

the progress and competence of Oklahoma's youth over the years, rendering them by that much, less able to meet the demands of the future. Who can calculate the detrimental influence this would have on families yet unborn? Who can say how much this knifing of the education of America's youth would render them less useful in emergencies of national or international import that might strike our security in the coming years?

Economy? Of course we believe in economy. But not the purblind economy that dwarfs the education of the future citizens of America, citizens of a democracy in which education is as indispensable as the air we breathe, to say nothing of the old axiom that knowledge is power. And power is what we shall doubly be called upon to provide against the ugly enemy that faces us from the Kremlin. That is why I plead with all the earnestness I can command that vocational education be amplified through additional Federal aid and not shrunk. In Oklahoma, my studies show, there is a need for an increase of 100 percent in vocational units in agriculture; 75 percent in distributive education; 100 percent in home economics; and 75 percent in trades and industries.

There are advantages to the Nation as a whole that do not show up in a budget and that are derived, I am sure, directly from the money we spend on vocational training.

We live today in a tragic consequence of our neglect of education in the past. What a false and visionless frugality that was. The consequences that have grown out of that neglect can be counted in the limited capacity of many of our citizens to earn a living, in their vulnerability to the influences of depression, their incapacity to work themselves out of their difficulties. Search through the army of the unemployed and see how many are nearly unemployable, or altogether unemployable, because of a lack of skills that vocational education would have prevented. The dollar we save in a Federal budget on vocational education today comes back to haunt us with thousands of dollars lost, with family tragedy, with relief and other evil consequences a decade later. It has its effect, too, on juvenile delinquency and touches the whole Nation in almost every part of its economic, political, social, and community life.

It is good to economize, but not on America's youth—not on America's future—and not on America's security.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a wire which I just received:

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 7, 1954.

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,  
House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge your vote and utmost efforts to pass Abbutt amendment adding \$6 million to funds for vocational education. Even this is almost 20 percent short of George-Barden Act authorization and more than 50 percent short of needs of high-school students for vocational education services.

JAMES G. PATTON,  
President, National Farmers Union.

Mr. Chairman, I feel the amounts voted for administration expenses and

building costs under Public Laws 815 and 874 are worthwhile, but insufficient.

Mr. Chairman, the members of the Oklahoma delegation who intended to attend the West Point graduation today stayed over in order to vote on this bill.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time and ask that the Clerk do now read.

The Clerk read through line 2, page 2.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NICHOLSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 429)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

*To the House of Representatives:*

I return herewith, without my approval, the bill, H. R. 1026, "to amend the Public Health Service Act, with respect to the provisions of certain medical and dental treatment and hospitalization for certain officers and employees of the former Lighthouse Service, and for dependents and widows of officers and employees of such Service."

From 1910 to July 1939, the Lighthouse Service was manned by civilian personnel. On July 1, 1939, under a reorganization plan, the Lighthouse Service was absorbed by the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard put into uniform those employees of the former Lighthouse Service who were willing and qualified to accept military appointments. Those employees who wanted to remain civilians were allowed to do so.

This enactment would extend entitlement to medical care and hospitalization at Public Health facilities under certain circumstances to a number of categories of former Lighthouse Service employees, their dependents, and widows. The bill, however, by according such benefits to one group of Federal employees alone, would discriminate against the vast body of Federal workers. In fact, under the enactment, situations would arise in which former Lighthouse Service employees working side by side with other Federal employees and doing exactly the same type of work would enjoy benefits to which their fellow civil servants would not be entitled. H. R. 1026 would also discriminate against uniformed personnel of the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service. It would establish a statutory entitlement to benefits for the widows of former Lighthouse Service personnel

which are not provided generally to the widows of the uniformed personnel enumerated above.

Moreover, the enactment would constitute an unfortunate precedent. Other groups not now entitled to the benefits which would be granted by H. R. 1026 would justifiably consider themselves entitled to benefits comparable to those which would be accorded to the former Lighthouse Service personnel.

I wish to reiterate my strong support for a program of contributory medical care and hospitalization insurance, on a voluntary basis, for Federal employees generally. Such a program would aid Federal employees in meeting their medical and hospital needs and would be fair and equitable to all concerned. Moreover, it would be consistent with my objective of combining the best practices of progressive private employers with the special demands of the public service, thereby improving our Federal career employee system and the efficiency of its administration.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 8, 1954.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and message be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

ANOTHER AMENDMENT PROPOSED IN SENATE TO CHANGE THE CONSTITUTION AFFECTING THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—CHANGING TRADITIONAL POLICY THAT ALL ITS MEMBERS MUST BE ELECTED BY THE PEOPLE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House of Representatives are proud of the fact that they are elected to a body of the United States Congress that only Members elected by the people are eligible to sit. It is all right for a governor to fill an unexpired term in the Senate—no one objects to that. In the House it is a different situation. It is the one body that is very close to the people and every Member of the House of Representatives must be elected every 2 years. Frequent elections make it responsive to the will and the wishes of the people. The framers of our Constitution properly provided that certain laws like revenue measures must originate only in the House of Representatives—the body that is so close to the people. It is the House of Representatives that also has the exclusive power to impeach and to elect a President when a candidate does not receive sufficient votes in the electoral college.

Now, it is proposed to change the Constitution by Senate Joint Resolution 39,