assertions that executive agencies can arbitrarily treat any intra-agency or interagency communication as confidential and outside of the range of congressional subpoena or the inquiries of the press. The only explanations I have received from the Justice Department have been vague and unsatisfactory.

In fairness, I suggest that you then go to the Justice Department and seek an opinion—preferably written—with an explanation of the reasoning and law behind the doctrine that the public has no right to any more than the final decisions of executive agencies and cannot go behind those decisions.

There may be a few stories that would develop out of an examination of what the Moss subcommittee has been doing, but if you never write a word about the testimony or the report the study will be worth your while.

The least that can be expected of us is some little understanding of the laws and the court cases that effect our access to information. Here you will find much of it bound up in a handy package to read and to use. It is the kind of equipment that I don't think a Washington reporter can afford to pass by.

I have taken several secrecy problems to the Moss subcommittee, and have been pleased with the follow-through. The major problem involved the May 17, 1954, letter sent by President Eisenhower to Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson during the Army-McCarthy hearings.

The letter was used to authorize Army Counsel John Adams to refuse to testify about conversations he had with Sherman Adams and Deputy Attorney General William F. Rogers. Many of you are aware how this letter has since been used by other agencies as authority for broad secrecy doctrine. In essence, this doctrine is:

The press, public and Congress can be barred from access to any intraagency or interagency communication the agency feels is confidential.

This broad secrecy doctrine has been used from Dixon-Yates to the Chotiner memo. It is my feeling that in each case, the administration would have been better off to take the brief embarrassment and open the records, rather than engage in a long fight that is certain to end with the records being brought into the open.

Senator John McClellan stated recently that Attorney General Herbert Brownell or Deputy Attorney General Rogers had sent a memo to Justice Department attorneys stating that they should deal "cautiously" with Mr. Murray Chotiner.

Rogers has declined to give me this memo, or to state the circumstances that caused the Justice Department to urge "caution" in dealing with Mr. Chotiner. This is confidential executive department business, Mr. Rogers says. He states that such a memo is protected from scrutiny by the press or Congress by the doctrine of separation of powers.

If the department were to apply the same principle to the communications involving T. LaMar Caule, his superiors, and Matt Connelly, those matters—now the basis for

criminal charges—would also be "confidential."

I don't believe the communications between Connelly and Caudle should be regarded as secret executive agency business. I think there is as little logic behind the secrecy surrounding the Chotiner memo.

Within the last couple of weeks, the Government Operations subcommittee of the House made a report stating that Brownell was wrong on some of his assertions on executive secrecy as set out in the May 17, 1954, letter. That report states there is no legal support for Brownell's assertions on a broad executive secrecy.

The Moss subcommittee has brought out testimony from other agencies showing they did not share the views of the Justice Department on the arbitrary right to withhold any interagency or intraagency communications.

The compilation of reports from various agencies showed how many agencies were relying on the May 17, 1954, letter as justification for secrecy, and how many were not.

As this subcommittee is helping to bring this matter to a head, it can also help bring your problems into focus. I would suggest that you take your problems to Chief Counsel John Mitchell, Staff Director Sam Archibald or Senior Consultant Lacey Reynolds.

This subcommittee must rely upon the press to bring cases of unreasonable secrecy. We should avail ourselves of this opportunity to solve some of our problems and learn some of our rights.

The Small Farmer Is the Modern Vanishing American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I desire that there be included copies of two letters which I have recently received from small, family-size farmers in my district.

These letters were unsolicited responses made to a letter which I wrote to small cotton farmers explaining the provisions for cotton acreage allotments which were included in the farm bill just enacted. They speak for themselves, very plainly and very tragically. These farmers want the answer to their problems, but I frankly cannot offer them any encouragement.

Mr. Speaker, when you receive letters like this it makes you wonder if we here in Washington are not living in an ivory tower of heartless indifference to the human problems and concerns.

With names and addresses omitted, these two letters follow.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am or was farming on a small scale, a one-man farm or family farm, but not any more. This sliding scale has already "slid" me and many others out. When the big acreage was cut the little acreage was cut, so I am out with several others and 1957 and 1958 will get the rest of the little fellows. So what are we going to do?

I am 59 years old, plenty able to work, but when I fill out an employment application and go in for an interview the first thing

they do is look at my age and then say you are too old. If I was to ask for a pension, they would say you are too young. So, it's beyond me. I am too old and too young, so they say. So what?

I am an American, paid taxes all my life, raised two sons that went to the war. We could all have an equal opportunity in this land of yours and mine, but now I am out because I was a small farmer and out in the employment line because they say I'm too old. I have debts and responsibilities and, above all, I have to eat. But how?

Mr. BASS, I am waiting to hear from you on the solution.

DEAR SIR: I was sure proud to get this letter from you and to think that you have got feeling for the poor people. But for me it is too late to help me and my children in farming.

I had 40 acres of land and I had to sell some to live. I did not owe a penny on the land. It was all paid for. All we have now is truck patches. If something isn't done we are going to lose all that we have worked so hard for. This farm program has brought us down to truck patches. Give me the answer to this problem.

Indian Bureau Does It Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have here an editorial which appeared in the Devils Lake (N. Dak.) Journal on May 26, 1956. This article calls attention to the irresponsible attitude taken by the Indian Bureau in regard to the welfare of the Indians and its arrogant disregard of the regulations to which it is supposed to adhere:

INDIAN BUREAU DOES IT AGAIN

Officials of the North Dakota Public Welfare Board and the United States Indian Bureau were all set for a conference last week when, without any apparent reason, the Federal agency called it off.

Selene Gifford, Assistant Indian Affairs Commissioner, was to meet with the State welfare board, the North Dakota Indian Affairs Commission and legislative representatives to clarify Indian policies.

Only the Indian Bureau can adequately explain why it suddenly got cold feet and refused to go on with the discussion. However, as has often happened in the past, the Bureau has no explanation for its actions.

Those of us who live near Indian reservations continually wonder at the justification for the actions of the Bureau. Nothing in that agency is done with a view to having either the Indians or the non-Indians understand its purpose.

There was poor public relations, both with the Indians and the adjoining communities, in the closing of the Fort Totten Hospital, which has now been replaced by a small clinic.

Fort Totten almost lost its school until the undercover efforts of the Bureau toward that end were brought to light.

Law and order came belatedly to the reservation, but only to end up with the Indian Bureau dictating who should serve as judge, rather than complying with reservation regulations, which provide for approval by the tribal executive committee.

Even the United States Indian Commissioner apparently has no explanation for the failure to keep faith with the people on the reservation. One of the first requisites in setting up instruments for law enforcement should be to abide by regulations. Unless the Government sets a good example, how can it expect the Indian people to have much respect for the law.

Authorities have enough trouble with law enforcement on our Indian reservations as it is without planting the seeds of disrespect for the law.

Has the Indian Bureau become so entwined in bureaucratic red tape that it has lost touch with the American citizenry? Does it have the right to flout regulations or to call off conferences without giving an explanation?

It would seem that the Indian Bureau stands as an example of what happens when an agency becomes too big and lacks a spirit of responsibility to the people it is supposed to serve.

For some reason, the Bureau has a different regulation for practically every Indian tribe. Actually no one knows what are its guiding principles.

Under the circumstances, perhaps it was too much to expect that it would be possible to get an official from the Bureau to sit down for a discussion. It could prove embarrassing.

Schenck To Confer With Residents of His District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, it is my great privilege and honor to represent the people of the Third District of Ohio here in the Congress of the United States. I am humbly grateful for this opportunity to be of service, and it is my constant aim to serve my constituents in the very best way possible. As their Representative in Congress it has been my constant policy to keep in close contact with the people of the Third District so that I may know how they feel about the many important issues facing us here in Congress.

Our Third District is the largest congressional district in Ohio and one of the largest in the United States. Its great importance, however, is not dependent on size alone, but rather on the outstanding contributions of its fine citizens to the general welfare of our Nation. Not only is it the birthplace and cradle of aviation, but many of its other products and inventions are serving people throughout the world. Our people are highly skilled in many ways, and we have a district in which scientific projects, manufacturing, and agriculture are developed to an unusually high degree. As the Representative of this great district, I have considered it my duty not only to be well informed of the opinions of my constituents, but also to be of the greatest possible service to persons having problems dealing with agencies or departments of our Federal Government.

Five years ago I initiated the idea of holding grassroots conferences through-