

industry in the United States. Controls should be used for such maintenance of a synthetic rubber industry only if specific authority is provided for that purpose.

I therefore recommend that the Senate and the House of Representatives, by joint resolution, make a declaration of policy to the effect that it is the firm intention of the Government to maintain a synthetic rubber industry in the United States, adequate to the minimum needs of national security.

I further recommend that the Senate and the House of Representatives act expeditiously in establishing appropriate committee arrangements to consider the problems involved in maintaining a synthetic rubber industry in the United States and to draft such legislation as is found to be necessary to accomplish this objective.

I repeat my recent recommendation that the authority to continue allocation controls on rubber be continued for 1 year under title III of the Second War Powers Act, in order that the Congress may have an opportunity to consider this problem and to enact such permanent legislation as in its judgment is necessary and appropriate.

The program of action I have outlined has the unanimous and vigorous support of all agencies of Government concerned with this problem. I am instructing these agencies to give all possible assistance to the Congress in its consideration of the problem, and to make available, on request, the statistical material and other information which they have collected.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 7, 1947.

PROTECTING AMERICAN AGRICULTURE, HORTICULTURE, LIVESTOCK, AND THE PUBLIC HEALTH

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill H. R. 597.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, this bill will provide legislation which makes mandatory the proper handling of garbage from transportation facilities, such as ships, railway cars, airplanes, and other forms of transportation by which garbage might be carried. Last year I introduced a similar bill, which passed the House but on account of a typographical error found on the last day of the session in the Senate the bill was held up. I reintroduced this bill in January of this year.

We now have in Mexico the hoof-and-mouth disease, and this bill will go a long way to protect what I believe might be one of the main germ carriers, transportation. Back in 1924 and 1925 we had the hoof-and-mouth disease in the United States. At that time it was brought in by ships from foreign countries. Garbage was dumped in the waters on the west coast near San Francisco, and we lost thousands of head of

cattle. We have the disease now in Mexico, and we all know that public carriers are daily coming from Mexico into the United States without proper regulation as to garbage that might be dumped in the United States and bring about this infection and disease. This bill will protect the American horticulture, agriculture, and livestock industry. I would like to see the House adopt this bill, because I think it is urgently needed, particularly at this time. Mexico, our neighboring country, has perhaps as much as half a million head of livestock affected by the hoof-and-mouth disease.

Mr. HOPE. While I made a reservation of objection, I have no intention, of course, of objecting to the bill. It is true, as the gentleman has stated, that the bill passed the House unanimously, as I recall it, in the last session, and it lacked passage only because of a clerical error which resulted in the consideration of the bill being postponed in the Senate. The Committee on Agriculture the other day reported the bill unanimously. I know of no objection to it.

Mr. ELLIOTT. It is important to bring it up at this time because of the prevalence of the hoof-and-mouth disease in Mexico, and I hope there will be no objection to the passage of the measure at this time.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) for the purposes of this act—

(1) The term "garbage" means waste material, such as food scraps, table refuse, galley refuse, and refuse from stores of ships, railway cars, and aircraft, including such waste material in passengers' and crews' quarters, derived, in whole or in part, from fruits, vegetables, or animal products which have originated outside of, and have not previously legally entered, the continental United States.

(2) The term "fruits, vegetables, or animal products" shall not include fruits, vegetables, or animal products, purchased as ships' provisions in Canadian ports on the Great Lakes, unless there is in effect, with respect thereto, a proclamation issued under subsection (b) of this section.

(3) The term "vessel" means every description of craft or other contrivance used, or capable of being used, as means of transportation on or in water.

(4) The term "aircraft" means every description of craft or other contrivance used, or capable of being used, as means of transportation through the air.

(5) The term "person" means an individual, partnership, corporation, company, society, or association, a State or any agency thereof, or a political subdivision of a State or any agency thereof; and such term imports the singular or plural, as the case may be.

(6) The term "United States," when not limited by the adjective "continental," includes all Territories and possessions of the United States, with the exception of the Philippine Islands and the Canal Zone.

(7) The term "continental United States" means that part of the United States located on the continent of North America, including Alaska, but excluding Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the Canal Zone.

(8) The term "territorial waters of the United States" means all navigable waters of the United States, including all portions of the sea within its jurisdiction.

SEC. 11. Nothing contained in section 13 of the act of March 13, 1899 (30 Stat. 1152; 33 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 407), shall be construed as forbidding the discharge of fluid garbage into the territorial waters of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 8, line 21, after the word "March" strike out "13" and insert "3."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

(Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

GOVERNMENT PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, during the campaign last November I repeatedly urged the residents of my district to vote on the basis of facts rather than rumors or propaganda. I believe I made that suggestion in every campaign speech. I further promised that if elected to Congress I would try to keep my district informed as to the activities of their Government.

It was with this in view that I introduced a few days ago a resolution authorizing a special committee to investigate Government public relations and propaganda activities.

So far as I can learn Congress has never in contemporary times obtained an integrated over-all picture of what we are spending on publicity agents and just what those agents do. Various appropriations subcommittees get some of these facts piecemeal as they consider the respective supply bills. But no committee so far as I can ascertain has ever compiled this information in such form that a House Member can learn for himself the costs and functions of Government publicity and propaganda. I feel that some House committee should collect these facts, that thereafter Congress should determine a definite policy with respect to publicity, and that appropriations should be confirmed by this policy.

Let me make it abundantly plain that I am not attacking the theory that Government needs information specialists to help the radio and press get the facts. Nor am I criticizing press and radio for utilizing such services. Beyond any doubt there is a need in Washington for a limited number of such information specialists.

Newspapermen here inform me that some of these press agents right now are performing a number of valuable services. For instance, I am told that public-relations men at the Labor and Interior Departments have evoked an open-door policy. In other words, they encourage Washington correspondents to make inquiries and they help the correspondents to get in touch with the proper officials. That undeniably is a helpful public service.

The press officer at the Justice Department, on the other hand, seems to function more or less as a censor or security officer. I am told by newspapermen that they must channel their inquiries at the Justice Department through the public information director. He in turn releases only such information as he or his superiors may choose. I am sure Congress does not regard that type of public information as desirable.

The State Department is now operating a vast foreign publicity program through its Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs. That office now has more than 3,000 employees. I am told that in many cases the Department has taken on young men just out of military service with little or no experience in public relations and little or no actual first-hand knowledge of American social and economic institutions. Yet these young men are being hired at salaries ranging from \$6,000 to \$7,000 and are being sent all over the world to serve as publicity agents for the United States Government. I am told that these agents are being appointed by the State Department without any examination whatsoever, and are being assured that after some service abroad they will be given a permanent State Department status without qualifying by examinations.

I have here an example of how this organization spends the taxpayers' hard-earned dollars. Look magazine recently published reprints of seven paintings purchased by the Government, we are told at a cost of \$40,000. These paintings are to be sent around the world as an exhibition of American art and culture. If these paintings represent American art at its best, let us bury them in a deep hole instead of displaying them to our neighbors.

The Federal Reserve Board presents another example of what I regard as a bad practice. It has long been the habit of many Federal agencies to hire publicity agents in the guise of other capacities. Thus their budget allocations are not identified as being for the purpose of public information. At the Federal Reserve Board, for instance, a Mr. Elliott Thurston is listed in the Official Register of the United States as "Assistant to the Chairman." Now as a matter of fact, Mr. Thurston is a former Washington correspondent who is actually public information director for the Board. This is well known by newspapermen here who contact the Board for information. Yet, officially Mr. Thurston has nothing to do with public relations, but is listed as an assistant to the Chairman.

It is my understanding that Mr. Thurston is the highest paid Government public-relations man in Washington.

The Official Register of the United States does not list his salary, but discloses that his salary is paid from assessments levied by the Board upon Federal Reserve banks.

Such disbursements by the banks naturally increase the cost of service to bank patrons. I feel sure that the public and the banks would welcome some revelation by Congress concerning Mr. Thurston's position and duties.

Any Member of the House can get some idea of what this overgrown Federal publicity system is costing the taxpayers by glancing at the 1947 Budget requests for the Office of the Secretary of Commerce. Under this office are listed the following publicity agents:

Director of Publications, \$10,000 a year salary.

Assistant Director of Publications, \$8,479 a year.

Chief, Editorial Section, \$8,180 a year.

Chief, Publications Program, \$8,180 a year.

Chief of the Field Publications Service, \$7,342.

Five information specialists, \$29,525.

Four city editors, \$23,860.

One information specialist, \$4,902.

Head of the Publications Section, \$4,902.

Now bear in mind that these press agents are only those found in the office of the Secretary of Commerce. Many of the agencies in the Department have their own public information specialists listed separately.

These figures do not include the salaries of those who grind out the material released.

Just to give the Members of the House some idea of the hand-outs prepared and distributed daily by Government public information men I asked one of the newsmen to save for me such handouts press releases received by his office in a day. Here they are. You can see they make up a pile about 2 inches thick. Any Member is perfectly welcome to look these over if he wishes.

Here is another phase of Government handouts which I think the House should look into. I hold in my hand a rather beautiful and comprehensive document printed in the Government Printing Office and compiled by the War Assets Administration. It numbers 16 pages printed on very high-grade glossy stock. It is well filled with excellent and costly art.

It is pure undiluted propaganda. There is not one single word of news in it that would be regarded as legitimate copy by a good newspaper or magazine. Its real purpose is to convince Congress and the public that the War Assets Administration has been making a valuable contribution to the Nation by selling war surpluses.

That sort of thing should be stopped.

Here is another example of Government publicity which I think should be given attention by this House. It is laughable, but it is costly.

This is an official Department of Commerce press release setting forth the conclusions of specialists in that Department who studied the establishment and operation of a book store. Here is their conclusion as set forth in this official release. I quote:

It is more important to be a smart businessman than a bookworm if you are to make success of running a book store.

That, Mr. Speaker, is a Commerce Department press release edited and broadcast at the taxpayers' expense.

I have here a handout which the Veterans' Administration probably will maintain is valuable and indispensable. It is entitled "Fillers." It presents three

pages of short two- or three-line paragraphs which the administration hopes newspapers will use to fill in surplus white space. I find it difficult to regard this sort of activity as essential to the press of the Nation.

I hold in my hand the Consumers' Guide, a Department of Agriculture publication printed on good glossy paper with plenty of pictures. How many magazines of this kind do you suppose the Government publishes? I would like to know. We employ thousands of people to furnish material to private publishers. Then we compete with them by publishing and distributing free magazines.

I have here a few press releases for February 8 and 9. These releases used to be sent out on plain inexpensive paper, but now I suppose that we are in the money with a thirty-five billion dollar tax income and the shooting war over. Now we must have colored letterheads. In fact, the Public Relations Division of the War Department now put their releases out with two-color jobs—the old red, white, and blue.

Again, I want to emphasize my object is to obtain the definite facts for Congress. Talk to any Washington newspaperman or radio man and you will get all sorts of reactions and reports on Government public information operations. Nobody seems to know what the program is or is intended to be. I feel the time has come for Congress to lay down a definite policy for Government publicity.

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

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. I presume a lot of this excessive and useless mail comes under what is called penalty mail in the Post Office Department.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It certainly is. There is no postage on any of it.

Mr. VURSELL. Being a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I find that in 1946 that Department stacked up a deficit of something like \$300,000,000. The President has called attention to this deficit and has recommended higher postal rates. Of that deficit probably fifty or seventy-five million is on account of the unnecessary and useless mail issued by the various Federal departments, known as penalty mail. I do not know what can be done about it, but I think the gentleman should be commended for bringing this to the attention of the House. Certainly one way to stop this would be to blast out some of this bureaucracy, and put these people, who have nothing to do except to waste Government money, back into civilian life where they might produce something to support the Government, rather than to ride and let their feet drag all the time at the expense of the Government.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is exactly what I am trying to do. We have to find out where these people are and under what title we will find them on the pay roll. They will not be down there as publicity experts in many, many cases.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP). Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

TAX REDUCTION

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, ever since this Congress convened the first part of January, we have heard a considerable amount of talk about reducing taxes. I do not believe there is any Member of this House or of the Senate either who would not and does not hope that he can with good conscience vote for a reduction in taxes. This, of course, is a most laudable objective, but I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether we have spent enough time talking about how we can accomplish this objective. We spend too much time, I think, talking about formulas and overlooking the most important point: That we can reduce taxes only as we correspondingly reduce expenditures. Mr. Speaker, we must do two very definite things before we can reach the point where we discuss and talk formulas for tax reduction, in my opinion. In the first place, we must balance the budget. We cannot spend the same amount we have been spending in the past and still balance our budget. In order, therefore, to accomplish even the first objective we have got to start cutting, and cutting deep. It amuses me very much, Mr. Speaker, to find gentlemen from the other side of the aisle here entering into the discussion of tax reduction and tax formulas when they themselves are committed to a Presidential budget which under no stretch of the imagination can leave room for any tax reduction. So I believe it would come with much better grace for them to stop talking about formulas for reducing taxes and to start whittling away at their own Presidential and party budget.

Before we talk about tax reductions we must, I believe, make provision for a very substantial payment on the national debt, and we cannot do even that if we are going to accept the Presidential budget of \$37,500,000,000. So that I believe the other side of the House might well give consideration to this factor before they inject themselves into the tax-reduction program. When we do this, when we make provision for the balancing of the budget, and when we make provision, Mr. Speaker, for a substantial payment on the national debt, then is the time for making some cut in taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that these three objectives are impossible, that they cannot be achieved; in fact, Mr. Speaker, I very firmly believe that under the new controls in the House and in the Senate and under the new philosophy that should pervade as a result of that change that all three of these objectives can and will be accomplished. But I want to warn the House and I want to warn the American public that those objectives cannot be accomplished and will not be accomplished unless there is a deep-seated desire and a will to actually cut expenditures to the bone. Mr.

Speaker, that is what we should concentrate on today. That is what our objective should be. The objectives, as far as the end results are concerned, namely, balancing the Budget, making a substantial payment on the national debt, and cutting taxes, are very laudable, and, as I say, I believe they can be accomplished; but, as in the war period, we had an ultimate objective, namely, the winning of the war. Where did we concentrate? We concentrated on a plan of operation as to how to attain that ultimate objective. That is what we have got to do today. We have to draw up a plan of operation in order to cut expenditures so as to make those things possible. This plan of operation, Mr. Speaker, should be to eliminate at least a minimum of \$7,500,000,000 from the Presidential budget. We have got to spend more time talking, thinking, acting, and doing something about that. Then we can attain our ultimate objective of cutting taxes.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman will agree that everything depends upon how high or how low a ceiling we place on the Budget. We will have to start from there.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman is absolutely correct, but I think he has to carry that one step further. Your budget top does not mean anything unless you are going to stick to it, stay with it, and insist on it.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman will recall that in the reorganization law it is provided that if the Congress exceeds the ceiling fixed on the Budget we will have to amend the War Debt Act to increase the ceiling on the war debt?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman is correct, but there is always that loophole. That is what I am worrying about, and I say that every Member of the House and every citizen of this country should worry about that. They should not forget that you cannot give a dollar in tax reduction until you take that dollar off your expenditures. That is where we have to concentrate.

Mr. KNUTSON. The great danger to the program, as I see it, is that too many Members may listen to false prophets.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think the gentleman is very right in that statement. The reason I think it is necessary to take the floor at this time to try in my little voice to emphasize this necessity for reduction of expenditures is the fact that we have still prevailing in the Congress, in the House of Representatives at least, the theory that we can keep on going and spending on new things or more things, continuing on and still be able to accomplish the three objectives which I have mentioned. I think it is a sad commentary to read an article in the January 31 issue of the United States News. It is a very factual statement, and I want to call it to the attention of the House. Here is what the article states:

The "gimme" theme still dominates, even in this period of roaring prosperity. Veterans want more billions when already they are receiving \$7,000,000,000 a year. Farmers

want Government to do more for them, in new price supports, production bonuses, and guaranteed high income. States want the National Treasury to help out with support of their schools. Old people want bigger pensions, bigger subsidies for State pension systems. Then there are costly aviation-development plans, more loans to business, more money asked for subsidies.

I continue further:

The demand for more money, for bigger spending, is bipartisan, and shows a tendency to grow and not decline with the size of existing payments.

Further on and more or less in conclusion of this article appears the following statement:

All in all, except for bills calling for investigations of past Democratic administration and for regulation of labor unions, the mass of bills in Congress reflects an apparently deep desire on the part of the American people to get something for nothing. Members of Congress propose a very great range of ideas for pumping dollars out of the United States Treasury and into the pockets of one group or another. At the same time, there is a strong desire to reduce taxes and to lower the national debt. No Member of Congress, however, is offering a formula by which hand-outs and subsidies can be stepped up by additional billions of dollars a year while taxes are being reduced and debt retired.

Yes; we talk on one hand of spending more money and we talk on the other hand of reducing taxes, but the formula is not presented to show how you can possibly do that. It just cannot be done. You have to cut first and then your taxes can be cut, and you cannot increase your expenditures without increasing your taxes.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman would not attempt to handicap the rural electrification program, would he, since that money all comes back? It is merely a loan to the farmers to build their own lines, and comes back with interest.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am not talking about any specific cut in that connection, but I do say this, that we have got to adopt an attitude that if definite economies can at the present time be made in rural electrification, they must be made, in spite of our individual desire to see a greater expansion made. That is true of all programs, and there is one place, Mr. Speaker, I think, where we are running into difficulty. We are inclined to take the attitude that it is all well and good to cut the other fellow, but "do not cut me," and that is a philosophy that we cannot let continue if there is going to be any cutting at all.

There are several specific things that I think this Government must do, and I would like to just point them out. In the first place, we must shut our eyes and our ears against new proposals for expenditures. We have got to make up our minds that we are going to resist all pressures for increases in Federal expenditures, for new aids to groups or to States or to local units of government; that for the time being, at least until we get our financial house in order, we must close the door to new expenditures.

No. 2. We must cut drastically our present proposed expenditures, and this

has to be done in two places: First, the operation even of necessary government activities, and then, second, we must cut out a lot of activities that are not in and of themselves absolutely essential or that cannot be performed by other units of Government.

Let us look for a moment at necessary governmental activities. We know that there is needless and top-heavy personnel and overlapping expenditures, and those must be investigated thoroughly. I know that the various subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations are working hard in examining under a microscope these various departments and other activities to cut out this deadwood and overlapping. They must jump on the necks of every department or employee that spends one needless dollar. Then, Mr. Speaker, we have got to back those subcommittees up because it will not do any good for them to come in with a proposal for a cut and a proposal for economies in departmental activities if the House itself is going to overrule them and say, "No; we have got to keep this or that appropriation up." We have got to stand by the subcommittees of our Committee on Appropriations when they make their cuts.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin, who has made a very careful study of this question, will agree that it is necessary to keep the Federal spending at \$32,000,000,000 or less if we are to have any tax reduction.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. In fact, I believe we should have a minimum cut of \$7,500,000,000, which would bring the budget down to \$30,000,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course, there are those who claim that the budget can be cut down to \$28,000,000,000; I do not know. But I am satisfied it can be brought down to \$32,000,000,000 without in any way impairing the national defense, our obligation to the veterans, and for all needed expenditures for necessary Government activities.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman is absolutely right. If we have the determination to do it, and the will to do it, and I sincerely hope we have, the cuts can be made. But, we must become a little more worried as to whether or not we are going to reach that objective. We must keep it constantly in our minds.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think the gentleman's fears are well founded because we detect on both sides of the aisle that spreading disease that calls for spending and spending, and taxing and taxing.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman is right. There are bills proposed in this House every day. I wish an analysis of them could be made. But there are bills and resolutions introduced in this House every day for spending more money to start some new project. Now, you cannot do that on one hand, and on the other hand say, "We are going to balance the budget, and make a payment on the national debt,