

Charles M. Johnston, of Maryland.  
William Kane, of Virginia.  
Andor Klay, of Ohio.  
Walter E. Kneeland, of Texas.  
Archie S. Lang, of New York.  
Chas. E. Laurendine, of Alabama.  
Mrs. Ruth A. Lovell, of California.  
R. Glynn Mays, Jr., of Maryland.  
Carl J. Nelson, of Virginia.  
William V. M. Owen, of the District of Columbia.  
James C. Powell, Jr., of Texas.  
Miss Catherine A. Rock, of Pennsylvania.  
Lawrence W. Sharpe, of Ohio.  
Charles G. Sommer, of Ohio.  
Donald S. Spigler, of Pennsylvania.  
Erwin C. Thompson, of California.  
Henry T. Unverzagt, of Virginia.  
Jack L. Vrooman, of California.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5:  
Miss Gloria E. Abiouness, of Virginia.  
James E. Akins, of Ohio.  
Robert N. Allen, of Oklahoma.  
Daniel N. Arzac, Jr., of California.  
G. Michael Bache, of Maryland.  
George M. Barbis, of California.  
Robert E. Barbour, of Tennessee.  
Richard W. Barham, of Texas.  
Malcolm R. Barnebey, of Texas.  
Robert S. Barrett IV, of Virginia.  
John A. Billings, of Missouri.  
Richard J. Bloomfield, of Virginia.  
Lewis W. Bowden, of the District of Columbia.

William G. Bradford, of Illinois.  
William R. Brown, of Ohio.  
Robert T. Burns, of Indiana.  
Charles B. Cook 3d, of Pennsylvania.  
Joseph H. Cunningham, of Nebraska.  
Thomas A. DeHart, of California.  
Walker A. Diamanti, of Utah.  
Thomas I. Dickson, Jr., of Texas.  
William B. Edmondson, of Nebraska.  
Alfred J. Erdos, of Arizona.  
Leo Espy, of Oregon.  
Miss Barbara C. Fagan, of New York.  
John E. Feissner, Jr., of the District of Columbia.

Robert T. Follestad, of California.  
William Lee Frost, of Connecticut.  
Fred J. Galanto, of Massachusetts.  
Samuel R. Gammon III, of Texas.  
John L. Gawf, of Colorado.  
Charles A. Gendreau, of Minnesota.  
H. Kent Goodspeed, of California.  
Richard C. Harmstone, of the District of Columbia.

Donald S. Harris, of Connecticut.  
William C. Harrop, of New Jersey.  
Roy T. Haverkamp, of Missouri.  
Robert T. Hennemeyer, of Illinois.  
Martin B. Hickman, of Utah.  
Howard Hill, of Missouri.  
David C. Jelinek, of Wisconsin.  
Robert W. Kent, Jr., of California.  
C. Dirck Keyser, of New Jersey.  
Burton Kitain, of New Jersey.  
Miss Paulina C. Kreger, of Ohio.  
Paul H. Kreisberg, of New York.  
Lyle F. Lane, of Washington.  
Myron Brockway Lawrence, of Oregon.  
Edwin D. Ledbetter, of California.  
Samuel W. Lewis, of Texas.  
Charles E. Lillen, of Illinois.  
Ralph E. Lindstrom, of Minnesota.  
John A. Linehan, Jr., of Massachusetts.  
John Lloyd 3d, of New Jersey.  
Alan W. Lukens, of Pennsylvania.  
John G. MacCracken, of California.  
Julian F. MacDonald, Jr., of Ohio.  
John C. Mallon, of Kentucky.  
Timothy M. Manley, of Connecticut.  
David P. Mann, of the District of Columbia.  
S. Douglas Martin, of New York.  
H. Freeman Matthews, Jr., of Virginia.  
Nicholas V. McCausland, of California.  
Miss Ruth A. McLendon, of Texas.  
John E. Merriam, of California.  
Dudley W. Miller, of Colorado.  
S. Paul Miller, Jr., of California.

John L. Mills, of Georgia.  
Harry J. Mullin, Jr., of Kentucky.  
Michael H. Newlin, of North Carolina.  
Emmit E. Noland, Jr., of Georgia.  
Donald R. Norland, of Iowa.  
Hugh B. O'Neill, of Connecticut.  
Frank V. Ortiz, Jr., of New Mexico.  
Richard B. Owen, of Michigan.  
Russell R. Pearson, of Minnesota.  
Frederick P. Picard, III, of Nebraska.  
Laurence G. Pickering, of Nebraska.  
Richard St. F. Post, of Connecticut.  
Arthur W. Purcell, of Massachusetts.  
Jess F. Reed, of Washington.  
James F. Relph, Jr., of California.  
Robert A. Remole, of Minnesota.  
Don W. Rogers, Jr., of Ohio.  
Leo J. Ryan, of Florida.  
Theodore Sellin, of Pennsylvania.  
Robert G. Shackleton, of Ohio.  
Allen C. Siebens, of Ohio.  
Paul K. Stahnke, of Illinois.  
Joseph F. Starkey, of California.  
Lawrence L. Starlight, of New York.  
Francis R. Starrs, Jr., of California.  
Birney A. Stokes, of New Jersey.  
William A. Stoltzfus, Jr., of Minnesota.  
Jean R. Tarter, of Massachusetts.  
Charles W. Thomas, of Illinois.  
Richard D. Vine, of New York.  
Robert B. Warner, of Michigan.  
Robert H. Wenzel, of Massachusetts.  
Lewis M. White, of New York.  
Victor Wolf, Jr., of New York.  
Dan A. Zachary, of Illinois.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert M. Balthaser, of Pennsylvania.  
William D. Calderhead, of Texas.  
Robert Alexander Campbell, Jr., of the District of Columbia.  
Miss Kathryn O. Clark, of the District of Columbia.  
Miss Alice W. Clement, of Pennsylvania.  
Eller R. Cook, of Florida.  
Jeffery R. D. Crockett, of the District of Columbia.

Robert W. Day, of Maryland.  
George Falk, of Maryland.  
Jack Friedman, of the District of Columbia.  
Robert J. Gibbons, of Ohio.  
Clifford H. Gross, of New York.  
Ernest S. Guaderrama, of California.  
Nez C. Hallett, Jr., of Texas.  
Alfred Harding IV, of New York.  
Gerrit J. W. Heyneker, of Massachusetts.  
Edward C. Howatt, of Virginia.  
Miss Marie A. Johnson, of Minnesota.  
John Edward Karkashian, of California.  
Kenneth W. Knauf, of Wisconsin.  
Charles W. McCaskill, of Virginia.  
Allan F. McLean, Jr., of Texas.  
Miss Mary Louise Manley, of the District of Columbia.

Charles Willis Naas, of Massachusetts.  
James M. E. O'Grady, of the District of Columbia.  
Onesime L. Plette, of Virginia.  
William R. Roof, of South Carolina.  
Gerald Schwab, of New Jersey.  
Richard G. Smith, of Florida.  
Edward O. Steilmacher, of Maryland.  
Raymond Thomsen, of Colorado.  
Vladimir I. Toumanoff, of New Hampshire.  
Ray E. White, Jr., of Virginia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Craig Baxter, of Ohio.  
Arthur E. Breisky, of California.  
Thomas R. Buchanan, of Illinois.  
Miss Helen E. Kavan, of Ohio.  
Robert V. Keeley, of Virginia.  
Stephen Low, of Ohio.  
David A. Macuk, of New Jersey.

Charles E. Marthinsen, of Pennsylvania.  
Byron B. Morton, Jr., of New Jersey.  
David W. K. Peacock, Jr., of New Jersey.  
Miss Allene M. Roche, of Connecticut.  
Samuel H. Weaver, of New York.  
Miss Suzanne S. Williams, of Ohio.  
Raymond W. Eisel, of California.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Arthur A. Bardos, of California.  
Henry L. Davis, of New Jersey.  
Elmer S. Dorsay, of Colorado.  
John V. Lund, of California.  
Stanley J. Prisbeck, of Pennsylvania.  
Garland C. Routt, of Indiana.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

William A. Krauss, of California.  
Irvin S. Lippe, of Ohio.  
George A. Tesoro, of Maryland.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Saxton E. Bradford, of Arizona.  
Daxid W. Smyser, of Maryland.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Basil A. Beardsley, of Ohio.  
Francis J. Jeton, of Massachusetts.  
A. Grima Johnson, of Louisiana.  
Charles M. Shannon, Jr., of Virginia.  
Michael Tanes, of Massachusetts.

#### COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Frank D. Yturria, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 23, with headquarters at Laredo, Tex.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Fred Carl Wolf, Jr., St. John's Episcopal Church, Corsicana, Tex., offered the following prayer:

O God, the fountain of wisdom, whose statutes are good and gracious and whose law is truth, grant us, we beseech Thee, Thy guidance that we may build upon the surest foundations, that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us for all generations to the glory of Thy name and the welfare of Thy people. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6043. An act to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the maintenance of the Merchant Marine Academy.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 7588) entitled "An act for the relief of Jane Edith Thomas," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KILGORE, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. WATKINS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. ELMER J. HOLLAND, be permitted to take the oath of office today. The certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ELMER J. HOLLAND appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

#### IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 329)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered printed:

##### *To the Congress of the United States:*

Throughout our history immigration to this land has contributed greatly to the strength and character of our Republic. Over the years we have provided for such immigration because it has been to our own national interest that we do so. It is no less to our national interest that we do so under laws that operate equitably.

The Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization have made a thorough study of the operation of our present immigration laws, and have advised me concerning the changes and additions which they consider necessary in the national interest. I have carefully reviewed their findings and concur in their conclusions. The recommendations now made are based on those findings and conclusions.

This message takes up four separate and distinct subject matters respecting our immigration policies: (1) the quota system and the use of national origins, (2) the private-relief-bill system of handling hardship cases, (3) unnecessary restrictions and administrative provisions of our immigration laws, and (4) judicial review in deportation. Each such subject matter is treated separately because the problems in each are wholly distinct from the others. Accordingly, the recommendations as to each subject matter will, I hope, be considered separately and each on its own merit.

I

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 was developed essentially as a

codification of many separate, and sometimes overlapping and inconsistent, immigration and nationality laws. It was thought inappropriate, in connection with that legislation, to revise our basic immigration policies. Moreover, at that time 1950 census information was incomplete.

The time has now come to consider those policies. Experience in the post-war world demonstrates that the present national-origins method of admitting aliens needs to be reexamined, and a new system adopted which will admit aliens within allowable numbers according to new guidelines and standards.

The Congress has traditionally formulated our basic immigration policies, and will doubtless wish to make its decision as to what new system should be established only after its own study and investigation of all possible choices. There are many factors that must be taken into consideration. Among these are: the needs of this country for persons having specialized skills or cultural accomplishments; close family relationships; the populations and immigration policies of countries sending immigrants to this country; their past immigration and trade relationships with this country; and their assistance to the joint defense of the friendly free nations of the world.

Pending the completion by the Congress of such study and investigation, it is essential that we take interim measures to alleviate as much as possible inequities in the present quota system. Accordingly, I recommend the immediate enactment of the following proposals.

First, the present quota system sets a maximum annual authorization of 154,657 quota immigrants. This figure is derived from a formula based upon the 1920 population. I recommend that total population as shown by the 1950 census be used as the base for determining the overall ceiling. I believe that economic growth over the past 30 years and present economic conditions justify an increase of approximately 65,000 in quota numbers. I recommend that Congress provide for such an increase by fixing the overall ceiling in terms of a percentage of total population as shown by the 1950 census. The new ceiling recommended would be approximately 220,000 quota numbers annually.

In order to eliminate some of the inequity resulting from the fact that several countries have large quotas which they do not use while others have small quotas which are usually oversubscribed, I recommend that the additional quota numbers—i. e., those over and above the 154,657 numbers now provided for—be distributed among countries in proportion to their actual immigration to this country since the establishment of the quota system in 1924.

This method of allocation will help to alleviate the problem of oversubscribed quotas. At the same time no country will have a lesser number of quota numbers allocated to it than at present.

Second, I recommend that the Congress set aside from the increased annual quota 5,000 numbers to be available for admission of aliens without regard to

nationality or national origin. Use of these numbers would enable us to meet some of the needs of this country which develop from time to time for persons with special skills and cultural or technical qualifications.

The existing immigration law recognizes somewhat similar criteria for quota immigrants by giving a preference to those whose services are determined by the Attorney General to be needed urgently in the United States because of the high education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability, and to be substantially beneficial prospectively to the national economy, cultural interests, or welfare of the United States. Our needs and requirements should be determined on the basis of consultation among the various departments and agencies of the Government, and also with the advice and testimony of private organizations.

This special pool has further value as an experimental plan departing entirely from our present system of distributing quotas on a basis of nationality or place of birth. It also would enable us to give greater assistance to persons abroad who have undergone suffering and hardship resisting Communist aggression, who would make beneficial contributions to this country, and who will not have the benefit of the Refugee Relief Act after that act's termination.

Third, quota numbers that are unused by countries to which they are allocated should be made available for use elsewhere. Under our present law quota numbers which are unused by any particular country in the year in which they are available become void and may not be used by any other country.

I recommend enactment of legislation that will permit the utilization of unused quota numbers in the succeeding year. This should be done by pooling the unused quota numbers in each of the following areas: Europe, Africa, Asia, and the Pacific Ocean area. These pooled quota numbers would then be distributed during a 12-month period on a first come, first served basis among eligible applicants of the area, without regard to country of birth within the area. These quotas should be limited to aliens who qualify for preference status under existing law—persons having special skills or close relatives in the United States.

There is a further inequity in the quota system by virtue of the so-called mortgage on quotas resulting from the issuance of visas under the Displaced Persons Act and other special acts. The law provides that visas issued under these acts are chargeable against quotas authorized under the Immigration Act. The result is that the quotas of many countries are mortgaged far into the future. For example, 50 percent of the quota for Greece is mortgaged until the year 2017; for Lithuania, until 2090; for Latvia, until 2274. The total number so mortgaged for the year 1955 amounted to about 8,000, and over the total span of years the aggregate could be as much as 328,000. I recommend the elimination of this unfairness. This is consistent with the action of the Congress in enacting the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. Congress

did not then impose additional mortgages on quotas but provided special non-quota visas for eligible refugees.

II

For some time I have considered that undue and largely useless burdens are placed upon the Congress and the President by the avalanche in recent years of private bills for the relief of aliens. The number of these bills is strikingly high in comparison with the number of public enactments. In the 1st session of the 84th Congress private immigration enactments alone accounted for 413 of 880 enactments, public and private; 3,059 such bills were introduced. During the 83d Congress private immigration enactments accounted for 753 of 1,788 enactments, both public and private; 4,797 such bills were introduced. At the beginning of the present session there were 2,159 private immigration measures pending.

The Congress, in the performance of its constitutional duties, must consider the worthiness of each private immigration bill introduced. The President, in the performance of his constitutional duties, must consider the worthiness of each bill enacted. The Nation's interest would surely be better served if the bulk of these private immigration claims were handled through suitable administrative machinery and if the Congress and the Executive could thus give their full attention to more urgent national problems.

Under the private bill system of handling individual immigration cases, many persons fail to obtain the very relief which others have received, because Congress has not had the time to take up and act on the bills introduced for their benefit. Indeed there are many whose plight has not even come to the attention of the Congress.

For these reasons it is my belief that action is called for to provide the necessary administrative authority to take care of such cases. I hope that such action will be taken without delay so that it may be of help this year. The enactment of such authority, in my opinion, would substantially eliminate the need for private legislative redress in this area. I suggest that there should be vested in the Attorney General limited discretionary powers to grant relief with respect to admission and deportation of aliens. Such discretion should be limited to aliens with close relatives in this country, to veterans, and to functionaries of religious organizations, regardless of the technical statutory ground on which the alien is inadmissible or subject to deportation. These classes of cases embrace the great bulk of the hardship cases which appeal to our sense of fairness. However, no relief ought to be accorded aliens whose presence here would be dangerous to the safety and security of the United States. An appropriate charge against the applicable quota would be made in each case where relief is granted.

It should further be provided by the Congress that there shall be a ceiling on the number of cases in which such discretionary authority may be exercised.

III

Experience under the existing immigration law has established that there are a number of changes, aside from the quota provisions, which should be made in the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. Some provisions create unnecessary restrictions upon travel to the United States, while others inflict great hardships upon the aliens affected. Consequently, I make the following recommendations:

Under the present law, every alien applying for a visa must be fingerprinted; and every alien admitted without a visa and remaining in the United States for 30 days or longer, even if here temporarily, must be fingerprinted. Although in our minds no stigma is attached to fingerprinting, it is not a requirement of travel in other countries. We should be the first to remove travel obstacles which hamper the free exchange of ideas, cultures, and commerce. Further, experience over the last 3 years has shown that this requirement does not significantly contribute to our national safety and security. The law should be amended to permit the Secretary of State and the Attorney General to waive the requirement of fingerprinting, on a reciprocal basis, for aliens coming here for temporary periods.

We must recognize the tremendous increase in air and surface travel in recent years. Aliens traveling from one country to another often find it necessary to pass through the United States without any intention to remain in or even visit this country. A South American flying to or returning from Europe, for example, will often pass through the United States. He should not be required to meet all of the standards for admission, coupled with inspection and examination, that normally apply. These requirements result in unnecessary hardships to the traveler, expense to the carrier, and loss of good will, without proportionate benefit to the United States. The law should be amended accordingly.

The present statute contains a restrictive requirement which makes it necessary for immigration authorities to inspect and apply all grounds of exclusion to aliens seeking admission to the mainland of the United States from Alaska and Hawaii. This requirement results in expense to the Government and causes delays and inconvenience in travel. It must be remembered that, by definition in the law, these Territories are part of the United States, and aliens who have entered or are present in them are subject to all the provisions of the act. If the alien was deportable before he came to the mainland, he remains deportable. I recommend the elimination from the law of this unnecessary restriction upon travel.

The immigration laws presently require aliens to specify race and ethnic classification in visa applications. These provisions are unnecessary and should be repealed.

A large group of refugees in this country obtained visas by the use of false identities in order to escape forcible re-

patriation behind the Iron Curtain; the number may run into the thousands. Under existing law such falsification is a mandatory ground for deportation. The law should be amended to give relief to these unfortunate people.

The inequitable provisions relating to Asian spouses and adopted children should be repealed.

The Immigration Act grants special naturalization benefits to veterans of our Armed Forces who have completed at least 3 years' honorable service, and who can submit proof of admission for permanent residence. Many have been unable to submit this proof. I recommend that proof of admission be not required in such cases.

The present statute is unnecessarily restrictive as to aliens who marry United States citizens. It forbids adjustment to permanent residence if the alien has been in the United States less than 1 year before the marriage. This disrupts the family and is expensive for the alien who must go abroad to obtain a non-quota visa, without proportionate benefit to the United States. I recommend that the requirement of 1 year's presence in the United States before marriage be repealed.

The above covers the principal changes which I recommend as a minimum toward amelioration of the immigration laws. Others will be suggested by the Attorney General.

IV

Just as the Nation's interests call for a larger degree of flexibility in the laws for regulating the flow of other peoples to our shores, there is at the same time a significant need to strengthen the laws established for the wholesome purpose of ridding the country of the relatively few aliens who have demonstrated their unfitness to remain in our midst. Some of these persons have been found to be criminals of the lowest character, trafficking in murder, narcotics, and subversion. Constitutional due process wisely confers upon any alien, whatever the charge, the right to challenge in the courts the Government's finding of deportability. However, no alien who has once had his day in court, with full rights of appeal to the higher courts, should be permitted to block his removal and cause unnecessary expense to the Government by further judicial appeals the only purpose of which is delay. I am concerned by the growing frequency of such cases involving as they often do the deprived and confirmed criminal. Accordingly, I have asked the Attorney General to submit to the Congress, a legislative proposal that will remedy this abuse of legal process.

I believe that these changes in our immigration and nationality laws, together with the amendments to the Refugee Relief Act which I have heretofore recommended to the Congress, not only will advance our own self-interest, but also will serve as living demonstrations that we recognize our responsibilities of world leadership. I urge their careful consideration by the Congress.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 8, 1956.

### JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 514) relating to the compensation of the executive director of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That section 205 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof a new sentence as follows: "The Joint Committee is authorized to fix the compensation of an executive director at a gross rate not in excess of \$18,000 per annum, and such executive director shall be in addition to the employees whose compensation may be fixed at basic rates in excess of \$8,000 per annum under the provisions of any other legislative authority."

The joint resolution 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.

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH AND SCIENCE

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Health and Science may be permitted to meet this afternoon during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

### BOY SCOUT WEEK

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, as all of you know, this is Boy Scout Week. Each of us has been honored to have young members of this great organization visit us this week. One of the proud and happy moments of the week was when young Martin Delaney, of Alexandria, Va., came by our office and honored me with this smile and a Boy Scout lapel button. He is a fine, bright-eyed youngster. These young folks and their sisters throughout the land are our greatest national assets. We are very proud of them.

For some 14 busy years I was honored to be officially connected with the circuit court in one of the judicial circuits of Arkansas. Among other things, that court had jurisdiction over criminal cases. I am proud to say that during all

those years, no boy or girl who had been or was a Boy Scout or Girl Scout came before me charged with a criminal offense. What a tribute that is to the great organization which we honor this week.

My colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS], usually makes a statement at this time about Boy Scout Week. However, his aged father is critically ill at home in Arkansas, and he has gone to his father's bedside. Mr. HAYS is a great and good friend of the Scout movement and through me extends his love and affection to the members of the organization.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks, I wish to insert a letter from President Eisenhower as follows, and one from the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Chief of the FBI:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
February 4, 1956.

*To the Boy Scouts of America:*

On the occasion of the 1956 observance of Boy Scout Week I extend warm greetings and congratulations to you and your leaders.

I am, of course, delighted that the number of Cubs, Boy Scouts, Explorers, and adult leaders now totals more than 4 million. This growth gives heartening assurance that in the years to come our Nation will continue to have citizens prepared in body, mind, and character to serve it and to further its strength and progress.

In preparation for citizenship—for the exercise of its rights and the discharge of its obligations—spiritual training plays a major part. I therefore congratulate you on the fact that your organization will round out its first half century with the 4-year program, "Onward for God and my country"—a program which will strengthen your knowledge of our heritage and your capacity to contribute to the welfare of your fellow man and of the Republic.

As you begin work under this program I wish all of you the greatest possible success.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

FEBRUARY 6, 1956.

*To the Boy Scouts of America:*

Present and past members of the Boy Scouts of America have every reason to be proud of the movement's earned record. Since 1910, you and former members have rendered voluntarily services that have greatly enriched the Nation.

There are many reasons why the Boy Scouts of America enjoy widespread respect and approval. The fact you live the Scout oath and law, day by day, is one of them.

Your new 4-year program, "Onward for God and my country," is most timely and needed. It is created to prepare boys to live in today's world, carry their full share of responsibility, give them opportunities to develop physical fitness, self-reliance, and personal courage, a spirit of helpfulness and an understanding of our Government's democratic processes. Most important, you constantly affirm the need for spiritual strength in all you do.

I am informed that your current membership is now more than 4,100,000 Cub Scouts, Boy Scouts, Explorers, and adult leaders. Your grand total membership of 24,500,000 since 1910 is both impressive and inspiring.

My associates join me in congratulating the members of the Boy Scouts of America on its service, integrity, and patriotism. You have set a great example. We are proud of you.

J. EDGAR HOOVER.

In closing, let us give a hand salute to all Scouts everywhere.

### FEDERAL PAYROLL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, at the request of the Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization and Departmental Personnel Management, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, legislation which will assist in controlling the number of employees on the Federal payroll.

Today we have about 2,360,000 Federal civilian employees on the Government payroll as contrasted to 1,943,000 just 6 years ago. That is an increase of over 400,000 employees and an increase in payroll costs of about \$1.8 billion.

As I have stated on numerous occasions, I am firmly convinced that the essential functions of our Government can be performed with 2 million or less employees.

This legislation will require the executive branch of the Government to furnish full information on the manpower required in connection with pending or proposed legislation. This information will indicate to the Congress the impact that substantive legislation can and often does have on the Federal payroll. Meanwhile, I suggest that all committees require manpower data on pending legislation in order that this information will be available for floor discussion on such legislation.

The bill I am introducing will give the Congress the information needed for aiding in controlling the size of the Federal payroll. It will give the Congress better information on proposed manpower costs. I strongly urge that this bill be given prompt consideration. In the interim, I respectfully suggest that all committees require full disclosure from the executive branch covering planned manpower increases resulting from pending legislation.

### IS NEW DISABILITY PENSION FOR SOME A ROADBLOCK TO BAR PENSIONS FOR ALL WAR VETS AT 62?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I am firmly convinced that we should provide pensions of \$100 a month for all honorably discharged war veterans when they reach the age of 62, without any disability or means test.

In the light of this personal declaration, I want to discuss certain phases of H. R. 7886, the modified disability pension bill. It is also known as the war veterans security bill which is apt to give the misleading impression that it applies to all older veterans.

Any pension bill which is an improvement on existing legislation, is deserving of support. But if it is an adroit maneuver to head off mounting demands for a general pension for all war veterans reaching the age of 62, then we must proceed carefully.

It is no secret that the present VA law is defective in some respects.

The Veterans' Administration has too much discretionary power; either to liberalize or tighten up on pensions—that are given only to some older war veterans—under the rating system.

By the VA's yardstick a few undeserving veterans manage to get on the rolls, while a few deserving veterans are discouraged from applying for the pensions that are due them.

The new bill provides that "a person shall be deemed to be permanently and totally disabled upon reaching the age of 65 years."

At first glance, this might seem to apply to all veterans reaching that age. But in a prior sentence, there is the requirement that "No pension shall be payable under this part for permanent disability less than total."

Furthermore, there is an annual income limitation for single or married veterans, beyond which the veteran is not eligible to receive a pension.

This bill is, therefore, an improvement, but still a compromise.

The national legislative bulletin of the American Legion quotes this Associated Press dispatch of January 9, 1956, in the Legion's support of H. R. 7886:

Nearly three-fourths of Americans over 65 either have no income or less than \$1,000 a year, according to a study released today. The report was issued by the Twentieth Century Fund, a nonprofit foundation for economic and social research and education. The study said that of the population over 65 years old, 36 percent have no income of their own, 38 percent have annual income under \$1,000; 11 percent have between \$1,000 and \$2,000 and 15 percent have \$2,000 or more.

Applying these ratios to our aging veterans, we find that 74 percent or nearly three-quarters have annual incomes ranging from \$1,000 to zero.

This is a compelling reason why we should legislate a national pension for war veterans, beginning at the age of 62.

A program of this type would be more costly, but it would be easier to administer, and it would treat all old soldiers as equal recipients of a nation's gratitude.

At that, it would be but a fraction of the war debt, and it would be a payment to men, instead of war materials that have been used or discarded.

The present issue concerns the relation of H. R. 7886, to this ultimate goal of a national pension for war veterans, beginning at the age of 62.

This bill is a part way measure that represents progress, but should not be regarded as the complete and final answer to the pension question.

One cannot disagree with its intent "to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards."

But one can reserve the right, while supporting this bill, to work for the ultimate goal of pensions for all war veterans 62 years of age and older.

H. R. 7886 is interim legislation, on the road to a genuine and all-inclusive pension for older veterans.

With that clearly understood, I shall vote for this bill.

#### AMENDMENTS TO IMMIGRATION LAW

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing four separate bills to carry out the recommendations contained in President Eisenhower's special message to Congress relating to amendments of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

These bills represent progressive steps to assure that we will not be left behind in the cold war. Public pronouncements critical of the present law in this country are often seized upon and twisted by our foes abroad for their own evil purposes.

There is no reason why our immigration and naturalization law should be a whipping-boy for Communist sympathizers and propagandists. We should demonstrate the ever present willingness of the United States to eliminate from our laws any possible grounds for charges of discrimination and unfairness as soon as circumstances so require. I agree with the President that it is time to revise the McCarran-Walter Act. By doing so we can prevent our enemies from exploiting shortcomings in the law in an effort to create dissension among us.

Under one of the bills the present quota system would be revised to take the last 1950 census as the base for computing quotas instead of 1920 in the present law. Unused quota numbers would be pooled for distribution in each of four geographical regions, Europe, Asia, Africa, and Oceania.

In another measure, the present intolerable burden upon the President and the Congress of private bills would be eliminated. This proposal would shift the function of discretionary review of alien cases to the Attorney General, who would pass upon such cases upon the recommendation of the State Department.

A third bill is designed to crack down on the alien racketeers—those who in the past have remained among us for years on end, pending the outcome of judicial proceedings instituted solely for the purpose of protracting their stay. This bill would regulate judicial review of deportation and exclusion orders so that we can expedite the exiling of those relatively few aliens who have clearly demonstrated that they have no right to remain here. Thus we will be able to get rid of such undesirables as those aliens guilty of subversion or serious criminal

violations in much speedier fashion than before.

Tomorrow I shall ask for time to explain more fully the contents and implications of the four bills.

I hope the Congress will take speedy action on these measures which will go a long way toward strengthening our hand in the affairs of the world. Passage of these measures will demonstrate to all the world that this Nation continues to stand for its time-honored principles of freedom, equality, and justice.

#### THE LATE FREDERICK WILLIAM DALLINGER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not on the floor last week when the gentlemen from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD and Mr. McCORMACK] were speaking of the life and services of the late Hon. Frederick William Dallinger, because at the time of his death and for the entire period of my service here, which dates back to 1943, Judge Dallinger was one of my most distinguished constituents.

When he retired from the bench he went to live in the beautiful town of Center Lovell, Oxford County, Maine. I visited him frequently in his home where he showed me with great and legitimate pride a large room filled with the various mementos of his long life of public service. I shall not recite the biographical details of his life which are contained in the remarks made by my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD], on February 1.

Judge Dallinger was a most diligent and devoted Member of this House, where he served throughout the decade from March 4, 1915 to March 3, 1925, and again from November 2, 1926 to October 1, 1932, when he resigned to accept appointment to the bench of the United States Customs Court. On this court he served for 10 years. Judge Dallinger took the greatest pride and satisfaction in his career of service here, and in all the friendships and associations which it brought to him. During his terms in this House he made it a point to know personally every one of his colleagues, and he had a strong sense of friendship for all those with whom he served irrespective of political affiliations. While, during the 13 years which he spent in retirement in Maine, he took no active part in politics, he had a very lively interest in everything that went on. I prized his friendship and benefited on many occasions from his counsel. His was a rich and happy life. I shall miss him and shall always honor his memory.

H. R. 6043

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Senate passed the Kings Point bill, H. R. 6043. I, with many others, including my colleagues Mr. BONNER, Mr. BECKER, Mr. WAINWRIGHT, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. BOSCH, Mr. KEOGH, Mr. VAN PELT, the Association of Parents and Friends of Kings Point, led by Mr. John W. Scherger, have worked and hoped for this for many years and now it is with deepest sincerity that I express my gratitude to my friends and colleagues in both parties and in both the House and the Senate for all their help in bringing this about, in recognizing the necessity of maintaining a permanent United States Merchant Marine Academy.

The faith that the Congress has shown in this superb school will not go unrewarded. This Academy is an important factor in the development of a sound merchant marine, and with the benefit of this legislative action and the expected presidential approval, it will be even better able to fulfill its responsibilities in furnishing well-trained young officers to our merchant marine in peacetime, and a vital source of naval officers when needed for the defense of our great country.

Those of you who have had the opportunity of visiting this school, seeing its beautiful setting, its excellent facilities, and the calibre of its staff and of its student body, understand my pride in having it within my congressional district. They understand, too, why I can say with such complete confidence that this school ranks equally with our three other great military academies.

Since the day of its founding, the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point has had a proud record of accomplishment, and this further aid that you have given it through this legislation will make possible even greater accomplishments in the future.

My sincere thanks to you all.

#### POLITICS IN THE WEST

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a bunch of Democrat politicians out West, after a look at the other candidates, chanted: "We need Adlai badly."

There is some justice in this. They sure need somebody badly. And Adlai is no more than they deserve.

#### SALE OF INSTITUTE, W. VA., COPOLYMER PLANT, PLANCOR 980

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Resolution 396, to disapprove the proposed sale of the Institute, W. Va.,

copolymer plant, Plancor 980, as recommended by the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission report, and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the resolution be fixed at not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the author of the resolution, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Resolution 396, with Mr. WILLIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives does not favor sale of the Institute, W. Va., copolymer plant, Plancor 980, as recommended in the report of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Armed Services has recommended against the adoption of House Resolution 396. This resolution, if adopted, would prevent the sale of a Government-owned copolymer facility at Institute, W. Va., to the Goodrich-Gulf Chemical Corp.

Now, Mr. Chairman, last year, after many hours of debate, the House of Representatives rejected a resolution which sought to prevent the sale of the Government-owned synthetic rubber producing facilities to private industry. Two copolymer facilities were not included in that original sales program. The first, located at Baytown, Tex., was not recommended for sale because the Commission could not obtain what they considered to be full fair value. The second copolymer plant, located at Institute, W. Va., and the one under discussion today, was not recommended for sale because no one submitted a bid for that facility.

After approving other recommended sales, the Congress amended the original law by permitting new bids to be taken for the Baytown plant. As a result, the Baytown plant was sold to private industry without objection on the part of anyone. Then Congress amended the law again to permit bids to be taken on this plant at Institute, W. Va.

Now this is the largest copolymer plant in the United States. It has a capacity of 122,000 long tons. No one bid on the plant when it was first offered for sale because it had a reputation of being a high-cost producer and in addition it has no facilities for producing cold rubber.

Bear in mind that the synthetic rubber industry had been in the hands of the Government since 1941, and thus private

industry was entering into a new field. Prior to the sale of the rubber facilities, the Government, for practical purposes, had been the sole manufacturer of synthetic rubber with the exception of some special types of synthetic rubber.

After Congress approved the sale of 11 copolymer plants, some interest was indicated in the Institute copolymer plant, so we passed a law authorizing the Commission to take bids and to negotiate with the potential purchasers following the criteria established under the Disposal Act.

Now in all of these sales, the Commission and the Congress has been guided by the original act which required the Commission to obtain full fair value, to assure a fair supply of the end products for small business, to preserve a competitive industry and to protect the national security.

The Commission advertised for bids on the Institute, W. Va., facility and they received the following proposals when the bids were opened on October 7, 1955:

Goodrich-Gulf Chemicals, Inc.	\$9,000,000
Goodyear Synthetic Rubber Corp.	2,000,000
Imperial Commodities Corp.	750,000
Edwin W. Pauley	2,000,000
Union Carbide & Carbon Corp.	1,500,000
United Rubber & Chemical Co.	4,000,000

Now this plant had a gross book value on October 31, 1955, of \$18,398,000, and a net book value on that same day of \$4,968,000.

After the bids had been opened, the Commission began to negotiate with the prospective purchasers. Three of the bidders withdrew and on November 21, 1955, Goodrich-Gulf increased its bid to \$9,500,000, and Mr. Edwin Pauley increased his bid to \$2,837,000. Union Carbide & Carbon increased its bid to \$2,700,000. So on December 19 the final bids were submitted and that day it was disclosed that Goodrich-Gulf had raised their bid to \$11 million, Mr. Edwin Pauley has increased his bid to \$5,800,000, and Union Carbide & Carbon had retained their latest bid of \$2,700,000.

So the \$11 million bid for the plant, plus \$333,000 for spare parts, constitutes a very substantial return to the Government. I do not think there can be much argument about full fair value on this facility.

Now let us turn to the question of small business.

Under the terms of the sales contract with Goodrich-Gulf Chemical Corp., the purchaser agrees to make available at fair market prices to small business enterprises in reasonable equal monthly quantities, the following tonnages per year: 21,000 long tons when only one line is in operation; 51,000 long tons when two lines are in operation; and 81,000 long tons when all three lines are in operation.

Now this is by far the largest commitment with respect to small business of any of the purchasers. And I might add that since the sales of the other facilities I know of only one complaint from small business with regard to the availability of rubber to small users, and that apparently was based on a misunderstanding.

The Attorney General, while consulting with the Commission, expressed concern with regard to the enforceability of the commitments contained in the sales contracts with respect to the availability of rubber for small business. The Attorney General said:

I am, nevertheless, concerned about the future enforcement of these contractual commitments when the Commission ceases to exist.

I personally believe that these contracts are enforceable, since the Commission entered into these contracts on behalf of the Federal Government and not on behalf of the individual Commissioners. But, beyond all that is the greatest enforcement weapon in the world, public opinion.

Each one of these purchasers, as well as the Goodrich-Gulf Corp., who will purchase this facility, have agreed to make rubber available to small users. The hearings and the record are clear and unmistakable in this regard. I think we have no reason to be concerned now or in the future with regard to the obligation incurred by the purchasers of copolymer facilities to make rubber available to small business users.

So that leaves us, for practical purposes, with only one question and that is whether or not the sale of this facility will provide for the development within the United States of a free competitive synthetic rubber industry and not permit any person to possess unreasonable control over the manufacture of synthetic rubber.

Now, under the disposal act, the law required the Commission to consult with the Attorney General in order to secure guidance, "as to the type of disposal program which would best foster the development of a free competitive synthetic rubber industry."

In that connection, I call your attention to the fact that the Attorney General advised the Commission that the sale of the Institute plant to the Goodrich-Gulf Chemical Corp., or to the Goodyear Synthetic Rubber Co., "would not best foster the development of a free competitive synthetic rubber industry, since disposal would add significantly to the substantial position presently held by these companies in the field of synthetic rubber."

However, the Commission then advised the Attorney General that of the remaining eligible bidders only Goodrich-Gulf Corp. had offered a purchase price that "met the Commission's views as to full fair value."

And the Commission further concluded, according to the findings of the Attorney General, that—

The only alternative to a sale to Goodrich-Gulf, in the light of the offers received, would be the continuation of this plant in standby with none of its productive potential available to the market.

The Attorney General further stated:

Under the existing statute, not even the Government could utilize this capacity to meet the needs of domestic fabricators, except pursuant to further act of Congress.

The Attorney General went on to say:

Under the act my responsibilities are limited to advising the Commission with respect

to (a) the type of disposal program which would best foster the development of a free competitive synthetic rubber industry, and (b) whether the proposed disposition, if carried out, will violate the antitrust laws. In view of this limited statutory responsibility, I do not undertake to evaluate the validity of the Commission's conclusion that the sale of Institute must be either to Goodrich-Gulf or not at all. I therefore accept the Commission's determination on this point. In these premises it is my view that the development of a free competitive synthetic rubber industry would be better fostered by bringing this plant into active competitive production rather than to allow it to lie fallow. \* \* \*

The firm commitment on the part of Goodrich-Gulf to make at least half of the Institute product available to small business enterprises buttresses the foregoing conclusion. Goodrich-Gulf has agreed to make available to small business enterprises at fair market prices 50 percent of the production of the first line at Institute and 73 percent of the production of the next 2 lines. We have been advised by the Commission that this commitment in favor of small business is by far the largest firm commitment offered by any of the bidders for this plant.

Now, you can see the position that the Commission was in as well as the Attorney General.

The Commission felt that they could not recommend the sale to any of the other bidders because none of them would approach anything like the minimum fair value that the Commission had placed on this facility.

Mr. Pauley, the second highest bidder, raised his bid from \$2 million to \$5,800,000 at the end of the negotiation period; but this was still \$3,700,000 less than what the Commission felt was the lowest price they would take for the facility.

On the other hand, Goodrich-Gulf Chemical Corp. raised their bid to \$11 million, which was \$1,500,000 more than the minimum price that the Commission would accept.

Now there is not much question in my mind that if Mr. Pauley, or any other bidder had been willing to raise their bid to \$9,500,000 that the Commission would have recommended the sale to some other purchaser than Goodrich-Gulf Chemical Corp., but nobody other than Goodrich-Gulf would go that high.

And on the other hand, the Attorney General, while recognizing that the sale to Goodrich-Gulf Chemical Corp. would give them the largest GR-S capacity in the Nation, nevertheless realized that if the Commission would not recommend the sale to anyone who would not meet the \$9,500,000 figure, that this would prevent the facility from going into production at a time when we are in short supply of rubber.

Now this is a very important matter because natural rubber has been selling for substantially more than synthetic rubber. As a matter of fact, it was up to 48 cents per pound, and it is now around 40 cents per pound. Synthetic rubber is selling for about 24 cents per pound on the average, and yet rubber is in such short supply that consumers are willing to pay the high price for natural rubber.

So from an economic viewpoint, it made good sense to approve the sale and that, in effect, is what the Attorney Gen-

eral has done, although he has called to the attention of the Congress the fact that he probably would have submitted this sale to a court for a judicial determination under section 7 of the Clayton Act had it been a sale between two private bidders. But he also said that since there was no precedent for this type of sale to private industry, he would find that the sale did not violate section 7 of the Clayton Act, since the entire sale would be reviewed by the Congress.

Well, we are in this situation:

If we reject this sale, the plant cannot be offered for sale for at least another 2 years, unless Congress passes a new law. And, under existing law, the Government cannot operate the plant for the production of GR-S. This was done to protect the purchasers from competition with the Government. So, if we do not approve this sale, then we are not going to help the people in the vicinity of Charleston, W. Va., a distressed labor area. This plant will employ as many as 700 people; and the improvements that will be undertaken by the purchaser will certainly improve the employment situation in that area.

And I want to call this to your attention: Under this sale Goodrich-Gulf will end up with about 19.9 percent of the existing synthetic-rubber capacity, plus the announced expansion plans and new plants that will be constructed in the near future. If you just consider existing capacity as it exists today, Goodrich-Gulf will have approximately 25.2 percent of the capacity; but this by and of itself, according to a decision of the Supreme Court, does not violate the Sherman Antitrust Act.

Now I also want to call your attention to the fact that the Congress did not disapprove the sale to Firestone of two copolymer facilities, at a time when those sales gave Firestone 18.8 percent of the total existing capacity.

So what are we talking about?

Basically, we are talking about the difference between 18.8 percent and 19.9 percent of capacity. It seems to me that the Congress would be in an untenable position to have approved a sale which gave Firestone 18.8 percent of the capacity, but disapprove a sale that would give Goodrich-Gulf 19.9 percent of the capacity.

Now I want to make it clear that, if we adopt this resolution, we will prevent the production of 122,000 long tons of GR-S in this Nation, at a time when we are in short supply of rubber. The best thing that could happen from the consumers viewpoint, and from a competitive viewpoint, is to have this plant go into production. It will increase the supply of synthetic rubber in the Nation and will make a substantial increase in the availability of rubber for small-business users.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the House will vote against this resolution. Under the original law, we were required to report the resolution or else it became privileged. So, therefore, we have reported the resolution adversely. I hope that the House will overwhelmingly reject this resolution.

However, I also want to say that, if we disapprove this resolution and Good-

rich-Gulf takes possession of the facility, no one of us will have expressed any opinion as to the legality of any future actions on the part of Goodrich-Gulf Chemical Corp. We have antitrust laws, and an Antitrust Division in the Office of the Attorney General. We will expect the Attorney General to keep a close watch on this purchase, as well as other large synthetic-rubber manufacturers. But, so far as the economy of the country is concerned, and particularly so far as the area of Charleston, W. Va., is concerned, I believe we would be doing a great disservice to the American people and to the people of West Virginia if we adopted this resolution.

I urge you to vote against this resolution, so that this sale may take place; that production may start, so that people may be employed in the Charleston, W. Va., area, and that a substantial increase in the production of synthetic rubber will be made available to the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Can the gentleman tell me the total amount the Government has invested in this plant?

Mr. VINSON. On October 31, 1955, the plant had a gross book value of \$18,398,000, and a net book value of \$4,968,000. The Commission recommended that it be sold for \$11 million.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. Let me say that I think the Commission has done a splendid job in getting the prices they have for the plants they have disposed of. We sold the other plants for around \$285 million. I thought then and the Congress thought then, overwhelmingly, that we received a good price for the plants.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. With pleasure.

Mr. SHORT. Since the gentleman has control of the time and I have none, I am sure he will be glad to yield.

Mr. VINSON. I will, with pleasure.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to say that it is a high honor and great privilege to serve in this body. With all our trials and tribulations and all the requests and disappointments and heartaches and headaches that we have, it is worth coming to Congress to serve with a man like CARL VINSON, whom I consider not only a fine Christian gentleman but also one of the ablest legislators that has ever been sent to this House.

I do not want to be superfluous and I am not going to, but in my humble and honest judgment there is no man in Congress or out of Congress, or in the Defense Department who knows more about the status of our national defense and everything related to it than the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

It has been really exciting, stimulating, comforting, and helpful to sit at his side all these years. He has spoken on this bill. If he would permit me to proceed for 1 or 2 minutes I would like

to remind the House that we came dangerously near losing World War II when our source of natural-rubber supply was cut off from Indonesia and the Far East. Not until big Bill Jeffers, former chairman of the board of the Union Pacific Railroad, now gone, came to Washington did we bring order out of chaos. We built up a \$700 million synthetic rubber industry and we learned to produce rubber that for some purposes was better than natural rubber in order to win that conflict and to support our domestic economy. But, believing in free individual enterprise, the Congress in its wisdom decided to get out of the rubber business and we have disposed of all these plants except one. That is the one at Institute, W. Va.

West Virginia is a great State. It contributed much to the winning of the war. Those people in that distressed area need this plant, but it is not because of hardship that the Committee on the Armed Services is advocating the sale of this last plant.

I agree with my chairman that the Commission has done a remarkable job. Although Mr. Pauley bid only \$2 million for this plant, he raised it to \$5,800,000 and the Commission itself set a minimum price of \$9,500,000. They finally negotiated with Goodrich to sell the plant for \$11 million.

Mr. Chairman, this plant has been idle for 2 or 3 years and it deteriorates rather rapidly. We are losing money. Unless we sell it we will perhaps get nothing. So after a long, patient and exhaustive hearing, the committee unanimously, with the exception of one vote "Present", decided that we should vote against this resolution and get the Government completely out of business. The Commission has done a remarkable job and private enterprise has taken over this and has done a remarkable job also. I hope, Mr. Chairman, we will vote down the resolution disapproving this sale.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my deep appreciation for the kind, generous remarks of my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri. So far as this matter is concerned, we are on sound ground. We have done the proper thing. We had a hearing, we took testimony, we had the benefit of the brilliant views of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] who will present his argument in opposition to the sale. I do want to say that the Commission received the fair market value for all of these copolymer and butadiene plants. I said to the House last year when we sold the facilities that they were to be congratulated for having obtained such a high price. I have compared it to other sales of Government property that were made and I say that we are receiving more for the synthetic rubber plants than we have received for any other Government facilities that have been sold up to date in proportion to the amount of money invested.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I, too, want to commend the gentleman for his excellent state-

ment. I am curious to know why there was a disparity in the final bids. I do not want to presume upon the gentleman's time, but I am curious to know why the second bidder was so far below the first, approximately one-half.

Mr. VINSON. That is a very pertinent question. Goodrich-Gulf, bid \$9 million. The Goodyear Synthetic Rubber Co. bid \$2 million. Now listen to this: The Imperial Commodities Corp. bid \$750,000. Here are two of the companies that were engaged in this kind of business. Mr. Pauley came in and bid \$2 million. The Union Carbide & Carbon Corp. bid \$1,500,000 and the United Rubber & Chemical Co. bid \$4 million.

Now, I was somewhat disturbed when this letter came in. Here is a plant that will turn out 122,000 tons annually of GR-S. The Imperial Commodities Corp. only valued it at \$750,000, and another concern valued it at \$9 million. Well, that disturbed the Commission, so the Commission just said "Now, we are going to say that the minimum price we will submit to the Congress is \$9.5 million" because they probably did not like the way these bids were coming in.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Is it not possible that the purchaser, Goodrich-Gulf, may have intentionally bid so high in order to make it a monopoly price thus assuring it of achieving a dominant position in the industry?

Mr. VINSON. They did not know what Imperial or any other bidder was going to bid.

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

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is this one of those privileged resolutions where, if I want to approve of the sale, I vote "No"?

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. From the standpoint of the future defense of the country, would it not be better to have this plant in operation by private industry?

Mr. VINSON. Of course it will.

Mr. BELCHER. Than probably to let it stand idle?

Mr. VINSON. I am standing here not only on this measure but on other measures trying to get the Government out of business. I stand flatfooted for free enterprise in these matters.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Does the gentleman know that this successful bidder, the Goodrich Tire & Rubber Company, was not successful as a defendant in an antitrust suit not so long ago?

Mr. VINSON. Yes, we know about that. And we know if they violate the antitrust laws, they should be prosecuted. But, that is no bar and should



not be a bar to people being able to buy that which the Government offers to sell.

Mr. CELLER. Does not the gentleman think it might well be a bar?

Mr. VINSON. Well, the gentleman is the chairman of the great committee. If you want to say that because a corporation has been prosecuted for violating the Sherman antitrust law or the Clayton Act, the Government will prohibit him from doing business with it, you can bring it in here and we will debate it. Now, I do not have jurisdiction over that.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman just briefly answer me this question: The acquisition of this plant, as I understand, will give the Goodrich-Gulf Co. a big percentage of the manufacture of synthetic rubber.

Mr. VINSON. 19.9 percent.

Mr. CELLER. Almost 20 percent of the capacity of the manufacture of synthetic rubber. In view of the antitrust record of the Goodrich Co.—and presently there is a complaint pending against the Goodrich Co. by the Federal Trade Commission, also—in view of that record, do you think it is proper and fair and consistent with the welfare of the Nation to have the Attorney General approve this sale which would give this company now 20 percent of the capacity of synthetic rubber?

Mr. VINSON. I have no hesitancy to say to that, yes, I think it is proper to permit this sale to go through. As a matter of fact, they will have 19.9 percent, you might say 20 percent, and if they violate the antitrust law, let the Department of Justice prosecute them.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 56 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, a vote against the pending resolution is a vote for monopoly and against free enterprise. A vote against the pending resolution is a vote for more concentration of power and against free competition. A vote against this resolution is a vote for predatory business practices and against opportunity for small business to compete.

This is a vital matter for the State of West Virginia and I hesitated long before filing this resolution. My good friends Mr. BYRD, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. STAGGERS, and the others almost persuaded me that I should not file it. But I feel so strongly about the disposal program and this sale that I felt I must. If the sale is approved, Goodrich-Gulf will open the plant which has lain idle for almost 2 years, giving opportunities for employment to many people in that depressed area. Yet, even though I, too, want employment for the people who live in that area, I wonder whether this sale is all they believe it is. Yesterday the president of Goodrich-Gulf testified that until 1958 only 1 of the 3 lines of this plant will be in operation. Instead of 750 to 1,000 jobs that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services said would be made available by this sale, the most that will be made available, if that many will be made available, will be approximately 300.

I want to commend the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] for his efforts in this matter. He has done an outstanding job, in filing the bill which

resulted in the sale and my defending it. We differ in our opinions concerning its merits but we are still and will continue to be good friends.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Is it not true that the Goodrich company is presently one of the so-called Big Four in the manufacture of products from natural rubber?

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CELLER. Does the gentleman agree with the gentleman from Georgia, the distinguished chairman of the committee, that we should disregard the antitrust record of the Goodrich Co. and allow them to make a purchase at this knock-down price of this synthetic plant?

Mr. YATES. No, I do not. The gentleman has posed a very important point, because the law requires that we consider the record of the Goodrich Co. The law under which this plant was sold requires the establishment by the Commission of a free, competitive synthetic rubber industry, one which will not permit any person to obtain unreasonable control over the manufacture of synthetic rubber or its components.

When Assistant Attorney General Barnes was asked last year about the Goodrich Co. and the other companies which have been purchasers of the plants and which have been the subjects of antitrust suits, he said we could not take their past records and judge what would happen in the future. Nevertheless, in response to a question by Senator DOUGLAS, he said, "It is true the leopards do not change their spots."

While it is true that perhaps we can disregard the antitrust suit against the company in the past, we cannot disregard an existing fact, which is that Goodrich-Gulf is now the subject of a complaint by the Federal Trade Commission because of monopolistic practices in its industry.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, over and beyond that, would it be fair to let them have this plant when we consider that they are a major factor in the manufacture of products from natural rubber; and now we would be giving them a very firm hold—20 percent—on the manufacture of synthetic rubber and synthetic rubber products?

Mr. YATES. Let me say this, that Goodrich-Gulf will have, not 20 percent of the industry if this sale is approved, but as of this time will have 25 percent of the industry. The figure of 19.9 percent, to which the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services alluded, was the percentage of control this company would possess in the industry after completion of the expansion program which the industry has announced. At this time we do not know whether that program will be completed. Some of the companies may decide not to go ahead with the expansion program. And if that is true, the amount of control by the Goodrich-Gulf Company over the industry will be correspondingly increased. Let us say that its control of

the industry is somewhere between 19.9 percent and 25 percent. If this sale is approved they will control one-fourth of the entire synthetic rubber industry in the United States. In my judgment this does not comply with the criterion established in the Disposal Act of 1953.

Mr. CELLER. They have more than that percentage of control of natural rubber, so that they will be in a dominant position not only in the natural rubber field but also in the synthetic rubber field if this sale is consummated.

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman has very properly raised this question about monopoly. It is something we are all concerned about, something which it is provided in the law shall be dealt with. The Attorney General's opinion must be asked for in connection with any such sale as to whether it does tend to foster monopoly. Now, what is the alternative? If this sale were turned down and the gentleman's resolution were approved, what then would happen, in the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. YATES. Under the law as it exists today, this plant would not be operated. It would be maintained in a standby condition. But let me point out that this was the situation, too, last year when the sale of the 24 plants was approved. The Baytown, Tex., plant was supposed to be placed in a standby position. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] filed a bill at that time which was considered within 3 weeks, bids were taken, and the Baytown plant was sold. It did not lie idle for any appreciable length of time. That is possible in this case. As soon as action is taken on this bill, if my resolution is approved, this plant can again be offered for sale by appropriate resolution.

Mr. KEATING. It can be, but is it not a fact that the Commission did previously offer it and did not get what they considered an adequate and fair price?

Mr. YATES. Let me refer the gentleman to the Commission's own report last year in which they stated Institute was an installation which no company in the industry thought was worth purchasing. It was described as a high-cost producer. Therefore, nobody wanted to bid for it. Yet now we have Goodrich-Gulf offering what seems to be an enormous price for this installation, one that will permit Goodrich to assume the dominant position in the industry.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman with great frankness has said that the result of the passage of the gentleman's resolution would be that this plant would lie fallow for the time being. The Commission certainly has made, as this record would indicate, very substantial efforts to dispose of it elsewhere. I think that in the discussion of this question of monopoly which, as I say, we are all concerned about and should be concerned about, attention should be directed to the position of the Attorney General when faced with the question put to him by the Commission, "What

do we do now?" since he had previously expressed some concern about the monopoly aspects. Then the one sentence which seems to me significant is this: "It is my view that the development of a free competitive synthetic rubber industry would be better fostered by bringing this plant into active competitive production rather than to allow it to lie fallow."

Mr. YATES. That is the only reason he approved the sale.

Mr. KEATING. He said in substance, "I don't like the monopoly aspects of it, and if it were free to be sold to anyone at any time, I would say, 'Don't sell.'" I think that is the fair substance of it. But he says that if it means that the plant is going to lie idle, which this record seems to indicate it will, then competition would be better fostered by making this sale.

Mr. YATES. Obviously, there is more competition if Goodrich operates the plant than if it were to lay idle. That is the sole basis of the Attorney General's opinion. Now, let me ask the gentleman a question. Would it not be better to forego \$5 million in the purchase price, if by doing so we provided a greater competition in the industry?

Mr. KEATING. I think it is very questionable whether it would be better. You are referring to the second bidder, Mr. Pauley.

Mr. YATES. The second highest bidder, Mr. Pauley.

Mr. KEATING. That is Mr. Pauley who offered some \$5 million less than the other bid?

Mr. YATES. Five million dollars, yes.

Mr. KEATING. I do not think I would favor selling to Mr. Pauley who offered some \$5 million less and I think the Congress would be severely criticized if it did that.

Mr. YATES. Why?

Mr. KEATING. Because \$5 million is still not peanuts and the Commission has ruled the Pauley offer does not measure up to a fair price.

Mr. YATES. How do we know what a fair, full price is? Does the gentleman know what the full, fair value of the plant is?

Mr. KEATING. No.

Mr. YATES. No member of the Congress knows nor have we any way of knowing, because the Commission never furnished the committee and never furnished the Congress with any earnings data which indicates the manner in which it reached its decision on what is the full fair value of the plant.

Mr. KEATING. But I know the difference between \$11 million and \$6 million.

Mr. YATES. Of course, the gentleman does. The gentleman is on the Committee on the Judiciary. Is it not entirely possible that the amount offered by the Goodrich-Gulf was a monopoly price purposely bid high to enable the company to assume a dominant position in the industry? Of course, that is possible.

Mr. KEATING. It is possible. Anything is possible.

Mr. YATES. Of course, it is possible.

Mr. KEATING. But I do not think there is any evidence in this record to

bear out any such proposition as that. And I do not want to be a party to a giveaway program whereby we authorize a sale to Mr. Pauley for \$6 million when there is someone else willing to pay \$11 million for the same thing.

Mr. YATES. Does the gentleman mean that the fact that the Goodrich-Gulf was the subject of an antitrust suit previously, and the fact that it is now the subject of a suit by the Federal Trade Commission does not indicate that it engages in practices which are monopolistic?

Mr. KEATING. Well, the fact that a suit is pending against anyone does not prove that he is guilty. I hope the gentleman does not make that kind of an argument. Of course, I know nothing of the merits of the suits.

Mr. YATES. Let me just break in to say that Goodrich-Gulf pleaded nolo contendere in that previous case.

Mr. KEATING. I would be delighted if the bid of \$11 million was made by some smaller concern and if Goodrich-Gulf were in Mr. Pauley's position of bidding a much smaller figure.

Mr. YATES. I join with the gentleman in that.

Mr. KEATING. But that is not the case before us. I assume probably it takes a huge amount of capital to run a plant like that—and there are relatively few companies which have the capital and the know-how to do such a job, and we have to balance that against the possible monopoly features. On balance it seems to me in this case we should approve of this sale.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is using the same conditional language of the Attorney General who appeared before the committee yesterday. After he had first said that the sale would not foster competition in industry, Judge Barnes came before the committee and said, and I quote from the transcript:

We felt that the thing for us to do, as I say, was to frankly state the advantageous situation that existed here, the disadvantageous situation, and under these circumstances give this limited approval which would put the matter in Congress who had originally created the act locking toward the disposition.

You will note that he said "limited approval."

In other words, the Attorney General did not pass upon it. He sent it back to the Congress to pass on it. He did not discuss the antitrust features of it and he did not say clearly and without equivocation that this sale meets the requirements of the antitrust provisions of our laws.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. BELCHER. I think probably the gentleman has nearly answered the questions that I had in mind. The closest bid to the \$11 million bid is \$5,800,000.

Mr. YATES. That is correct.

Mr. BELCHER. Would the gentleman prefer to disregard the \$11 million bid and sell for \$5,800,000?

Mr. YATES. The gentleman might or might not prefer to do that if I had sufficient facts on which to base an opinion

as to the full fair value of the plant. The Commission was required under law to accept the bid that offered the full fair value with due recognition for protection of a free competitive rubber industry. I do not know whether this bid represents the full fair value. I do not know whether \$5,800,000 represents the full fair value. I do know that nobody in the industry was willing to bid \$5,800,000 for it a year ago, at the time that other plants were offered for sale. This may be the full fair value. It is entirely possible, too, that Goodrich-Gulf may have offered an inflated price in order that it might achieve a dominant place in the industry.

Mr. BELCHER. In that case the Government would be getting about \$5 million more than the plant was worth.

Mr. YATES. Is \$5 million sufficient to justify a monopoly?

Mr. BELCHER. I am asking the gentleman. He has more information than I have. I am asking him whether or not, with all the facts considered, that would bring the \$5,800,000 up to \$11,000,000.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman from Illinois has attempted to answer the question by saying that if the gentleman from Illinois had the facts which would show what the fair value of the plants were, the gentleman would be very happy to answer the gentleman's question. Not having enough facts, the gentleman from Illinois cannot answer that question specifically.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Has the gentleman got the figures as to the other 80 percent of this capacity in the industry? I notice in the report that Firestone presently owns about 18.8 percent. How much of a margin would Goodrich have, after this sale, over its nearest competitor?

Mr. YATES. The report of the Commission indicates, on page 13, what the ownerships were at the time of the sale last year, and what the ownerships would be as of the conclusion of the expansion program which has been announced by the industry. Goodrich itself agrees as of the present time that its ownership is close to 25 percent. It says that after the industry's expansion program is completed, it thinks it will move down from the high figure it now has, to one which will approximate 19.9 percent or even 13 percent. The point I make is that we do not know as of this time whether the proposed expansion program will ever be completed or whether Goodrich will also expand. As of this time, if this sale is approved, the ownership by Goodrich-Gulf will be close to 25 percent.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. But there are other giants in the field that are competitors of Goodrich, are there not?

Mr. YATES. Of course there are.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am not trying to argue with the gentleman. I am trying to get the facts.

Mr. YATES. Well, you know that as well as I do.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think it ought to be brought out. I wanted to be sure that the relative positions of these

people remained about what they are now.

Mr. YATES. Would it not be better if they did not, and other competitors came into the field?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Oh yes. The gentleman has a point there.

Mr. YATES. Let me show you why I have a point. The Commission sold the Baytown, Tex., plant to an outsider, to a company that was not one of the big four for a very good price. The Commission said to the Goodyear Co., "We will not accept your bid because it will give you too dominant position in the industry." And it rejected Goodyear's bid. What the Commission should do in this case is to seek to find an outsider which they could bring into the industry to aid production, because, as the Attorney General points out, this is the best way to stimulate competition in the industry.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. I notice from the report that this contract would make available to small business, at fair market prices, 50 percent of the production on the first line and about 73 percent on the next two lines.

Mr. YATES. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. YATES. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HESELTON. I do not find anywhere where Goodrich-Gulf would make this available to small business. The Attorney General apparently says that the disposal sale will create problems of economic concentration. In other words, he indicates to us that there is a real problem here, but there might be other facts which would override it. What I cannot get from the report is what guaranty there is, if any, to small business, that it will get any consideration; or is it a fact that the company will be able to offer it at the same price, and if they do not take it, it is just too bad?

Mr. YATES. With respect to the provision the gentleman refers to, small business is entirely at the mercy of the big companies. In response to questions before the committee, the purchasers stated they would allocate certain portions of their production to small business firms. But this assurance is just a moral commitment. There is no way that any of those small business people can enforce that promise against any of the big companies.

Mr. HESELTON. May I ask the gentleman if he knows whether in fact any small business has recommended this disposal?

Mr. YATES. None that I know of.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BATES. I did not want to make special reference to the point to which the gentleman from Massachusetts just made, but on yesterday when we had the witnesses before the committee they

said it was not only a moral responsibility but also a legal responsibility.

Mr. YATES. Who can enforce it?

Mr. BATES. Which they said was enforceable.

Mr. YATES. By whom?

Mr. BATES. They said it was enforceable.

Mr. YATES. By whom is it enforceable? Who can enforce it? The Attorney General of the United States last year said it could not be enforced.

Mr. BATES. They said yesterday that it was enforceable.

But I want to touch on another point, the one the gentleman mentioned earlier on this question of monopoly.

I do not know and I do not even think that the learned gentleman knows, distinguished lawyer that he is, when a monopoly is created in an industry.

Judge Barnes, when he was before our committee on yesterday, cited certain figures given by a most famous jurist on this question that where 1 individual or 1 firm could have 90 percent of an industry that undoubtedly it was a monopoly; that when the figure was 67 percent that probably it was a monopoly; but he said that when it gets down to 33½ percent undoubtedly it is not a monopoly.

Here we are talking about a situation somewhere between 18 percent and 25 percent. Now, what, in the judgment of the gentleman do the percentages indicate in the instant case?

Mr. YATES. I am willing to take Judge Barnes' opinion.

Mr. BATES. Will the gentleman answer?

Mr. YATES. Yes, if the gentleman will let me. I said I am willing to take Judge Barnes' opinion.

Mr. BATES. His argument was based on a court interpretation.

Mr. YATES. You did not let me finish my reply. I said I am willing to take Judge Barnes' opinion that where a purchaser moves into a field there is a relative amount of competition created, greater or less depending on the acquisition. But I say to the gentleman Judge Barnes yesterday said he would give limited approval to the sale; and I refer the gentleman to the transcript of yesterday. Judge Barnes talked about limited approval.

Mr. BATES. But he struck out those words "limited approval."

Mr. YATES. He did not strike that out.

Mr. BATES. If you will read the full committee report you will see that he revised those words and that instead of the phrase "limited approval" he said, "We cannot give an opinion in a limited sense; either we go one way or we go the other."

Mr. YATES. Here is what he said, and I read from the transcript:

The CHAIRMAN. You classify it as a limited approval? You used the word "limited" there, but don't use that phraseology in your opinion.

Mr. BARNES. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, there might be on the floor of the House—

Mr. BARNES. There is no question but that on balance the Attorney General approves the transaction.

On balance, he says. Is that an unqualified approval? Of course it is not.

Mr. BATES. The gentleman knows that in every case it is a little gray; but finally he came out and said on balance. In fact he gives his approval. He cannot give it a little bit, he must make up his mind; and he did on yesterday.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman knows very well that the Attorney General wrestled with himself on this sale; he wrestled with his conscience and finally, he won.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The question that occurs to me is this: Supposing the sale were made at the sum of \$5 million to a private individual. Would it be incumbent upon that purchaser to retain possession of the property acquired or could he within 30 days sell it to Firestone or some other purchaser he might elect?

Mr. YATES. The gentleman raises an interesting question. As far as I know there is no barrier.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

As far as I know there is no barrier to such a sale.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I will yield to the gentleman but first let me finish my statement to the gentleman from Iowa. I recall seeing this in an opinion of the Attorney General—where he stated specifically in his written opinion—that if this were a sale by one private company to another private company rather than a sale by the Government to a private company he would have to sue for an injunction to restrain such a sale under section 7 of the Clayton Act.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. We hear a lot of talk about monopolies and violation of the antitrust laws. I refer to section 7 of the Clayton Act as amended by the Celler-Kefauver amendment that provides there is a violation if there is a substantial lessening of competition in any given area. Would not the acquisition of this new synthetic plant by the Goodrich people result in a substantial lessening of competition in a given area?

Mr. YATES. In my opinion, it would and that was also the opinion of the Attorney General until he reversed himself and decided he did not want to disapprove the sale.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I should like to pursue the point raised by the gentleman from Iowa a little further. If this resulted in a sale to Mr. Pauley and he turned around and made a \$5 million profit the next day by selling to the

Gulf people, would there be anything in the antitrust laws that would prevent that? I know of nothing. Mr. Pauley is not engaged in the synthetic rubber business now.

Mr. YATES. I refer the gentleman to the opinion of the Attorney General in which he stated that if such a sale were proposed by one private person to another he would sue for an injunction under section 3 of the Clayton Act to restrain such sale.

Mr. KEATING. I think he was referring to the sale by one company engaged in the business to another.

Mr. YATES. Yes, but, as I understand Mr. Pauley's business, he is in the oil business and I would assume he qualifies therefore as one who is in this business and could properly be sued if he proposed to sell to another company.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Am I not correct in saying that the issue before us today is not whether Mr. Pauley can buy this plant or whether this plant should be sold to the Goodrich Co.?

Mr. YATES. That is right.

Mr. MULTER. The gentleman's resolution simply seeks to disapprove this particular sale, is that correct?

Mr. YATES. Yes.

Mr. MULTER. It is not as to who may buy or who may not buy?

Mr. YATES. That is right.

Mr. Chairman, one thing I think we are losing sight of, and I do not think it was brought out adequately by the chairman of the committee, is that this sale must be conducted pursuant to certain criteria established by the Rubber Facilities Disposal Act of 1953. There were three important criteria that we should bear in mind before we decide to approve this sale.

One of those was the requirement for the development of a free competitive synthetic-rubber industry without unreasonable control by any person manufacturing synthetic rubber or component materials. If we believe this sale will give to Goodrich-Gulf a position in the industry which would not permit it to be free and competitive with respect to any of its materials, we must disapprove this sale.

The second criterion is the requirement of the offering to small business of a fair share of the end products and the facilities sold at a fair price. Goodrich-Gulf says: We will allocate a certain proportion of the production to small business. But the Attorney General of the United States stated last year—he has not changed his mind this year—that there is no way in which small business can enforce that contract legally. The company says it is a moral and legal commitment. The Attorney General disagrees. I do not know how any small-business man can go into court and compel Goodrich-Gulf to live up to its agreement.

The third requirement is one of full fair value for the facilities. I do not know whether full fair value for the

facilities has been achieved or not. We do know that Goodrich-Gulf bid \$11 million, more than twice as much as its next competitor. We know, too, that Goodrich-Gulf as a result of this purchase will take the No. 1 position in the industry, which leads me to conclude that Goodrich-Gulf may have bid high purposely in order to get the plant and move into the No. 1 position.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In the making of synthetic rubber, is it necessary to use petroleum products or do we find any agricultural products going into the alcohol or synthetic rubber process?

Mr. YATES. Petroleum is used for the most part. Alcohol is used also, but the alcoholic process is 3 cents higher in cost per unit than the petroleum process.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Can the gentleman inform me as to how much agricultural production might find its way into the making of alcohol and synthetic rubber?

Mr. YATES. I am sorry. I just do not know the answer to that question.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MUMMA. In reply to that question, for the past several years I have been endeavoring to get the Department of Agriculture to consider getting rid of some of the surplus wheat to go into the production of alcohol and synthetic rubber, and only today again have I written them a letter to reconsider their stand. They said the price was too high to sell, but at the same time we are continually piling up rental for storage space.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to say in that respect that the synthetic alcohol plant at Omaha, Nebr., is about to be sold. It is used almost exclusively for the making of alcohol, and the observation has been made that if 4 percent of the gasoline and alcohol production could be made from agricultural products, there would be no surplus production of agricultural products in this country. Sweden for many years and Germany have been using from 5 to 20 percent, depending on the amount of agricultural products they had to get rid of, and I think it would help the gentleman and the bill a great deal if we could be assured that some agricultural products would be funneled into this plant to make alcohol and synthetic rubber and 101 other things that industry can make out of surplus agricultural products.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for his statement. I wish I knew more about the subject so that I could reply adequately. I think his contribution is a worthy one, however.

On page 4 of the Commission's report we find the following statement, that "the synthetic rubber industry born as a Government monopoly in the early anxious days of World War II has passed to

private ownership. The American concept of free enterprise has become a reality."

Mr. Chairman, if that statement were true, I would not have filed this resolution. It is because I want the American concept of free enterprise to become a reality that I am opposing the sale to Goodrich-Gulf. The only thing that has occurred as a result of this transfer by the Government to Goodrich-Gulf is the transfer from public ownership to private ownership, but what was a Government monopoly before can still be a monopoly if it is transferred to private hands. This would occur, for example, if all the plants were sold to two companies. It would still be monopolistic. But, suppose the purchaser of one plant winds up with 25 percent of the entire industry. Would not the gentlemen of the House think that this certainly was a tendency toward monopoly, if not actually monopoly itself? The Attorney General thought so, too, until the Commission established an upset price of \$9.5 million, which, to all intents and purposes, wiped out every other bidder except Goodrich-Gulf. At that point the Attorney General reversed himself and said he would not disapprove the sale because he could not conscientiously say there was less competition with that plant in Goodrich's hands than if it were lying idle.

With the sales of the synthetic rubber plants, the Nation's synthetic rubber industry has been delivered to only very few large corporations, corporations which are already dominant in the rubber industry. Can it not be said that instead of resulting monopoly occurring because of the transfer to one company, that the monopoly resulted as the result of a transfer to a few companies?

Of the 24 plants sold last spring, 60.6 percent of the GR-S facilities went to the big 4 rubber companies and 26.7 percent went to 2 major oil companies, Shell and Phillips. So, we find that 86 percent of the facilities are in the hands of the big 4 rubber companies and of 2 of large oil companies. Of the butadiene facilities, 63.8 percent were sold to companies purchasing copolymer plants, thereby creating substantial vertical integration, despite the fact that such integration was not technologically imperative.

The issue is not one of the highest price, highest maximum financial return. Price is important so that the American people can get their investment back, but the fact remains that the law under which these plants were sold has to be complied with and section 17 (5) of that law does not say that the Commission shall obtain full, fair value without regard to the rest of the requirements. This is what it says. It says that the Commission should receive full, fair value, taking into consideration the policy set forth in section 2.

And, Mr. Chairman, do you know what section 2 requires? Section 2 requires that the facilities shall be disposed of under conditions which will develop a free synthetic rubber industry within the United States. So that the act's

mandate which requires a free competitive synthetic rubber industry is fully as important as the requirement for full, fair value.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HESELTON. May I refer to the question I asked the gentleman, briefly. I have had an opportunity to read the committee report a little further and I see that the committee states flatly that, "the Attorney General has expressed concern that these contracts may not be enforceable insofar as availability of rubber for small business users is concerned when the Commission ceases to exist. It is the opinion of the Committee on Armed Services that these contracts are enforceable in law by the Federal Government. But certainly the commitments made by each of the purchasers, including the purchaser of the Institute facility, are enforceable through an even stronger enforcement agency, the weight of public opinion."

Mr. YATES. That is right.

Mr. HESELTON. Which is a very peculiar reliance, it seems to me. May I ask the gentleman in what conceivable way could a small business concern go into court and enforce any such commitment as exists here? The Attorney General says he does not think it is enforceable.

Mr. YATES. That is correct. I do not know how it could be done.

Mr. HESELTON. Does the gentleman think they will?

Mr. YATES. No. I agree with the Attorney General, because I do not know how one small business firm could sue to get its proportionate share of the allocation.

Mr. HESELTON. What form of action would he resort to?

Mr. YATES. I have not the foggiest notion. The Chairman told the Committee yesterday that even if he could not do it on the basis of a lawsuit, the bar of public opinion would protect the small-business man.

Mr. HESELTON. I suppose that he might sue for breach of contract. He might try to get into an equity court. But how in Heaven's name could he get an order from an equity court directing the delivery of a certain amount of rubber?

Mr. YATES. I can only reply to the gentleman by saying that what a small-business fabricator would need is not a lawyer but a genius to find some method of enforcing his rights.

Only in the Baytown sale did the Commission keep in mind this mandate about having a free, competitive synthetic rubber industry. In the Baytown sale, the Commission threw out the bid of the Goodyear Company saying that it would have too dominant a position in the industry. Yet they refused to do that in this case. I do not know why.

The Commission declares that with this Institute sale the American concept of free enterprise become a reality. Mr. Chairman, small business will not agree that this is free enterprise. We now see the Nation's synthetic rubber industry within the control of a few giant

rubber and oil companies which are both the small-business man's supplier and his competitor. Small-business men know from hard experience that in many fields of business today their freedom is limited by the whim of their large suppliers and competitors. One of the major problems facing the small-business man today is that he is caught in the vise of dependency upon his large producers and fabricators for his own supplies of raw material, knowing that he must compete with them on the distribution level. He is completely at the mercy of the integrated company.

The Federal Trade Commission does not act merely on suspicion. It has recently filed suit accusing the purchaser of engaging in monopolistic practices?

How can we in this House possibly disregard the mandate of the Rubber Disposal Act of 1953 and approve this sale to a company that is only now the subject of a suit for monopolistic practices?

Mr. Chairman, much has been said about the allocation by the facility's purchaser to small business, the question the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] raised. The fact remains that these allocations are entirely voluntary on the part of the big companies. Certainly, when the Commission ceases to exist—and this is an important point, Mr. Chairman, for with this sale the Rubber Facilities Disposal Commission goes out of existence. The Commission is the party to these contracts. When this commission goes out of existence, who will there be to enforce the rights of the small-business men under the allocations? There has been no transfer of the rights of the Rubber Facilities Disposal Commission to any other organization. When it goes out of existence, as it must when this sale is approved, there is nobody to enforce the rights of the small-business people.

Last year the chairman interrogated each of the purchasers on the amount of the production each would set aside for the small-business firms. There was presumably a satisfactory allocation made for each. Nobody can enforce that agreement. Judge Barnes of the Attorney General's office said that nobody could enforce that agreement. In his letter of transmittal to this House in connection with the sale, on this point of the right of small business to enforce these allocations under the contract, this is what the Attorney General said, and I read from his opinion:

At this juncture it is appropriate to point out that similar provisions to assure small business enterprises a supply of GR-S that were embodied in the contracts of sale in the Commission's first disposal program were the subject of considerable congressional interest during the hearings on the program. This interest turned upon the question of enforcement of the purchasers' commitments. Assurances were given by the plant purchasers that they considered these pledges binding upon them. In fact, the president of the B. F. Goodrich Co. stated that he considered this commitment both a legal and moral obligation.

Listen to what the Attorney General said:

I am, nevertheless, concerned about the future enforcement of these contractual

commitments when the Commission ceases to exist.

This is by the Attorney General, who wants the sale approved, nevertheless, he is concerned that the commitments will not be enforceable. How can we possibly approve this sale?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yesterday in the committee hearings I noticed the gentleman from Illinois who now has the floor had left the room when Judge Barnes was interrogated by a member of the committee on this point. As I recall, Judge Barnes' reply was to the effect that there were two possible remedies. The one he thought most acceptable, the most likely way for the Government to intervene in behalf of small business, would be specific performance. Then following that, as I recall the gentleman from Illinois was still out of the room, at that time the president of the purchasing company took the stand and he was asked by our chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] whether or not he considered this a moral contract, a legal contract, and one that would be enforceable in court. My recollection of the answer of the president was that he considered it both a moral and a legal obligation and that he accepted it as one enforceable in court.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman. I had to go to a meeting of my Subcommittee on Appropriations yesterday and that was the reason I could not remain to hear the testimony of Judge Barnes and the other witnesses.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I was not criticizing the gentleman because he was not there. I understand that he had other work to attend to.

Mr. YATES. That is correct. The president of Goodrich-Gulf was asked that same question about the allocation to small business in the other body by Senator FULBRIGHT. In reply to Senator FULBRIGHT he gave the same reply that he did to your committee:

The chairman of the committee of another body then said, "Suppose you are no longer the president? Suppose the board of directors is changed? Will the company still enforce or recognize its obligations?" He said, "I do not know. I assume that they would."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does the gentleman contend that the statement by the president of the company, the purchaser, made before a congressional committee, a part of the record, would not be binding upon the company regardless of who the president and directors are in the future? Is that the gentleman's contention?

Mr. YATES. That is the gentleman's contention, and I am buttressed in that opinion by the Attorney General of the United States who, in connection with the report on this sale, has stated, as I indicated a few moments ago, as follows:

I am nevertheless concerned about the future enforcement of these contractual commitments when this Commission ceases to exist.

If the Attorney General of the United States is concerned, should not we be

concerned as to who is going to enforce it?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does the gentleman feel that in order to sell these plants we should continue this Commission in perpetuity in order to enforce the contracts of small business?

Mr. YATES. No; as I indicated before the gentleman's committee yesterday in my testimony, I thought that the rights of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission in connection with the contracts should be transferred to some permanent agency of the Government, like General Services Administration, for example, so that the rights of small-business men could be enforced, assuming they are enforceable. As of this time, asked as we are to approve this sale, now, we do not know whether this will be done. That is one of the things I think we should do before we approve this sale. We should know definitely that the commitments of the purchasers to small business are in the hands of a competent Government agency, which can enforce their rights in accordance with law.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. MASON. This Commission for the disposal of these plants is the agent of what?

Mr. YATES. Of the Government of the United States.

Mr. MASON. And if, as an agent of the Government of the United States, it enters into certain contracts, specific contracts, and then after the job they are supposed to do is over, would not then the person whom they were the agent of take over and enforce those contracts?

Mr. YATES. Who is the Government of the United States for enforcing the contract?

Mr. MASON. Why the Attorney General, of course, is the legal man to enforce the contracts.

Mr. YATES. On behalf of whom? If the gentleman will recall, suits that are brought by the Federal Government are brought through a specific agency that has jurisdiction over the matter. For example, the War Assets Administration used to sue for certain rights within its jurisdiction. The gentleman would not contend, for example, that an agency of the Government such as the Federal Communications Commission could sue to enforce the allocations under these contracts, would he?

Mr. MASON. No, but I would contend an agency of the Federal Government in whose jurisdiction this would be would have to enforce those contracts.

Mr. YATES. I agree with the gentleman. The point I make in reply is that there is no agency of the Government other than the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission soon to go out of existence, which has jurisdiction and the right to enforce these contracts.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I am reading from the basic law, section 20:

After the Commission ceases to exist, such contracts and leases and other matters in-

volving the Commission shall be administered by such agency of the Government as the President may designate.

I reiterate "shall be administered by such agency of the Government as the President may designate." I think that is all very well, but what happens to the rights before the President designates the successor agency? The President can designate in the future but he is not required to. Suppose he does not; will the gentleman tell me what right of enforcement a small purchaser has? It is obvious the President is going to designate somebody or some agency.

Mr. YATES. Why is it so obvious? Has the gentleman anything to indicate that he will make the appointment?

Mr. BYRD. Does the gentleman have anything to indicate that he will not?

Mr. YATES. I have no indication that he will, and I know the Commission is going out of existence.

Mr. BYRD. I rather suspect that he will appoint somebody.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is entitled to his suspicions.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. YOUNGER. Do I understand you are advocating the sale to the second highest bidder? Is that the argument you are making?

Mr. YATES. No. The gentleman from Illinois is arguing for the rejection of all bids and throwing open the plant to competitive bidding again.

The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], pointed out what a great job the Commission had done in selling these plants last year for something like \$280 million. I love the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. I respect him and I revere him, but I most respectfully disagree with him. The Commission has never furnished the Congress of the United States with the data, with the earnings data, which would permit us to know the value of these facilities. It has never given us a valuation based on earnings. That is why I asked the Library of Congress to take the earnings of the Commission and fix such a valuation, one based upon a capitalization of earnings. This was done, using the Commission's own figures and a capitalization of 10 percent, which has been approved by the Commission. The companies exceeded the rated capacity last year. Using the figures of the Commission and the actual production figures, using the 10-year factor, we find instead of the price that the Commission accepted of approximately \$289 million for the 24 plants, the Library of Congress indicates that the worth of the synthetic rubber plants to be conservatively \$516,273,167—over a half billion dollars. This was in accordance with the estimate of Chairman CAPEHART, of the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate, when that matter was under consideration in 1953. Congressman Shafer, who was floor manager for the disposal bill in 1953, estimated they would be worth in excess of \$350 million. The estimate of the Library of Congress, based upon their earnings, is \$516,273,000. If that is their

value, can we say that the amount received was the full fair value?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Can the gentleman tell us who made that estimate? We tried to find out but nobody was able to tell us who he was.

Mr. YATES. I told the gentleman's committee yesterday who the people were that made that estimate.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No. You just told us a man that the Library Research Department picked out—an economist.

Mr. YATES. I told you the names of the people who computed these figures, and I shall place the computation in the RECORD. The calculation was automatic based on the figures submitted by the Commission.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Another thing I wanted to bring out is that you have continually referred to the fact that no fair value was ever properly estimated. You were at one time a member of the Illinois Public Utilities Commission?

Mr. YATES. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. And you know that when you tried to establish rates for electricity or gas or other utilities, the opinions as to value vary widely. For instance, I was in a lawsuit one time where land values varied from \$10 an acre to \$500 an acre. These determinations are merely matters of opinion; they are not scientific factual determinations.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman permit me to answer him?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Certainly.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is right about variances of valuation. But the Commission declared that it was following the congressional mandate to use earnings in determining the value of these properties, and that is all that this statement is based on, the earnings of the properties.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is not the only test.

Mr. YATES. I am telling the gentleman what the Commission did.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The gentleman knows that in appraisals the basis is entirely the opinion of the man who looks at the property, and opinions can vary widely.

Mr. YATES. That is true, but new basic data in this computation is the Commission's. Let me just finish my statement. The valuation I just gave to the House was based upon a price for rubber per pound of 23 cents—and that, Mr. Chairman, is after taxes. This is not before taxes; the \$516 million was the computation based on earnings after taxes.

If the price of synthetic rubber should go up from 23 cents, which is likely, if it should go up from 23 cents a pound to 24 cents a pound, the valuation jumps to \$605 million. If the price of synthetic rubber goes up to 30 cents a pound—and natural rubber right now is almost 50 cents a pound—the value would be over a billion dollars.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In my opinion that was just a wild guess of

some economist over there; that is my opinion.

Mr. YATES. Suppose the gentleman reserves his judgment until he examines the valuation in the RECORD tomorrow. I think the Library of Congress experts did a good job. However, the gentleman had every opportunity of calling these people before his committee and cross-examining them.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No.; we had no opportunity to interrogate them.

Mr. YATES. I gave the names to the gentleman's committee yesterday. They could have been called.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We had no chance to call the individual as we were completely occupied by the hearings.

*Synthetic rubber facilities computed net operating profit and capitalized value of facilities in 1955 under assumed conditions*

[All amounts are millions of dollars]

Price per pound and facilities for production of—	Computed net profit if all facilities operated at percent of assigned capacity <sup>1</sup>				Capitalized value of earnings <sup>2</sup> at 10 percent when facilities operated at—			
	80 percent	90 percent	100 percent	Annual rate May-December 1955	80 percent	90 percent	100 percent	Annual rate May-December 1955
<b>Copolymer:</b> <sup>3</sup>								
23 cents.....	16.31	18.35	20.39	24.57	163.1	183.5	203.9	245.7
24 cents.....	22.24	25.02	27.80	33.51	222.4	250.2	278.0	335.1
25 cents.....	28.18	31.70	35.22	42.44	281.8	317.0	352.2	424.4
26 cents.....	34.11	38.37	42.63	51.38	341.1	383.7	426.3	513.8
27 cents.....	40.04	45.04	50.05	60.31	400.4	450.4	500.5	603.1
28 cents.....	45.97	51.72	57.46	69.25	459.7	517.2	574.6	692.5
29 cents.....	51.90	58.39	64.88	78.18	519.0	583.9	648.8	781.8
30 cents.....	57.83	65.06	72.29	87.12	578.3	650.6	722.9	871.2
<b>Butadiene:</b> <sup>4</sup>								
14 cents.....	16.54	18.61	20.68	27.06	165.4	186.1	206.8	270.6
15 cents.....	21.02	23.65	26.28	34.39	210.2	236.5	262.8	343.9
16 cents.....	25.51	28.70	31.89	41.73	255.1	287.0	318.9	417.3
17 cents.....	29.99	33.74	37.49	49.07	299.9	337.4	374.9	490.7
18 cents.....	34.48	38.79	43.10	56.41	344.8	387.9	431.0	564.1
19 cents.....	38.96	43.84	48.71	63.74	389.6	438.4	487.1	637.4
20 cents.....	43.45	48.88	54.31	71.08	434.5	488.8	543.1	710.8
<b>Copolymer and butadiene:</b>								
14 and 23 cents.....	32.85	36.96	41.07	51.63	328.5	369.6	410.7	516.3
24 cents.....	38.78	43.63	48.48	60.57	387.8	436.3	484.8	605.7
25 cents.....	44.72	50.31	55.90	69.50	447.2	503.1	559.0	695.0
26 cents.....	50.65	56.98	63.31	78.44	506.5	569.8	633.1	784.4
27 cents.....	56.58	63.65	70.73	87.37	565.8	636.5	707.3	873.7
28 cents.....	62.51	70.33	78.14	96.31	625.1	703.3	781.4	963.1
29 cents.....	68.44	77.00	85.56	105.24	684.4	770.0	855.6	1,052.4
30 cents.....	74.37	83.67	92.97	114.18	743.7	836.7	929.7	1,141.8

<sup>1</sup> Net profit per pound of 1.32 cents per copolymer plant output and 1.77 cents per pound for butadiene were computed for estimated annual production near 80 percent, in data supplied to the House Committee on Armed Services by the Rubber Facilities Disposal Commission. Charges for depreciation, interest, and insurance, were based on the actual prices and terms at which the facilities were sold. A higher price for the facilities would increase these costs and reduce net income and capitalized value computed from net income. A higher rate of output would reduce these charges per unit of output and increase net income and capitalized value. The computed net profits and capitalized values included in this table were computed without attempting to make adjustments of depreciation and interest, or other overhead, and direct costs, to reflect costs when borne by private owners and operations at higher than estimated capacity rates.

<sup>2</sup> Computed as 10 times net profits shown in appropriate columns.

<sup>3</sup> Assigned annual capacity 689,600 long tons. Annual production estimated at time of sale, 540,466 long tons. Production at 80 percent of capacity, 551,680 long tons; at 90 percent, 620,640 long tons; at annual rate of May-December 1955, 831,000 long tons, or 120.5 percent of assigned capacity.

<sup>4</sup> Assigned annual capacity 584,000 short tons. Annual production estimated at time of sale, 494,000 short tons. Production at 80 percent of capacity, 467,200 short tons; at 90 percent, 525,600 short tons; at annual rate of May-December 1955, 764,300 short tons, or 130.9 percent of assigned capacity.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has consumed 56 minutes.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, I was the author of H. R. 7301, the bill which became Public Law 336 last year, and which provided for sale of the Institute facility. Plancor 980 is located in my congressional district, a district which is a labor distress areas.

A few months ago the widely circulated U. S. News & World Report presented an article entitled "Where Jobs Are Hardest To Get." In that article it was said that the national average was

Mr. YATES. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I offer the following recommendations:

That the sale of the Institute plant to Goodrich-Gulf be set aside.

That new legislation be passed promptly authorizing the Commission to take new bids.

That the Commission should not go out of existence until the rights of small business shall have been protected by enforceable agreements signed by the facility purchasers with a permanent Government agency which will assure that small business shall receive a fair share of the synthetic rubber at a fair price.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully urge the House to support my resolution.

icals, Inc. The Commission's report has properly been submitted to the Attorney General of the United States and to the Congress. Today, we have before us a resolution which would disapprove the sale. This matter, I believe, has been rather adequately covered already. You have heard the pros and cons. At the risk of repetition, however, I would like briefly to emphasize a few of the salient facts about this sale before you vote on the resolution introduced by my friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois.

The bid submitted by Goodrich-Gulf was, in the words of the Commission, the only bid representing full fair value. On the chart here before you I have shown a bar representing the price offered by Goodrich-Gulf, the amount of \$11 million being the high bid.

Some question has been raised as to who is to say what is full fair value? My answer to that would be, that the Commission was created to do this under the law. That was one of the functions which the Commission was expected to perform. Certainly on the basis of the past sales consummated by the Commission, upon the basis of experience, and with all of the pertinent facts and figures possessed by the Commission, the Commission was in a most advantageous position, better than any of the rest of us, to determine just what full fair value would be.

The second highest bid, as you can see here, was the \$5.8 million offered by Edwin W. Pauley.

One of the criteria which governed the disposal of these plants was that the sale should best foster the development of a competitive industry. I do not need to tell you that for the Commission to have negotiated a sale to this firm would have meant in reality a Government subsidy, and would have given this firm a competitive advantage over other producers. It would not have best fostered a competitive industry. So the Commission determined that the Goodrich-Gulf offer was the only bid which represented full fair value and which would, at the same time, best serve to strengthen competition in the synthetic-rubber industry.

A question has also been raised as to why the Commission proceeded to negotiate from a figure of \$9 million. I quote from the original disposal act, section 16, which says:

In arriving at its recommendation for the disposal of the facilities, the commission shall use as the basis for negotiating the sale of each facility the highest amount proposed to be paid upon each facility.

Goodrich-Gulf proposed to pay \$9 million. According to the law, then, the Commission should use as the basis for negotiating the sale the highest amount proposed.

There are some who say that to sell this plant to Goodrich-Gulf would be to contribute to the creation of a monopoly. I realize that the Attorney General stated in his findings that with Institute Goodrich-Gulf would possess 25.2 percent of the total capacity of synthetic rubber production, but the Attorney General went on to state that this figure did not take into account the publicly announced

a fraction more than 1 jobless area per State, but West Virginia was shown as having 13 labor distress areas.

Only last month out of a total population of less than 2 million people, 208,660 of my fellow West Virginians kept body and soul together by virtue of their receiving Government surplus commodities. The sale of the plant at Institute, W. Va., therefore means something in terms of jobs and food and clothing to the people of my State.

The Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission in accordance with the terms of the law proceeded last fall to negotiate a contract of sale of the Institute plant to Goodrich Gulf Chem-

expansions of competitors. He admitted it in his statement of findings. Many of these competitors have already spent money to expand their plants. They have announced plans for further expansion. So, in order to see just where Goodrich-Gulf will rank among the various synthetic rubber plants, we should in all fairness project our figures into the future to such a time as all competitors will have completed their plans of expansion and to the time when all three lines of the Institute facility will have begun operating.

The Institute facility has 3 units each capable of producing 41,000 long tons. Because of the shortage of butadiene, which is the major raw component of synthetic rubber, it will be impossible for Goodrich-Gulf to operate more than one line of the Institute plant until approximately 18 months hence. Then, how can we say that this company will be in a position of producing one-fourth of all the synthetic rubber in the United States when it will not be able to get but one line into operation for a period of approximately 18 months, at which time the expansions of competitors will have been finalized, and which expansions will necessarily reduce the ratio of Goodrich-Gulf production as compared to that of other competing firms. On the accompanying chart here, you see the maximum percentage of rubber which Goodrich-Gulf will ultimately be able to produce as being 19.9 percent. The next closest producer will be Firestone, with 17.4 percent. There will be a difference between the two top producers of 2.5 percent.

Now, bear in mind that this chart does not take cognizance of the fact that the Shell Co. has announced plans to materially expand its plant. As yet it has submitted no figures as to the extent of expansion it intends to carry out, but, we can rest assured that any expansion by Shell will again serve to materially reduce the percentages of all other competitors including Goodrich-Gulf.

So I repeat that after all planned expansion has taken place, Goodrich-Gulf will produce only 2.5 percent more synthetic rubber than will the nearest competitor, Firestone, and yet following the first disposals in April of 1955, Firestone possessed 18.8 percent of the total capacity, which was 2.2 percent greater than its closest competitor, Goodyear, yet, at that time, mind you, not one question was raised by the Congress or the Commission or the Attorney General about Firestone's possessing 18.8 percent of the total capacity, but now that Goodrich-Gulf is going to possess 1.1 percent more capacity than did Firestone after the first disposals, a lot of people have raised their eyebrows.

Mr. Chairman, Goodrich-Gulf has committed itself to supply small businesses with 50 percent, or 21,000 long tons, of the production of the first line at Institute. The Commission stated that this was the highest commitment made by any bidder on the Institute facilities. Goodrich-Gulf also has committed itself publicly and before congressional committees and to the Commission that it will supply 67 percent of the total

output of the Institute facility to small businesses.

Now let us just take a look at the performance of companies which have committed themselves to supplying small businesses.

Let me say parenthetically that Goodrich-Gulf, when it purchased the Fort Natchez plant last year made a commitment to supply small business with 15,000 long tons of synthetic rubber. What does the record show? It shows that Goodrich-Gulf has actually supplied 19,000 long tons to small business. The total overall commitments at the close of the first disposals in April of last year amounted to 106,739 long tons. Let us see what the record of performance shows. There has been some doubt as to the ability or the intention of these producers to supply small businesses with rubber in the amounts committed. The actual performance is shown in this line of the chart. Total sales amount to 144,731 long tons. I would say that this is a performance which would inspire public confidence in the rubber producers of this country.

We now reach the final chart and it raises two questions about Institute: Loss or profit? As it now stands, Institute is costing the Government of the United States \$240,000 a year to maintain in standby. The Federal, State, and local governments are not collecting taxes from that plant. Are we going to continue to let this plant deteriorate? Are we going to continue to let it be a dead horse costing the taxpayers \$240,000 a year?

On the other side of the chart we find this. If this plant is reactivated, it will mean the immediate employment of about 300 men. My colleague from Illinois [Mr. YATES] said that we will be buying a pig in a poke. I should like to say this. The gentleman raised the point that the plant would only be operating one line. But while that one line is operating, remember this; Goodrich-Gulf is going to spend \$6 million modernizing this plant, which will mean additional employment, which will also mean additional purchasing power and a more stable economy in West Virginia. And instead of the Government paying out \$240,000 a year, the Government will be a partner in this enterprise. It will be collecting 52 percent of the profits in taxes plus the income taxes from men employed. Not only will the Federal Government be collecting taxes, but the State and local governments will be collecting money in taxes. Moreover, once the institute plant begins operating, it will encourage the location of additional industries in the area. And finally let me say that the reactivation of this plant is in the best interests of national security. Is it not in accord with the military policy of this country to disperse vital industries? This plant is located a long distance away from the synthetic rubber producing plants which are situated in the gulf coast area. I say that we today should take the necessary action to insure the reactivation of this plant by a company which is an experienced and capable producer of synthetic rubber, that it might proceed with modernizing the plant and begin placing

into the hands of the consuming public synthetic rubber.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I should like to ask the gentleman, inasmuch as this plant is located in his congressional district, is there any opposition locally to the sale of this plant to the Goodrich-Gulf Co.?

Mr. BYRD. I am delighted that my colleague asked that question. There is no opposition. All of West Virginia looks today to the Congress of the United States to make possible the reactivation of this plant.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. May I say further to the gentleman that I have listened to every word of his speech. I think he has presented a very, very strong argument in favor of the ratification of the sale and the voting down today of this resolution.

It strikes me that on the one hand we have a plant that is going to pieces gradually, that is not earning anything; you have people out of work and needing jobs. On the other hand you have an opportunity to sell this plant at a very good price, apparently. It will put people to work, give them jobs, and put this property back on the tax rolls. The locality, too, will profit from a growing industry. If you accept that and put that plant back into operation by selling it to private industry, you still retain the anti-monopoly powers of the Government, and you can still go in there at a later date in the event some monopoly practice materializes we do not see today and break it up by the proper and vigorous enforcement of the antimonopoly laws of the country.

Mr. BYRD. I thank my colleague for his comment. I agree with him.

In closing, may I say that I congratulate and commend the Rubber Facilities Disposal Commission on its good work in disposing of these plants. I also wish to thank the others of the West Virginia delegation in the House and Senate and the members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs for their wonderful assistance in this matter. The Governor of West Virginia has assisted too. I am very much indebted to Congressman VINSON particularly. I must compliment Congressman YATES on his sincerity of purpose. In conclusion, I ask the Members of Congress to vote "no" on this resolution. A "no" vote means the reactivation of the Institute plant at Institute, W. Va., and jobs for my fellow West Virginians.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, most of my colleagues in the House are well aware that the economy of the State of West Virginia is far below the level of the economy of the Nation as a whole. I am interested in this legislation because of the boost it will mean to West Virginia's economy. There is involved the possibility of some 800 jobs. No State in the Union needs jobs for its workmen more than West Virginia does. I am going to be selfish in my approach.



Let me remind you that if this resolution is disapproved and the sale is permitted to go through the Government will receive a greater percentage of its original investment than it has received in the sale of any 1 of the more than 20 rubber plants that have been disposed of. The Government will relieve itself of the maintenance cost of \$240,000 a year. The city of Charleston and the county of Kanawha will be able to acquire, when the title from the Federal Government is passed into the hands of the Goodrich-Gulf people, an assessed valuation of some \$10 or \$12 million, which will help materially in defraying the costs of the local and county governments, a burden that plant should help share at the present time but which it is not sharing because the title is in the Federal Government.

Again, let me say to you and to the members of this committee that disapproved the resolution offered by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that I think the committee acted wisely, and I want to commend them. That same committee, the Committee on Armed Services, in allocating several billion dollars worth of Federal installations some few years ago, overlooked the State of West Virginia completely. It is the only one of the 48 States that did not receive some kind of Federal defense facility. Here is an opportunity for the Congress to do something that will help to relieve the economic situation and the unemployment situation which is still rampant in the State of West Virginia. Some 62,000 men and women are still unemployed.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the Yates resolution and approve the sale of this property, as provided in the original bill offered by my distinguished colleague [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. In that event the vote would be "no"; is that right?

Mr. BAILEY. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume within the time remaining.

Mr. Chairman, I want first to congratulate and commend my good friend, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] upon the very splendid presentation he has made in support of his position in this debate. Throughout the debate he has demonstrated real ability, a very fine spirit and a thorough grasp of the problems involved. I know that his motives are of the highest in seeking to have the sale approved.

I want, too, to thank the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] for the very gracious and very courteous hearing that he gave me yesterday before his committee and for the exceedingly generous manner in which he has treated me at all times.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I want only again to urge the House to consider the effect that

this sale will have upon one of the major industries of the country and upon the Nation's economy. If the members believe that this sale will tend to promote monopoly in the synthetic rubber industry, I believe they should support my resolution. I urge them to support my resolution.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], a member of the Committee on Armed Services, to close the debate.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, many in this room recall the 7th of December 1941. Many in this room recall that shortly thereafter there was great concern in America as to whether or not we would have sufficient rubber to support our defense effort. I recall people advising us to take the rubber mats out of our automobiles. Others advocated turning in our hot-water bottles. I recall that automobile tires were rationed. Why? Because this Congress and the people of America were very much concerned and distressed as to whether or not we would be able to have sufficient rubber to carry on the war successfully. Then, I also recall we had here shortly after Pearl Harbor the Guayule bill to get rubber from the Guayule plant which was brought out by the Committee on Agriculture. We passed that bill. Whatever happened to it, I do not recall. But, shortly thereafter, there were exhibits in the caucus room here and in hotels put on by the petroleum industry and the alcohol industry to show the Members what could be done in the way of synthetic rubber being made from those products with the result that eventually a total of 28 plants was built throughout the United States for the manufacture of various kinds of synthetic rubber such as the butadiene plants and copolymer plants and so forth. Today we are concerned with the disposal of the last of those plants, the copolymer plant.

At this point, I want to pay tribute to the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services and to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and our former chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], for the help and support they gave to this subcommittee which worked long and arduously to get a bill to provide for a commission to sell these plants to the advantage of the Government of the United States and get them back to private industry. I also wish to compliment and pay tribute to some of the staff members who worked with this subcommittee, particularly Mr. Smart and Mr. Blandford. I think they have done a magnificent job for the American people and for the taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a couple of observations. In my district, north of Des Moines, we had built during the war a small-arms factory making small-arms ammunition for the war effort. After the war was over, it was declared surplus and eventually sold by the General Services Administration. To whom? To the United States Rubber Co. For how much? For about 10 cents on the dollar of the original cost. There

is no provision that the United States Rubber Co. protects small business or that it provide a certain amount of rubber for the country in the case of another war effort. Let me take you to San Diego, Calif. We had a plant out there that cost about \$12,500,000 to build. It was declared surplus and was sold to the highest bidder for \$1,050,000. It was not long before this bidder resold 15 percent of it for about \$3 million. The Korean war came on and we had to get it back, and the owner asked \$15 million for the remainder. During a war we have to pay a lot, and then we sell at a loss.

Not so in these rubber-disposal plants. This Commission, appointed by the President under authorization of the Congress, has gotten back almost 100 cents on the dollar for these plants. For the actual sale against the actual cost it would be over 50 percent as compared with the average of all of about 10 percent. I do not see how we can possibly vote for this resolution and throw this back, in face of that record.

This Commission had three objectives when it started out, after its appointment by the President. One was to get as good a price for these plants as possible. The second was to see that small business would get its share of the rubber; and, third, that there would be sufficient rubber produced in those plants that in the event of another war we would not be caught short. In each and every contract there is a guaranty that a certain amount of long tons of rubber will be produced continuously, so that in case of another war or emergency we will not have a shortage of rubber for our forces.

In addition to that, in this particular sale, 67 percent of the long tons to be manufactured at the Charleston, W. Va., plant will be allocated to small business, and percentages similar to that throughout the sale of all these plants has been provided for. I do not see how any Commission could have done a better job for the security of America, for the taxpayers, and for all concerned, including small business, than this Commission has done.

In conclusion I ask you to vote against this resolution. I want to congratulate everyone who had anything to do with the sale of these plants.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives does not favor sale of the Institute, W. Va., copolymer plant, Plancor 980, as recommended in the report of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the resolution back to the House with the recommendation that it be not agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WILLIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Resolution 396, had directed him to re-

port the same back to the House with the recommendation that it be not agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 61, nays 310, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—61

- |             |               |              |
|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| Addonizio   | Fernandez     | Metcalf      |
| Anfuso      | Fogarty       | Multer       |
| Ashley      | Forand        | Murray, III. |
| Aspinall    | Friedel       | O'Hara, Ill. |
| Bolling     | Garmatz       | O'Neill      |
| Boyle       | Gordon        | Patman       |
| Burdick     | Granahan      | Perkins      |
| Byrne, Pa.  | Gray          | Pfost        |
| Cannon      | Green, Pa.    | Polk         |
| Carnahan    | Heseltun      | Powell       |
| Celler      | Johnson, Wis. | Price        |
| Christopher | Jones, Ala.   | Rhodes, Pa.  |
| Chudoff     | Karsten       | Rodino       |
| Davidson    | Kelly, N. Y.  | Rogers, Tex. |
| Delaney     | Keogh         | Sisk         |
| Denton      | Klein         | Sullivan     |
| Dollinger   | Kluczynski    | Wier         |
| Elliott     | Lanham        | Yates        |
| Engle       | Mack, Ill.    | Zelenko      |
| Evins       | Magnuson      |              |
| Felghan     | Marshall      |              |

NAYS—310

- |                |               |                 |
|----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Abbt           | Cole          | Harris          |
| Abernethy      | Cooler        | Harrison, Nebr. |
| Adair          | Cooley        | Harrison, Va.   |
| Albert         | Coon          | Harvey          |
| Alexander      | Cooper        | Hayworth        |
| Alger          | Corbett       | Hébert          |
| Allen, Calif.  | Cretella      | Henderson       |
| Allen, Ill.    | Crumpacker    | Herlong         |
| Andersen,      | Cunningham    | Hess            |
| H. Carl        | Curtis, Mo.   | Hiestand        |
| Andresen,      | Dague         | Hill            |
| August H.      | Davis, Ga.    | Hillings        |
| Andrews        | Davis, Wis.   | Hinschaw        |
| Arends         | Dawson, Utah  | Hoeven          |
| Ashmore        | Dempsey       | Hoffman, Mich.  |
| Auchincloss    | Derounian     | Hollifield      |
| Avery          | Devereux      | Holland         |
| Ayres          | Dies          | Holmes          |
| Bailey         | Diggs         | Hope            |
| Baker          | Dingell       | Horan           |
| Baldwin        | Dixon         | Hosmer          |
| Bass, N. H.    | Dolliver      | Huddleston      |
| Bass, Tenn.    | Dondero       | Hull            |
| Bates          | Donohue       | Hyde            |
| Baumhart       | Donovan       | Ikard           |
| Becker         | Dorn, N. Y.   | Jackson         |
| Belcher        | Dorn, S. C.   | Jarman          |
| Bennett, Fla.  | Dowdy         | Jenkins         |
| Bennett, Mich. | Doyle         | Jennings        |
| Berry          | Durham        | Jensen          |
| Betts          | Edmonson      | Johnson         |
| Blatnik        | Ellsworth     | Johnson, Calif. |
| Blich          | Fallon        | Jones, Mo.      |
| Boggs          | Fascell       | Jones, N. C.    |
| Boland         | Fenton        | Kean            |
| Bolton,        | Fino          | Kearney         |
| Frances P.     | Fjare         | Kearns          |
| Bonner         | Flood         | Keating         |
| Bosch          | Flynt         | Kee             |
| Bow            | Ford          | Kelley, Pa.     |
| Boykin         | Forrester     | Kilburn         |
| Bray           | Fountain      | Kilday          |
| Brooks, La.    | Frazier       | Kilgore         |
| Brooks, Tex.   | Frelinghuysen | King, Calif.    |
| Brown, Ga.     | Fulton        | Kirwan          |
| Brown, Ohio    | Gary          | Knox            |
| Broyhill       | Gathings      | Krueger         |
| Budge          | Gavin         | Laird           |
| Burleson       | Gentry        | Landrum         |
| Burnside       | George        | Lane            |
| Bush           | Grant         | Lankford        |
| Byrd           | Gregory       | LeCompte        |
| Byrnes, Wis.   | Griffiths     | Lesinski        |
| Carlyle        | Gross         | Lipscomb        |
| Carrigg        | Gwinn         | Long            |
| Cederberg      | Hale          | Lovre           |
| Chelf          | Haley         | McConnell       |
| Chenoweth      | Halleck       | McCormack       |
| Church         | Hand          | McCulloch       |
| Clark          | Harden        | McDonough       |
| Clevenger      | Hardy         | McDowell        |

- |                |               |                 |
|----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| McGregor       | Radwan        | Talle           |
| McIntire       | Rains         | Taylor          |
| McMillan       | Ray           | Teague, Calif.  |
| McVey          | Reece, Tenn.  | Teague, Tex.    |
| Macdonald      | Rees, Kans.   | Thomas          |
| Mackrowicz     | Reuss         | Thompson, La.   |
| Madden         | Rhodes, Ariz. | Thompson,       |
| Mahon          | Richards      | Mich.           |
| Mason          | Riehman       | Thompson, N. J. |
| Matthews       | Elley         | Thompson, Tex.  |
| Meador         | Rivers        | Thomson, Wyo.   |
| Merrow         | Roberts       | Thornberry      |
| Miller, Calif. | Robeson, Va.  | Tollefson       |
| Miller, Md.    | Robson, Ky.   | Trimble         |
| Miller, Nebr.  | Rogers, Colo. | Tuck            |
| Miller, N. Y.  | Rogers, Fla.  | Udall           |
| Mills          | Rogers, Mass. | Utt             |
| Minshall       | Roosevelt     | Vanik           |
| Morgan         | Rutherford    | Van Pelt        |
| Moulder        | St. George    | Van Zandt       |
| Mumma          | Saylor        | Velde           |
| Murray, Tenn.  | Schenck       | Vinson          |
| Natcher        | Scherer       | Wainwright      |
| Nelson         | Scott         | Watts           |
| Nicholson      | Scrivner      | Weaver          |
| Norrell        | Scudder       | Westland        |
| O'Brien, N. Y. | Seely-Brown   | Wharton         |
| O'Hara, Minn.  | Selden        | Whitten         |
| O'Konski       | Sheehan       | Wickersham      |
| Osmers         | Sheppard      | Widnall         |
| Ostertag       | Short         | Wieglesworth    |
| Passman        | Shuford       | Williams, Miss. |
| Pelly          | Sieminski     | Williams, N. J. |
| Phillips       | Sikes         | Williams, N. Y. |
| Pilcher        | Siler         | Willis          |
| Poage          | Simpson, Ill. | Wilson, Calif.  |
| Poff           | Simpson, Pa.  | Wilson, Ind.    |
| Preston        | Smith, Kans.  | Winstead        |
| Priest         | Smith, Miss.  | Withrow         |
| Prouty         | Smith, Wis.   | Wright          |
| Quigley        | Springer      | Young           |
| Rabaut         | Staggers      | Younger         |
|                | Steed         | Zablocki        |
|                | Taber         |                 |

NOT VOTING—63

- |               |               |               |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Barden        | Eberharter    | Mollohan      |
| Barrett       | Fisher        | Morano        |
| Beamer        | Gamble        | Morrison      |
| Bell          | Green, Ore.   | Norblad       |
| Bentley       | Gubser        | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Bolton,       | Hagen         | Patterson     |
| Oliver P.     | Hays, Ark.    | Pillion       |
| Bowler        | Hays, Ohio    | Reed, Ill.    |
| Brownson      | Hoffman, Ill. | Reed, N. Y.   |
| Buckley       | Holt          | Rooney        |
| Canfield      | Holtzman      | Sadlak        |
| Chase         | James         | Schwengel     |
| Chatham       | Jonas         | Shelley       |
| Chiferfield   | Judd          | Smith, Va.    |
| Coudert       | King, Pa.     | Spence        |
| Cramer        | Knutson       | Tumulty       |
| Curtis, Mass. | Latham        | Vorys         |
| Davis, Tenn.  | McCarthy      | Vursell       |
| Dawson, Ill.  | Mack, Wash.   | Walter        |
| Deane         | Maillard      | Wolcott       |
| Dodd          | Martin        | Wolverton     |

So the resolution was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

- Mr. O'Brien of Illinois for, with Mr. Mollohan against.
- Mr. Barrett for, with Mrs. Green of Oregon against.
- Mr. Eberharter for, with Mr. Wolverton against.
- Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Shelley against.
- Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Morrison against.
- Mr. Rooney for, with Mr. Hays of Arkansas against.
- Mr. Bowler for, with Mr. Coudert against.
- Mr. Dawson for, with Mr. Jonas against.
- Mr. Dodd for, with Mr. Bentley against.
- Mr. Holtzman for, with Mr. Beamer against.
- Mr. Tumulty for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.

Until further notice:

- Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Martin.
- Mr. Barden with Mr. James.
- Mr. Bell with Mr. Cramer.
- Mr. Chatham with Mr. Canfield.
- Mr. Deane with Mr. Reed of New York.
- Mr. Fisher with Mr. Chiferfield.
- Mr. Hagen with Mr. Sadlak.
- Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Latham.
- Mrs. Knutson with Mr. Judd.

Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Norblad.  
Mr. Spence with Mr. Morano.

Mr. BOYLE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, rejection of House Resolution 396, just voted by this House, has the effect of approving sale of the Institute, W. Va., copolymer plant to private industry, thereby virtually completing the synthetic rubber disposal program.

I cannot permit this occasion to pass without paying tribute to my distinguished and beloved predecessor, the late Congressman Paul W. Shafer, who was author of both the Synthetic Rubber Act of 1948 and the Synthetic Rubber Disposal Act of 1953.

Today's action by this House is a summation of the wisdom and labors which he devoted to this problem. I wish, as I know do the Members who served as his colleagues, that he might have been privileged to be here and share in this accomplishment.

It was the Synthetic Rubber Act of 1948 which assured continued operation by the Government of the synthetic rubber plants at a time when there was a real danger that the synthetic rubber industry, under the auspices of either Government or private enterprise, would not survive. It was this legislation which gave the Nation the supply of synthetic rubber urgently needed when the Korean attack occurred 2 years later.

As a firm believer in private enterprise, it was Mr. Shafer's earnest hope that this important segment of American industry would ultimately take its place as a part of the private enterprise system, albeit with adequate safeguards for the interests of national security, a reasonable return to the Government of its investment of tax dollars, adequate safeguards against monopoly abuses and adequate protection for small business.

Congressman Shafer accordingly welcomed the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Congress on a proposal for disposal to private industry of Government-owned rubber producing facilities submitted early in 1953. He welcomed this program and he welcomed the support given to this program by President Eisenhower.

A year after the enactment of the Synthetic Rubber Disposal Act of 1953, Congressman Shafer, speaking on the floor of the House March 30, 1954, paid tribute to the work of the Commission appointed by the President to take bids and negotiate for the sale of the Government-owned synthetic rubber plants.

Mr. Shafer at that time and in the face of some passing indications of apathy toward the program within the rubber industry, made this statement:

I believe there are enough people in private industry in this Nation who have confidence in the future of America to buy these plants at a fair price. I think \* \* \* that there are many companies in this country who are willing to invest in the future of America.

I am sure that were he here today, the late Congressman Shafer would regard the approval given to this and previous

disposal recommendations as a most gratifying vindication of his faith.

Since he could not be here I was proud to be able, by voting against House Resolution 396, to express the satisfaction I feel, and which I am sure he would have shared, over the accomplishments of the House Committee on Armed Services and the Disposal Commission.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the resolution just under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

#### ORGANIZATION FOR TRADE COOPERATION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point and include extraneous matter in two instances.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, on April 14, 1955, during the first session of the 84th Congress, I introduced legislation, H. R. 5550, which would authorize United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation. I introduced this legislation as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, at the request of the administration.

I have recently received a letter from the President of the United States urging the enactment of this legislation. For the information of the Members of the Congress and other interested persons, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD the letter which I received from the President and a memorandum prepared for the Cabinet by the Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, pertaining to the Organization for Trade Cooperation:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, January 19, 1956.

The Honorable JERE COOPER,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COOPER: You will recall that on December 30, at the bipartisan meeting, I asked that every person present be supplied with a memorandum on the Organization for Trade Cooperation. I enclose a paper prepared for the Cabinet by Secretary Weeks which, in my judgment, tells the OTC story about as briefly as it can be told.

When last July you advised me of your plan to hold hearings on the OTC early in this session, you said that enactment of this legislation is of "vital importance to the continued expansion of markets for our products abroad." This description of our need for OTC is still accurate but this legislation is even more essential today, now that the Soviets have stepped up their activities on the economic front. Not only would the OTC maximize benefits from reciprocal trade agreements for American industry, agriculture, and labor; it would also advance our efforts to strengthen the free world.

The administration will cooperate fully with you in bringing this matter to hearings and in moving it through the Congress as promptly as possible.

With kind regard,  
Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington.

Memorandum for the Cabinet.

#### THE FACTS ABOUT THE OTC: THE ORGANIZATION FOR TRADE COOPERATION

##### I. WHAT IS OTC?

The OTC would be an organization composed of government representatives from 35 countries, including the major trading nations of the world.

Its major job would be to administer the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, in which the United States has participated for a number of years.

H. R. 5550 would authorize the United States to join the proposed OTC.

##### II. WHAT OTC CANNOT DO

OTC would be exclusively an administrative organization. It could not add to United States obligations under the General Agreement. It could not abridge the powers of the Congress with respect to customs and import duties. It could not make tariff concessions or modify in any way the United States tariff structure.

OTC would not be supranational in any respect. It could not impose obligations on its members. Its method would be persuasion. It could not impair in any way the sovereignty of the United States.

##### III. NEED FOR OTC

OTC, by attacking measures which discriminate against United States exports and limit the benefits of tariff concessions made to us, would help make our trade agreements truly reciprocal and would facilitate expanding markets abroad for United States industry and agriculture.

Today the General Agreement has no regular administrative machinery. Its business can be conducted, therefore, only at intermittent conferences—this time loss and inefficiency is hurtful to all participating nations. For example, in April 1954 France specially taxes imports from the United States and other countries. With OTC the United States could have had prompt action—without it we had to wait for nearly a year until the cumbersome ad hoc machinery of the General Agreement could be brought to bear on the problem.

OTC is therefore indispensable if we are to resolve currently the many issues constantly arising in day-to-day trade among nations.

OTC would also provide a forum for discussion and solution of other world trade problems, each government remaining entirely free to adopt or reject OTC recommendations.

OTC would also have the important function of assembling and publishing valuable data on worldwide trade movements and trends.

##### IV. OTC WOULD INCREASE UNITED STATES BENEFITS FROM THE GENERAL AGREEMENT

Today a number of political, military, and financial groupings strengthen the free world and advance American interests abroad. Among these are: NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization), SEATO (Southeast Asia Treaty Organization), IMF (International Monetary Fund), IBRD (International Bank for Reconstruction and Development).

Each of these international agreements has an administrative organization to make it effective. The general agreement does not and, therefore, is reduced in value to the United States and every other participating nation. With Soviet economic activities on the increase, the United States must

strengthen its cooperation with free nations in the trade field. OTC is essential to this end.

##### V. UNITED STATES GAINS FROM THE GENERAL AGREEMENT

The general agreement is a multilateral trade agreement among 35 trading nations, including the United States. It is the principal instrument for promoting internationally those trade policies which have been the United States own objectives for many years.

The one major difference between the general agreement and United States policy was eliminated in 1955 when the participating countries gave the United States a broad waiver to impose import quotas unilaterally on agricultural products as required by our domestic agricultural laws.

Under the general agreement many reciprocal tariff reductions have been negotiated and the benefits guaranteed to all members including the United States.

The general agreement encourages the abolition of quotas and import licenses injurious to American enterprise. Between 1953 and 1955, 14 Western European countries removed quantitative restrictions on more than 60 percent of dollar imports.

Through the general agreement, Belgian and German restrictions on imports of United States coal have been almost entirely eliminated, rapidly expanding our coal exports. Previous bilateral discussions between the United States and these countries had failed to accomplish this reduction.

Through mediation under the general agreement international commercial disputes such as one between India and Pakistan involving jute and coal have been amicably settled.

Closer trade cooperation among members of the general agreement has strengthened the western alliance.

##### VI. SUMMARY

A. The United States has been party to the general agreement for 8 years.

B. The OTC, the agreement's administrative organization, is absolutely essential if United States agriculture, labor, and industry are to receive maximum benefits from the general agreement.

C. OTC could not reduce United States tariffs, increase United States obligations under the general agreement, or impair United States sovereignty in any way.

D. Adoption of H. R. 5550 authorizing United States participation in the OTC is in the national interest.

SINCLAIR WEEKS.

#### HIGHWAY REVENUE ACT OF 1956

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, I announced the day before yesterday that the committee would begin public hearings on Wednesday, February 15, 1956, on the Highway Act of 1956 (H. R. 9075) introduced by my committee colleague, the Honorable HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, who served as chairman of the subcommittee on this subject during the last session of Congress.

In announcing these hearings I issued a press release so that interested persons could be informed as to the procedure that may be followed by the committee in conducting these hearings.

The distinguished gentleman from Louisiana also issued a press release with respect to his bill, the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (H. R. 9075).

So that the Members of Congress and other persons who may be interested in this legislation may have the information contained in these two press re-

leases, I request that they be printed at this point in the RECORD:

HONORABLE JERE COOPER, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, ANNOUNCES PUBLIC HEARINGS ON THE HIGHWAY REVENUE ACT OF 1956 (H. R. 9075)

The Honorable JERE COOPER, chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, today announced that the committee would hold public hearings on the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, H. R. 9075, introduced by the Honorable HALE BOGGS, Democrat, Louisiana. This legislation would provide for raising the necessary Federal revenues to finance the proposed new Federal highway program.

The hearings will begin on Wednesday, February 15, 1956, and it is hoped that they can be concluded by Tuesday, February 21, 1956.

Chairman COOPER announced that the hearings will not be limited solely to the revenue sources described in the bill. Comments from witnesses are also desired on other possible revenue sources which witnesses may feel will warrant Committee consideration.

The bill introduced by Mr. Boggs would raise (1) the present 2 cents a gallon tax on gasoline to 3 cents; (2) the present 2 cents a gallon taxes on diesel fuel and special motor fuels to 3 cents; (3) the present 5 cents a pound tax on tires to 8 cents; (4) the present 8 percent tax on trucks, trailers, and buses to 10 percent; and (5) provide a 3 cents per pound tax on camelback or retread rubber.

The rates of increase for the taxes described above are fixed in the interest of obtaining a free exchange of views on what these rates should be from witnesses appearing before the Committee on Ways and Means. The items on which increases are proposed by the Boggs bill would be temporary increases, effective for only the period in which the proposed highway bill would be in effect. The termination dates for the new rates are fixed at July 1, 1971 under the bill.

The Boggs bill would impose the tax increases described above only with respect to highway vehicles. In addition, it provides a special exemption in the case of the gasoline, diesel and special-motor-fuels taxes for municipal and other local transportation systems.

It is estimated that the proposed new road program, together with the existing highway program (for other than Federal domain roads such as those in the national parks) will cost approximately \$35 billion over the next 15 years. Existing highway-use taxes, namely, those on gasoline, diesel and special motor fuels, and tires and tubes are expected to raise approximately \$22 billion over the same period. The Boggs bill would raise about \$12 billion in additional revenues over the next 15 years to make the highway program self-financing.

Persons desiring to testify on the legislation may arrange to do so by submitting a written request to the clerk of the Committee on Ways and Means, room 1102, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C., by Monday, February 13, 1956. It is desired that to the maximum extent possible interested groups designate one representative as spokesman for an industry or association. The chairman has instructed the clerk to receive prepared statements (in triplicate) from persons who desire to have a statement included in the printed record of the hearings in lieu of a personal appearance. Such statements for inclusion in the record must be received in the committee office not later than February 25, 1956.

Pursuant to the usual committee practice, it is requested that each witness furnish the clerk with 50 copies of his prepared testimony for the use of the committee, 24 hours in advance of his scheduled appearance.

Witnesses who desire to have their prepared statements distributed to the press should furnish the clerk with an additional 50 copies for this purpose.

HON. HALE BOGGS, DEMOCRAT, LOUISIANA, MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, ANNOUNCES THE INTRODUCTION OF THE HIGHWAY REVENUE ACT OF 1956 (H. R. 9075)

The Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (H. R. 9075) which I have introduced today seeks to provide the framework for the additional revenues required for a pay-as-you-go national roadbuilding program.

The bill which will be considered by the full Committee on Ways and Means at public hearings beginning Wednesday, February 15, 1956, supplements the Fallon bill now being considered by the Committee on Public Works, and is the result of intensive studies on the part of the Ways and Means Committee staff, working with the staffs of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the Treasury Department, and the Bureau of Public Roads.

This legislation will set aside for highway purposes all of the revenues now derived from gasoline, diesel fuel, special motor fuels, and tires and inner tubes. This represents a vast increase in the present approximately \$700 million per annum from these sources now being used for highway purposes.

Over the 15-year period of the program, it is estimated that almost \$22 billion of the approximately \$35 billion required will be derived from existing revenues.

We have after much study written in exemptions from the proposed increase in taxes. These exemptions would include bus transportation systems operated within metropolitan areas, fuels and tires which are used on vehicles which are not highway vehicles, and the farmers' exemption provided for in legislation recently passed by the House of Representatives.

Every study indicates the tremendous need for the proposed highway program, both from

the point of view of the economic development and security of the Nation.

The Congress last year rejected the bond proposal which carried estimated interest charges of about \$11 billion. The pay-as-you-go program will save these enormous costs to the American people. Actually, the additional revenues which would be produced by my bill are only about \$1 billion more than this interest item alone would have been.

The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, in its report to the President on June 20, 1955, recommended that the interstate highway system be financed on a pay-as-you-go basis and that the Congress provide additional revenues for this purpose primarily from increased motor-fuel taxes. As stated by the Commission, increased taxes are preferable to deficit financing as a means of supporting larger highway outlays by the National Government, because deficit financing would result in high interest charges and shift the burden of payment to citizens of a future generation who will have continuing highway and other governmental responsibilities of their own to finance.

It is understood that the President, after a conference with the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Republican, of Massachusetts, House Republican leader, has decided to abandon his plan for issuing bonds as a means of financing the highway program, and that the President now approves and supports the proposed pay-as-you-go method of financing, to which Mr. MARTIN has pledged bipartisan support.

The following new rates are proposed in the bill: Gasoline, diesel fuel, special motor fuels, from 2 to 3 cents; tires, from 5 to 8 cents; camelback or tread rubber, to be taxed at 3 cents per pound; and the excises upon trucks, buses, and truck trailers, from 8 to 10 percent.

It is estimated that these levies will yield about \$12 billion over the 15-year period (fiscal year 1957-71) as set forth in the following table:

Anticipated revenue yield

Item	Rate		Revenue <sup>1</sup>		
	Present	Proposed	Present	H. R. 9075 <sup>2</sup>	Total
Gasoline.....	2 cents.....	3 cents.....	\$18.0	\$8.6	\$26.6
Diesel fuel.....	do.....	do.....	.5	.2	.7
Special motor fuel.....	do.....	do.....	.2	.1	.3
Trucks, buses, and trailers.....	8 percent.....	10 percent.....	(3.5)	.9	.9
Tires.....	5 cents.....	8 cents.....	3.3	2.0	5.3
Camelback.....	do.....	3 cents.....	0	.2	.2
			22.0	12.0	34.0

<sup>1</sup> Dollar figures in billions.

<sup>2</sup> Adjusted for exemptions previously indicated.

NOTE.—Parentheses indicate figure not included in total.

It is my hope that we will have full cooperation of all of the Government departments, the affected industries, and the public at large so that we may be able to pass this legislation providing the money to build the roads at the same time that we pass the legislation providing for the roads.

UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, foreign nations which have objected to the shipment of 50 percent of United States

Government-sponsored cargoes on American-flag ships are in effect unwittingly endangering their own security. If, through their efforts and propaganda, they succeed in getting Congress to repeal our Cargo Preference Act—which is the so-called 50-50 law—they will succeed also in driving most of our tramp fleet off the seas. Since the end of the war, the bulk of our tramp fleet has already gone out of business because, being unsubsidized, they have been unable to compete with foreign flagships whose operating costs are from one-fourth to one-third those of United States tramps.

It is estimated by maritime authorities that about 75 additional tramps will go out of business if they are not permitted to carry 50 percent of our aid cargoes and agriculture surpluses being

sold abroad under Public Law 480. While 75 ships is not a huge number, the fact is that, according to military authorities, our Nation is even now about 600 active ships short of the number needed to meet the initial and immediate requirements of an emergency.

The shortage of active ships in the event of an emergency would undoubtedly be much more catastrophic than has ever heretofore been the case in our history. It is quite improbable that we or our allies would have much more than a fraction of the time to prepare ourselves that we had in World War I or II. We would not have the time to reactivate or build the ships which would be needed to meet military requirements. That could well be catastrophic for both our allies and ourselves.

The experience of World War II should be a clear warning to both. Military spokesmen and others have stated that without our merchant fleet we could not have won the war; and that the conflict was a touch-and-go matter, dependent in large measure upon the availability of ships. The wartime head of the Army Transportation Department testified before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to the effect that the No. 1 priority of World War II for a long period of time was not airplanes, tanks, guns, or naval vessels, but was the carrying of cargoes to our European allies. That simply meant that what we needed most was commercial ships to carry the cargoes.

The Germans knew that and therefore intensified their submarine warfare. At the outset of the war they only had about 60 or 70 submarines. The Russians today have at least 400.

Our foreign friends today say that because of a NATO agreement providing for a Defense Shipping Authority we need not be so concerned about an emergency. They say, in effect, that they will supply our defense ship needs. Unfortunately, history contradicts them. They were our allies in World War II, and all of their ships were pooled in an effort to meet shipping requirements. But we found that as in World War I we could not rely upon our allies for the ships we needed. We had to launch a desperate shipbuilding program, and in the final analysis we supplied our allies with about 5½ millions of tons of ships as against some 800,000 tons which they supplied to us.

We barely had time enough to build those vitally needed ships in the last war. We will not have as much time in the next emergency. Our foreign friends would do well to remember this because their own security is at stake. The fewer active ships we have in our fleet the more vulnerable is their own position. Their efforts to scuttle our 50-50 law could well scuttle themselves.

#### IRRIGATION WATER FOR ARIZONA

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution directing the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to study the economic and engineering feasibility of acquiring riparian rights from the Republic of Mexico to water in the Gulf of California for the piping and pumping of water from the Gulf of California to Arizona for irrigation purposes.

On June 20, 1955, the Congress extended the act of July 3, 1952, related to research in the development and utilization of saline water. The program was extended for a 13-year period, and the amount of \$10 million was authorized for the research program. The program calls for close cooperation and coordination of the saline-water research program with the Atomic Energy Commission and the Civil Defense Administration in the interest of achieving the objectives of the program.

The resolution that I have introduced in the House and which the junior Senator from Arizona will introduce in the Senate is to further implement the idea of the saline program that was adopted in the first session of this Congress. On January 18, 1956, the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, in his annual report on the Department's saline-water-conversion program stated that the results achieved thus far, together with the great potential value of opening vast new sources of water supplies through conversion processes, "clearly justify the accelerated prosecution of the work." The Secretary further states that the economical improvement of brackish waters for many irrigation uses is definitely in sight. In the light of the progress that has been made in the conversion of sea water and brackish inland water to fresh water, I feel that it is not too early to begin planning the use of sea water for irrigation purposes in Arizona.

I am aware of the fact that in 1931 the then senior Senator from Arizona, the Honorable Henry F. Ashurst, with his usual foresight, introduced a proposal that the United States acquire land from Mexico which would give the State of Arizona a seaport on the Gulf of California. The reaction of the Mexican Government was not favorable. I am further aware that Article 27 of the Constitution of the Republic of Mexico of 1917 offers a possible impediment to the acquisition of territorial rights for any land in Mexico. However, I am sure that our good neighbors in Mexico are as anxious as we are to adopt the utilization of sea water for the use of people and agriculture, and that it is possible to arrive at an agreement for the transportation of desalinated sea water from the Gulf of California to inland areas of this country and of Mexico. With this aim in view, the resolution has been introduced. It is not my intent thereby to impair in any way the sovereignty which the great Republic of Mexico exercises over the land within its borders.

As the problem of adequate water is one that has ceased to be restricted to the western areas of our Nation, I am sure that representatives of all of our

States will recognize the need for adequate preparation for that day when sea water may be usable for irrigation, municipal and industrial purposes.

#### THE MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] is recognized for 120 minutes.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have obtained this time today in order to address myself to the most serious and explosive situation existing in the Middle East. I know that many of my colleagues desire to participate in this call for action and I will yield to them after a brief statement.

No one can disagree that the leaders in the Kremlin have thrown a firebrand into the Middle East situation by the shipments of the most advanced military weapons to Egypt and other Arab States.

"This critical situation was termed by a high administration official in the executive department to be a threat in the Middle East as great as Korea." This statement was made to me while I was in Europe and it is contained in the report of my subcommittee on Europe.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 6, 1956, 126 Members of the House of Representatives, including 40 Republicans and 86 Democrats, petitioned the administration to sell arms to Israel in order to offset Egypt's purchase of arms from Czechoslovakia.

This plea was rejected by the administration for the present, but Secretary of State Dulles declared:

We do not exclude the possibility of arms sales to Israel.

That is a hope.

The Secretary further declared that the foreign policy of the United States embraces the preservation of the State of Israel. It also embraces the principle of maintaining our friendship with Israel and the Arab States.

Continuing, he stated the Middle East security cannot rest on arms alone but rather upon the international rule of law and upon the establishment of friendly relations among neighbors. He added:

We are actively working toward the establishment of such relations.

The combined influence—

The Secretary continued—

of the nations which would, under the United Nations Charter and the tripartite declaration, be against any armed aggression is a far more effective deterrent to any potential aggressor than any amount of arms which could be obtained by either side.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this rejection of the Secretary does not conform to the statements made by him in Chicago on December 8, 1955, in his speech entitled "The Foundation for a Firm Peace."

I ask unanimous consent to have this speech of Secretary Dulles printed in full at this point inasmuch as I intend to make references to it. I would like everyone to have the opportunity to read his speech in its entirety. I hope to prove that the action I request and which has been requested in part by 126 Members of the House is first, consistent

with the administration foreign policy; second; it is a necessary part of that foreign policy; and third, the present action of the administration is a contradiction of their present foreign policy.

In his speech on December 8, 1955—and this was made after the Geneva meetings—Secretary Dulles stated:

We are, it seems, in a new phase of the struggle between international communism and freedom. The first post war decade was a phase of violence and threat of violence. \* \* \* Since last spring, this phase of violence seems to have undergone an eclipse. But we should remember that one of the doctrines taught by Lenin and constantly emphasized by Stalin was the need for zigzag.

He continued:

In prudence, therefore, we must act on the assumption that the present Soviet policies do not mark a change of purpose by a change of tactics. We do not, however, want policies of violence to reappear. Therefore, it is useful to have clearly in mind what are the free-world policies which have caused the Soviet Union to shift from tactics of violence and intimidation as being unproductive.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, why not continue policies of the past which have been productive? Why weaken the Mutual Security Control Act, commonly known as the Battle Act? Why give in to England to sell goods to Iron Curtain countries?

In an exclusive interview with Marguerite Higgins, of the New York Herald Tribune, on January 29, 1956, Secretary of Agriculture Benson stated:

The United States has recently had to pass up possibilities of disposing of some of its huge farm surpluses to Russia's Eastern European satellites. The United States could not take advantage of these chances to diminish its mountainous surpluses because of congressional restrictions that any sales of the corn, cotton, lard, etc., piled in American warehouses must be to friendly nations only.

Mr. Speaker, it was my amendment that placed the words "friendly nations" in Public Law 480. If these countries need our surpluses, let us be realistic. Give them to them on the condition that we distribute them.

Let us return now to Secretary Dulles' speech. After explaining the vast importance of the many treaties to which the United States is a signator, he continued:

But now, except for countries of South Asia which choose neutralism, the gaps in the political warning system have been closed. The United States with bipartisan cooperation has made mutual-security treaties with the Philippines, Japan, the Republic of Korea, and with the Republic of China on Taiwan. We have entered into the ANZUS pact. We have joined with seven other nations to make the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty. There is the Balkan Alliance of Yugoslavia, Greece, and Turkey, and the Baghdad pact, which includes the northern tier of Turkey, Iraq, Iran, and Pakistan. All of these treaties are made pursuant to what the United Nations Charter calls the inherent right of collective self-defense. Together they constitute a worldwide political warning system. They prevent the despots from miscalculating that they can use Red armies to conquer weaker nations, one by one.

Please take note that these treaties are called by the Secretary of State a political warning system.

In that portion of his speech following the need and success of the political warning system, the Secretary continues, under the subtitle "The Deterrent of Retaliatory Power":

It is, however, not enough to have a political warning system. It must have backing if it is effectively to deter. That poses a difficult problem. \* \* \* As against the possibility of full-scale attack by the Soviet Union itself, there is only one effective defense, for us and for others. That is the capacity to counterattack. That is the ultimate deterrent.

I am not asking the Department of State for arms to attack or to counter-attack, but to deter aggression by those nations who have consistently threatened to drive Israel into the sea; who have stated that Israel to the Arab world is like a cancer to the human body and the only remedy is to uproot it just like a human cancer; who refuse to sit down to a peace conference; who refuse to recognize Israel's existence.

The Soviet Union is recognized as increasing tensions in the Middle East—and I quote from the declaration of Washington, February 1, 1956, from the joint statement issued by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain:

The action of the Soviet bloc in regard to arms supplies to Middle East countries has added to the tensions in the area and increased the risk of war. Our purpose is to mitigate that risk.

Mr. Speaker, our policy must be more than that of mitigating, or rendering less severe, such a risk. We must seek to eliminate such a risk.

To return to Secretary Dulles' speech on December 8, we find the following:

Our mutual security arrangements help provide the local defensive strength needed to preserve internal order against subversive tactics and to offer a resistance to aggression which would give counterattacking, highly mobile forces time to arrive. \* \* \* We earnestly strive for some dependable system of limitation of armament. Until we succeed in such efforts, however, we and our allies must constantly maintain forces, weapons, and facilities necessary to deter armed aggression, large or small. That is an indispensable price of peace.

Mr. Speaker, is not Israel one of our strongest allies? Israel has begged her neighbors to meet her at a peace conference but they refuse.

Again, I read from Secretary Dulles' speech on December 8:

President Eisenhower, speaking last August, pointed out that "Eagerness to avoid war—if we think no deeper than this single desire—can produce outright or implicit agreement that injustices and wrongs of the present shall be perpetuated in the future. Thereby, we would outrage our own conscience. In the eyes of those who suffer injustice, we would become partners with their oppressors. In the judgment of history we would have sold out the freedom of men for the pottage of a false peace. Moreover, we would assure future conflict.

Mr. Speaker, is not the denial of the sale of arms to Israel assuring future

conflict by the Arab world when they have sufficient weapons procured through Kremlin assistance?

Mr. Speaker, all of us are interested in the security of the United States—those who disagree on arms to Israel as much as those who agree. However, I do not feel that our stagnant policy in the Middle East helps our security one iota. While other nations may believe in a policy of muddling through, the explosive situation in the Middle East must not be muddled through.

Does United States leadership mean, in effect, saying to the Communists, "Go ahead, gentlemen, ship arms to the Arab States. That's O. K. with us"?

These are fundamental and basic questions we must ask ourselves. It is not a fundamental teaching of our way of life that we declare a policy of eternal enmity. We believe in resolving problems through discussion. But, the Arab States stubbornly refuse to talk with Israel. Even more, the Arab States consistently state that the annihilation of Israel is their goal. General Nasser, their chief spokesman, as recently as January 16, stated—and this quotation is taken from his monitored speech:

We declare our solidarity with all Arabs from the Atlantic Ocean to the Persian Gulf for the sake of freedom, independence, and the right to existence.

However, in a special dispatch from Cairo to the New York Times on January 16, he is quoted as follows:

From the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf, there is but one Arab nation, which no one will succeed in dividing again.

I realize that the factor of oil in the Middle East is one which is uttermost in the minds of many people.

I realize that oil is important to the free world. But, let me point out that it is even more important to the Kremlin. Their policy in the Middle East is to block shipments of oil to the free world and to use it for their own purposes. The Communists do not love the Arabs any more than they love us. How then, will our policy of closing our eyes to Communist penetration in the Middle East protect either the Arabs or the oil or the free world interests? The Arabs have done very well in their dealings in oil with the free world. How will they do under communist domination? History supplies us with the answer but I am afraid the overtures of the Communists have blinded the Arabs to historical facts. In the U. S. News & World Report of November 4, 1955, General Nasser is quoted as follows:

For us the danger and the thing to worry about now is Israel, not Russia.

General Nasser obviously is no expert on Communist tactics and strategy.

As leaders of the free world, we must insist that there must be a bold, new, positive program for this area. Generalities such as those which have come from the Eisenhower-Eden talks lend some hope. But the explosive situation in the Middle East demands specific action now and fewer generalities. Specifically, I feel that it is essential to the best interests of the United States, the

free world, and the Middle East and all nations therein, that there be held without delay, a peace conference.

Mr. Speaker, the political warning system referred to by Secretary Dulles was a deterrent prior to January 1955, but the U. S. S. R., under the guise of the Geneva atmosphere—and while the foreign ministers were meeting in Geneva in late October and in November—bypassed these treaties and stepped right into the Middle East. By this action, a most critical situation jeopardizes the peace of the free world. The Soviet has ignited old hostilities and is fomenting new ones between the Arab States and Israel for the purpose of increasing the tensions in that area and subverting it for Communist purposes.

I believe it is imperative that solutions to the problems involving the Arab States and Israel be reached without delay.

I believe that the United States should forthwith and in positive terms utilize its influence and exercise its leadership to bring about a conference between the Arab States and Israel and such other friendly nations as may be appropriate for the purpose of discussing and reaching solutions to the major issues confronting the Middle East, including this threat of Communist penetration and subversion of the area, and to solve the political, economic, social and military issues between the Arab States and Israel.

I believe that the United States, Great Britain, and France should reaffirm their adherence to the three power declaration of May 25, 1950 and should take immediate effective measures to meet the threat of Communist penetration and subversion in the Middle East; and that the United States should immediately supply military arms and other forms of military assistance and economic assistance, to such friendly nations in that area which request such aid and are willing to meet at a peace conference.

Mr. Speaker, why do I ask for these specific measures? I ask only because they are needed to implement the principles which the Secretary of State has stated are a necessary deterrent to aggression and constitute the foreign policy of this administration.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to extend congratulations to my esteemed colleague from New York, Congresswoman EDNA F. KELLY, on her fine presentation of the current critical situation in the Middle East. Our colleague is a very capable legislator and has made a sincere study of this problem. I want to go on record in endorsing her statements.

From a purely American point of view we must face this problem in a traditional manner. We must have the courage and the initiative to lead our allies and to help guide the destiny of the free world. Our country has throughout its entire history always been a beacon of light to colonial and oppressed people, who are yearning to maintain their national independence. Circumstances have willed it so that our country has

assumed a position of moral leadership among the free nations, hence we must be extremely careful to maintain that position and to retain the faith and confidence of the other nations.

Today many of the former colonial and persecuted peoples, who gained their freedom and independence since World War II, are struggling with the trials and tribulations of their newly found independence. Some of these nations are being threatened by a militant communism; others are faced with hostile neighbors who allow themselves to become the dupes and pawns of communism. Israel is one of the newly independent countries which finds itself in such a predicament. Some of its Arab neighbors have turned to the Communists for arms and are entering into other alliances with them, not realizing how much they are hurting themselves and to what extent they are exposing the whole free world to the danger of Communist aggression.

I, for one, cannot and will not believe that the Arab countries and their leaders will voluntarily allow themselves to be swallowed up behind the Iron Curtain and in this way completely extinguish every trace of freedom and independence now enjoyed by their people. Right now, however, they are doing everything to bite their nose to spite their face. Their uncompromising attitude is only encouraging Soviet Russia to exploit every opportunity for intrusion into the Middle East—and the Arab people will be the first to suffer when Russia gets a foothold there.

The Arab leaders maintain that they desire peace in the Middle East. But thus far they have shown no willingness to sit down with Israel and negotiate a peace settlement on honorable terms satisfactory to both sides. Nor would they have the Western Powers or the United Nations attempt to negotiate such a settlement. The result is constant tension and a confusing situation which is growing more chaotic with each passing day. The only one who stands to gain from all this chaos and disorder is Communist Russia. The Communists thrive on just such conditions.

As for our own policy in the Middle East, I think the more we seek to appease the Arabs the less cooperation we seem to obtain from them. Appeasement has never brought the desired results. It did not work to prevent World War II and it will not work now.

If we back down on Israel now, I guarantee you that we will not gain the support of the Arab States. We will only lose Israel. But if we give arms and other support to Israel, the Arabs will have more respect for the United States and they will finally realize that we are earnest about peace in the Middle East.

Do you want any better example of firmness or the lack of firmness than what is happening now in Pakistan? When Russia stated that Kashmir belonged to India, Pakistan immediately turned to us for help. We said nothing and we did nothing. We were strangely silent. According to latest reports, Pakistan is now negotiating with Russia—which previously had been so firm against her.

The situation has now become a serious threat to the security of the United States and the whole free world because of the adamant stand taken by the Arab States; hence, we should consider taking effective steps to safeguard our interests and the interests of the free world.

I have urged our Government in the past, and I shall continue to do so again, to make available a substantial amount of arms to Israel which that country needs for defense purposes. I have also urged that we conclude a mutual-defense pact with Israel to guarantee the integrity of its borders and its future existence as an independent nation. I am convinced that if these two steps are taken now by the United States, tension in the Middle East will subside and the threat to the peace of that area will diminish considerably.

There is also a third step which I suggest as a means for easing the tension there, namely, a determined effort to solve the Arab refugee problem. I propose that the United States call on the United Nations to appoint a commission which is to undertake a study of this problem, in an effort to develop a new approach toward a permanent solution. After study of the problem and following consultations with the Governments of the Arab States concerned and with the Government of Israel, the commission is to submit to the United Nations a detailed program for a permanent solution of the Arab refugee problem. It is further suggested that the program be based on a plan to make these refugees self-sufficient and that they be assimilated among their own peoples in the Arab countries. Israel, however, is to admit a limited number of these people consonant with its security regulations and its ability to integrate them within its economy, and it is also to pay a compensation to the refugees who cannot be returned and for this purpose an international loan is to be made to Israel.

Mr. Speaker, in order to make some progress toward a solution of the Arab refugee problem along the lines I have just outlined, I am today introducing a concurrent resolution advocating the creation of a commission by the United Nations to deal with this problem.

May I again commend our colleague for having made a fine contribution on the subject and for granting us the opportunity to express our views in the matter.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO]. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

STUDY MISSION TRIP TO ISRAEL IMPRESSIVE AND INSPIRING

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, may I say, first, that the best way for any Member of Congress to acquire a real education in the foreign policy problems of our country and of the free nations friendly to us is to be fortunate enough to accompany a study mission headed by the gracious gentlewoman from New York, Mrs. KELLY, a ranking member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. As chairman of the Study Mission to Europe last fall, the Congresswoman

from New York demonstrated a grasp of foreign affairs which, to me, was simply amazing. I shall forever be grateful for the opportunity which I had to accompany the group, and particularly for the invaluable information which I acquired through the help and assistance of Congresswoman KELLY and her profound knowledge of international affairs.

In all of our interviews with heads of government, foreign ministers or other top officials of the nations we visited, Congresswoman KELLY was so familiar with the problems of each nation that I know it made a favorable—a great—impression on these officials, showing the interest of the Congress of the United States in the problems of all of the free nations. I might add that as a woman Member of Congress I was deeply proud that we women who serve in this House have such an outstanding expert among us in the complex field of foreign policy.

Now as to Israel. In the report which the gentlewoman from New York, as chairman of the Study Mission to Europe, filed recently with the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the statement is made in regard to the visit to Israel that—

We were able to drive over most of the country, visiting Bersheba on the south, the trenches near the Gaza strip, Haifa, Tel Aviv, Jerusalem, Nazareth, and the north above the Hula Lake, within a few miles of the border. The visit to Israel was enlightening, impressive, and inspiring.

I certainly agree with that. In keeping with that statement, I would like to ask if the gentlewoman from New York would not agree that the determination of the people of Israel to defend themselves, to maintain their freedom and their independence, was the immediate impression one received from the moment one enters the country?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Yes. I was impressed not only by that fact, but I know that they are a democracy and are endeavoring to pattern their entire life after the Western World. That is the reason I say I know that they are our allies and will be there with us when we need them.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. May I ask the gentlewoman from New York, as Chairman of the Study Mission that went to Europe whether she discovered anywhere in Israel, among any of the people in Israel to whom we talked, a warlike or aggressive attitude? In other words, did those people talk as though they looked forward to committing aggression against any of their neighbors, or was it not entirely a case of their merely wanting to defend themselves and their own country against aggression?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. That is the feeling I have always had. They are very anxious to secure and maintain this country which has been assigned to them and given to them after a long period of years. They are most anxious to have peace there to develop that country for their people and for the neighboring States. The difficult problem to them is that they have been blocked and they are surrounded by enemies. I feel that if peace is brought about there we will bring peace to that section of the world.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Does the gentlewoman agree with me that our Government's official attitude, that of the State Department, toward Israel is often one of being "neutral" as between a country with a sincere desire to live in peace with its neighbors, on the one hand, and a group of surrounding countries which are as yet unready to accept the peace? How can we be neutral as between such outright contrasts in intention?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. At this point I do not feel that we can be neutral in spite of the need for the oil in this area. That is why I have taken this time today. I think the time has come when we should declare and know and accept our friend, and Israel is our friend; and we should do what we can for Israel to protect it.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I thank the gentlewoman. I congratulate her on bringing this subject to the floor of Congress at this time. In my report to my own committee, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, in connection with our trip to Europe, I said of Israel:

Israel is a country on the battlefield. One can traverse the entire country in just a few hours, and at some points you can cross the country by car in 20 minutes. Each frontier is an attack point along almost every inch of ground. The prevailing doctrine is hard work and defense.

Certainly it is imperative that this brave little nation be enabled to survive, and it is a fine thing to have this matter brought to the attention of the House of Representatives in such a forthright and able manner as has been done here today by the Congresswoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY]. When I saw the hardships in Israel which the pioneers and settlers there have to undergo to assure the nation's survival, I was vividly reminded of the manner in which our own West was settled—I was reminded of the pioneering spirit which we who live in St. Louis are so well aware of in our own history.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DAVIDSON].

Mr. DAVIDSON. I thank the gentlewoman very much. I appreciate greatly the opportunity to add to what has already been said in commendation of her remarks and her efforts here on the floor of the House today.

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 24, 1956, Secretary of State Dulles indicated to his news conference that he was attempting to arrange an agreement whereby partisan discussion of the Middle East situation, and especially discussion of the Israel-Arab crisis, would be off-limits in the presidential campaign. This bald attempt by Mr. Dulles to foreclose discussion on this problem of world concern is in my opinion ill conceived and smacks of the methods employed by totalitarians, who, finding themselves in an untenable position from which they refuse to retreat, take the easy way out, by silencing all who would dare to oppose or criticize them.

I for one am not persuaded by the philosophy of government which Mr. Dulles advocates. I will never subscribe to the view that criticism of policy and open discussion of one's feelings and

opinions must be curtailed or halted for any reason. Discussion is the lifeblood of our democratic process; without it there can be nothing but conformity and stagnation.

These are my feelings about the essential elements of public debate. Apparently Mr. Dulles and I are the proponents of opposing views.

With regard to the Middle East and the crisis and tension which now exist in that area, I believe that discussion must take place on a continuing basis so that a just and proper solution is found. There is no truth to Dulles' contention that criticism of the State Department is an attack on the Nation; or that criticism will divide our country or imperil our national unity. The only truth that commends itself is that the Middle East is seething with a discontent and a tension which the United States can alleviate; that Mr. Dulles refuses to disclose his Department's plans; and that, at the same time, he does not want anyone else to make known their ideas about, or criticisms of the present course of our dealings in the Middle East.

I cannot be a party to this distorted view of political activity. I am compelled to address myself to the crisis in the Middle East and to what I believe is the sound approach to the present situation.

We are confronted with a serious problem of balancing our relationships with the many millions of people in the Middle East. I would be the last to advocate that this country act in a fashion to alienate one people simply to curry the favor of another. My position is that we owe it to all people whom we consider our friends to deal with them in an impartial fashion and in a manner which will dissuade all others from embarking on a course of action designed to disrupt the delicate status of peace which now obtains throughout the world.

It will come as no news to my colleagues in the House to learn of the tremendous imbalance of armaments which exists in the Middle East. On January 27, the United Nations published a survey of the arms that had been sent to the Middle East from 1951 to mid-1955. These figures show that during the above period some nine million dollars worth of arms were sent to Israel while over 13 millions were sent to the 5 Arab States of Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, and Syria. And the survey excluded some rather significant recent developments. For example, they did not include aircraft shipments for any period, nor did they include the British annual subsidy of \$23 million to Jordan's Arab Legion, nor arms from France, nor, most significant of all, Communist Czechoslovakia's agreement to sell Egypt \$80 million worth of arms.

Yet this overpowering superiority of Arab military strength is only one aspect of the situation. The Arab countries are linked together by treaties in defense alliances, some of them with Western Powers. Israel is without any counterpart to these defense systems, and its exclusion creates a more critical imbalance. In terms of a long-range policy to deter aggression, the United States



has found that creation of mutual-security pacts is eminently successful. We have entered into pacts which bind us to no less than 44 of our friends throughout the world. This has been a procedure adopted to implement the United Nations Charter and to carry into effect the principle of fellowship which pervades that charter.

The only remaining question in light of these facts is the route that we, as a Nation, are to take in bringing peace to this troubled area. In the quest for an answer, we are confronted with several basic truths. In the first place, Israel represents the only true democracy in the Middle East. A great lesson can be learned by the surrounding nations if Israel prospers and grows as it has shown it can during its short existence. On the other hand, the Arab nations, with which Israel must live in peace, have been totalitarian since the dawn of history. Second, Israel, being a democracy, has firmly allied itself with the Western World both in word and action. It has actively sought the aid of the great Western Powers in its struggle for growth and survival. The Arab nations, while outwardly displaying a mantle of neutrality, have courted the Communist world in its struggle to destroy this new nation. This is especially true of Egypt. Its arrangement to purchase arms from Czechoslovakia is but one manifestation of this new alliance. Their attitude in the United Nations has been even less commendatory, abstaining on practically every crucial East-West vote, including the resolution to oppose aggression in Korea.

There is no question in my mind that our loyalty and aid should be extended to those who hold out their hands, in friendship to us. This Israel has continually done. To force her to seek aid elsewhere and to cause her to lose her faith and trust in us would be the most harmful course on which we might embark, for we would, in effect, be sacrificing our only truly democratic friend in the Middle East on the altar of dollars sticky with oil. Our path is clearly marked; all we need do is follow it.

Our first concern relates to the question of armaments. It is my belief and I sincerely advocate that we make available to the State of Israel such military aid in the form of arms as is required by her for her legitimate self-defense. Do not misunderstand, no plea is made that we foment a general arms race. All that is proposed is that we make an attempt to bring into balance the patent superiority which the Arab nations now have over Israel. It will be too late for us to make this contribution after the battle begins. It is best that we attempt to even the scale in the hope that the shipment of arms will act as a deterrent to any and all aggressive tendencies of the Arab nations.

Second, there is the long range problem of bringing a true peace to the Middle East. Again, it is my belief and I sincerely advocate the establishment of a mutual-security pact with Israel and the Arab States. Such a treaty should not be forestalled by the prior condition that boundary disputes be settled between Israel and the Arab States, for

such action does not appear to be any nearer reality now than it was in August 1955, when Mr. Dulles first set down this impossible condition.

This treaty is called for both in the name of world peace and in the name of sound logic. Israel, of all the nations in the world, has a history that most clearly parallels our own. As a nation, its growth is attributable to the same spirit of immigration and pioneering that is part of our own heritage. There is between the United States and Israel a basic community of interests and ideals that commends the formation of a defense alliance in the best interests of our own Government and in the cause of world peace.

These then are my views on the Middle East crisis. I have presented them at some length to give emphasis to my position that this situation calls for public debate. It also serves as my answer to the recent comments of the Secretary of State who would prefer to have his actions and those of his Department scrutinized in silence, irrespective of whether or not they are moral, honest, decent, or democratic. Mr. Dulles has asked us not to create issues in this election year. I did not create this issue. It has existed for a long time for those who have eyes to see. Nor will I remain mute for the next 10 months. I have stated, without equivocation, exactly what my position is with regard to this crisis, and the precise terms of the program that I advocate. It will be a blessing for the American people and for the democratic people of the world, if Mr. Dulles will do likewise.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentle lady from New York [Mrs. KELLY], not only on her splendid address this afternoon but because of her masterful report, particularly on the subject of Israel which she wrote for the Foreign Affairs Committee. I commend all of you to read that report.

At the outset of my remarks on Israel I should like to place in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent therefor, a declaration on the Near East by 94 Democratic Members of this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

DECLARATION ON THE NEAR EAST BY 94  
DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS

Under the Tripartite Declaration of 1950, our Government recognized "that the Arab States and Israel all need to maintain a certain level of armed forces for the purpose of assuring their internal security and their legitimate self-defense and to permit them to play their part in the defense of the area as a whole."

Communist weapons and technicians are now pouring into the Near East as a result of the Egyptian-Czech arms deal, imperiling the stability and peace of the region and weakening the defenses of the free world.

The Egyptian-Czech arms deal brings the front of the cold war to the Egyptian-Israeli frontier, and the survival of Israel is directly and immediately menaced.

It is vital that our Government act decisively to end the threat of war in the Near East. The best way to do this is, of course,

to promote an honorable peace settlement between the parties. To that end we urge that our Government and other interested nations seek by all possible means to negotiate formal treaties within the framework of the United Nations guaranteeing the existing frontiers of Israel and the Arab nations in the Near East that want peace and are ready to enter into such treaties. But to make peace we need agreement to negotiate and until there is agreement by the Arab nations to sit down at the peace table, there is the present danger of a major outbreak of hostilities.

Accordingly, we make this further specific suggestion: That our Government permit Israel to purchase the \$50 million of defensive arms which she seeks in this country strictly for purposes of self-defense. Israel is firmly a part of the free world and she may be counted upon not only to defend herself, but also to join in the defense of the free world.

While we are opposed to an arms race in the Near East, we believe that the military capability for safeguarding Israel's national existence must be maintained. We believe the danger of war will be seriously increased if the Arab nations attain a military preponderance capable of use for aggression because of the Communist initiative.

Our Government should continue to offer economic and technical assistance and help to resettle the Palestine Arab refugees with impartial friendship to all in the Near East who will cooperate for peace.

We have heard with regret that there are proposals that Israel be asked to yield vital territory of her small area to the Arab States. We believe this is the road to appeasement, not the road to peace.

The American people will not tolerate anything so immoral as the sacrifice of Israel to Communist infiltration of the Near East. The time to act is now. Failure to take action will encourage the Communist offensive, increase tension, and endanger freedom.

Signed by HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, 11th, New Jersey; CARL ALBERT, 3d, Oklahoma; VICTOR L. ANFUSO, 8th, New York; THOMAS L. ASHLEY, 9th, Ohio; WAYNE N. ASPINALL, 4th, Colorado; CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, 3d, West Virginia; WILLIAM A. BARRETT, 1st, Pennsylvania; JOHN A. BLATNIK, 8th, Minnesota; RICHARD BOLLING, 5th, Missouri; JAMES B. BOWLER, 7th, Illinois; CHARLES A. BOYLE, 12th, Illinois; CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, 24th, New York; JAMES A. BYRNE, 3d, Pennsylvania; CLARENCE CANNON, 9th, Missouri; EMANUEL CELLER, 11th, New York; EARL CHUDOFF, 4th, Pennsylvania; FRANK M. CLARK, 25th, Pennsylvania; IRWIN D. DAVIDSON, 20th, New York; WILLIAM L. DAWSON, 1st, Illinois; JAMES J. DELANEY, 7th, New York; JOHN J. DEMPSEY, A-L, New Mexico; CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr., 13th, Michigan; JOHN D. DINGELL, 15th, Michigan; THOMAS J. DODD, 1st, Connecticut; ISIDORE DOLLINGER, 23d, New York; HAROLD D. DONOHUE, 4th, Massachusetts; JAMES G. DONOVAN, 18th, New York; CLYDE DOYLE, 23d, California; HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, 28th, Pennsylvania; CARL ELIOTT, 7th, Alabama; GEORGE H. FALLON, 4th, Maryland; DANIEL J. FLOOD, 11th, Pennsylvania; JOHN E. FOGARTY, 2d, Rhode Island; AIME J. FORAND, 1st, Rhode Island; SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, 7th, Maryland; EDWARD A. GARMATZ, 3d, Maryland; THOMAS S. GORDON, 8th, Illinois; WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, 2d, Pennsylvania; Mrs. EDITH GREEN, 3d, Oregon; WILLIAM J. GREEN, Jr., 5th, Pennsylvania; Mrs. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, 17th, Michigan; HARLAN HAGEN, 14th, California; WAYNE L. HAYS, 18th, Ohio; DON HAYWORTH, 6th, Michigan; CHET HOLIFIELD, 19th, California; LESTER HOLTZMAN, 6th, New York; Mrs. EDNA F. KELLY, 10th, New York; EUGENE J. KEOGH, 9th, New York; CECIL R. KING, 17th, California; MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, 19th, Ohio; ARTHUR G. KLEIN, 19th, New York; JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, 5th, Illinois; Mrs. COYA KNUTSON, 9th, Minnesota; THOMAS J. LANE, 7th, Massachusetts; RICHARD E. LANKFORD, 5th,

Maryland; JOHN LESINSKI, Jr., 16th, Michigan; JOHN W. MCCORMACK, 12th, Massachusetts; TORBERT H. MACDONALD, 8th, Massachusetts; HARRIS B. McDOWELL, Jr., A-L, Delaware; RAY J. MADDEN, 1st, Indiana; THOMAS E. MORGAN, 26th, Pennsylvania; MORGAN M. MOULDER, 11th, Missouri; ABRAHAM J. MULTER, 13th, New York; JAMES C. MURRAY, 3d, Illinois; THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, 6th, Illinois; BARRATT O'HARA, 2d, Illinois; PHILIP J. PHILBIN, 3d, Massachusetts; MELVIN PRICE, 24th, Illinois; ADAM C. POWELL, Jr., 16th, New York; JAMES M. QUIGLEY, 19th, Pennsylvania; LOUIS C. RABAUT, 14th, Michigan; HENRY S. REUSS, 5th, Wisconsin; GEORGE M. RHODES, 14th, Pennsylvania; PETER W. RODINO, Jr., 10th, New Jersey; BYRON G. ROGERS, 1st, Colorado; JOHN J. ROONEY, 14th, New York; JAMES ROOSEVELT, 26th, California; JOHN F. SHELLY, 5th, California; ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI, 13th, New Jersey; MRS. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, 3d, Missouri; FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., 4th, New Jersey; T. JAMES TUMULTY, 14th, New Jersey; CHARLES A. VANIK, 21st, Ohio; ROY W. WIER, 3d, Minnesota; HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., 6th, New Jersey; SIDNEY R. YATES, 9th, Illinois; HERBERT ZELENKO, 21st, New York; KENNETH J. GRAY, Illinois; EDWARD P. BOLAND, Massachusetts; WINFIELD K. DENTON, Indiana; PETER F. MACK, Jr., Illinois; THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr., Massachusetts; THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, Michigan; ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, New Mexico.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I shall not read this declaration in detail now, but in that declaration those 94 Members proposed that the United States and other interested nations seek to negotiate formal treaties within the framework of the United Nations guaranteeing the existing frontiers of Israel and the Arab nations in the Near East that want peace and are ready to enter into such treaties.

However, the Congressmen went on to say that in the absence of agreement by the Arab nations to sit down at the peace table, there is the present danger of a major outbreak of hostilities. Accordingly, they propose that our Government permit Israel to purchase \$50 million worth of defensive arms which she seeks in this country strictly for purposes of self-defense.

I have been to Israel on four different occasions. I have seen those Israeli people at first hand. I can assure you there is no desire on the part of the Israelis to stage any kind of war against the neighbors of Israel. The word "shalom" is a word you most often hear in Israel. It is a word of greeting. It is a word you hear on departure. It means "peace." It is a time-hallowed word and you hear it on all sides. It is contrary to the very nature of the Israelis to wage any kind of war against anyone. When provoked, however, they will defend themselves and defend themselves to the utmost, unto death. The Israelis will be able to take care of themselves if they are let alone. I say I have been to many nations, to all parts of the world, but I have never seen a people with a greater faith than that of Israelis.

They do not wear their faith as one would the fashion of a hat; no, theirs is a faith that is deep and abiding, a faith in the language of Browning that can move mountains.

And there you see amongst those people a determination as firm as the rock you hold in your hands, and an exultation that is as fierce as a streak of light-

ning. There you see unmatched courage. They exemplified that courage on the battlefield when they, a mere handful of some six hundred thousand, successfully stood off the aggression of 7 hostile Arab nations comprising over 40 millions of people, and they fought with a dearth of arms and almost with their bare knuckles. With that faith, and that determination, and that courage, they will indeed be able, as I said a moment ago, be able to take care of themselves.

Now they are confronted with a very severe crisis, a crisis that has developed because of the sale of Czech arms under Soviet auspices to Egypt. Those arms will create an imbalance, and that imbalance bodes ill for Israel. It is our purpose, at least the purpose of those Members who signed this declaration, some 94 Members, to obliterate that imbalance, to create a balance. If there is a balance of arms I am certain it will assure peace.

In all this I want to say a word about Great Britain. Great Britain has been guilty of bad faith here. Great Britain has been supplying military material and armaments to Egypt long before the Czech supplies went into Egypt. I read from the editorial page of the Manchester Guardian:

The British Government has placed itself in a weak position to complain about Communist supplies, because it was first in the field. Sir Walter Monckton refused to give details of the arms sold by the Government to Egypt, taking refuge behind the old excuse that it would be contrary to all practice to disclose what had been sent.

There you have it, a very responsible journal in England confronts the British with what they did.

When I was in England this past year I learned that England had sent 64, or was in the process of sending, 64 up-to-date, modern Centurion tanks to Egypt. It is very strange that while Egypt under the aegis of Nasser, Lieutenant-General Nasser becomes more bellicose and belligerent daily, England keeps speeding her arms into the Egyptian maw.

Egypt under Nasser denies access to the canal to Israeli commerce, Israeli ships, or any other ships bearing Israeli cargo contrary to the edict and the admonition of the United Nations.

Nasser flouts the resolution of condemnation of the United Nations. He blockades the Israeli port of Elath and now he is trying to block access to Israel by way of the Mediterranean Sea through Czech submarines.

Despite all this England continues to supply arms to Nasser. We are told as an excuse that if Nasser is made strong that will insure peace.

I say to Mr. Eden that is very much like the man who keeps feeding beef-steaks to a tiger in the hope of making that tiger a vegetarian. You are not going to convert Mr. Nasser. If Egypt wants peace Egypt has more arms than she needs; if Egypt wants war she has more arms than she deserves.

Nasser has stated in unequivocal terms that Israel must be destroyed, that it shall be the purpose of the Arabs at all times to annihilate Israel. Specifically he said that Israel is like a condemned prisoner in the dark awaiting execution.

That gives you the import of all the pronouncements that are coming out of Egypt, that are coming out of the Arab States as against Israel.

In the face of that what shall the United States do? I think it would be well for Mr. Dulles not to lend too attentive an ear to the plea that may be made to him by Anthony Eden. Mr. Eden believes, unfortunately, that Israel is expendable. He fears there would not be access to oil reserves if Israel is made strong. That is a dangerous doctrine for Mr. Dulles to hear, but I fear he is going to harken unduly to what Mr. Eden is going to try to sell him, namely, the idea of slicing off a goodly part of Israel and giving it to Egypt, performing a sort of Caesarian operation on Israel.

Israel is small as it is. The doors of small Israel must be kept open to the driven Jew, the Jew that has been tossed about like dry leaves before the chilly autumn blast year after year. Where can these persecuted Jews go, the Jews of North Africa, in Morocco, Tunisia, and Algeria, the Jews from behind the Iron Curtain, who seek surcease from their troubles? Where can they go? There is only one place to which they can repair and that is Israel and the United States must see to it that Israel is kept strong and made stronger so that she can resist the hostile neighbors that surround her and continue as a haven for the driven Jew.

Israel today comprises 5,000 square miles. At the time of the independence declaration in 1948 when she was born as a nation, it was 4,000 square miles. Then the Arabs converged on her, seeking to destroy her, but the Israelis worsted the Arabs in battle and Israel secured a thousand square miles from that war, captured through battle. So today Israel comprises 5,000 square miles, attained as the result of the spilling of much blood, as the result of sweat and tears and the loss of many, many lives. But remember, Israel was originally 40,000 square miles. It covered both sides of the Jordan. Now it is 5,000 square miles and it must remain 5,000.

Today I understand representatives of the Foreign Offices of the United States, France, and England are in a huddle. They are talking about Israel. All we get is talk and more and more diplomatic talk. Meanwhile Israel is in danger. Israel is in danger of what we call a sneak attack because the Russians have supplied Egypt with these MIG's, these jet fighters, tanks, heavy artillery, and submarines. And consider that it is only 8 minutes flight from Cairo to Tel Aviv by a jet plane. While they are in a huddle it is possible those MIG's may unload their bombs upon Haifa, Tel Aviv and Jerusalem. Then what? Israel might be destroyed or partially destroyed. Israel will then be invited to sit around a table, bludgeoned and bloody. Then she may be asked by Anthony Eden: We will give you peace if you allow the Arabs to hold what they have obtained by the sneak attack. Israel may thus emerge with only a tiny portion of land.

It is because we want to give Israel the power to ward off a sneak attack that we 94 Members on the Democratic side

and 40 Members on the Republican side have asked that the United States supply at least financially the equivalent amount of arms that the Czechs have given to Egypt—\$50 million worth. If those arms are sent to Israel, she can well take care of herself. If those arms are antiaircraft guns, antitank guns, and subchasers, Israel will be able to ward off the foe. Mind you this, it is in the interest of the United States to supply these subchasers. Think of it. Some 6 or maybe 8 Russian submarines flying the Egyptian flag and manned by Russian technicians are in the Mediterranean in the very shadow of our 6th Fleet stationed in the Mediterranean. They are a danger to our own welfare.

What are we going to do about it? Can we continue to accept the unrealistic, the unfortunately unrealistic, policy of Mr. Dulles and remain silent? It is incumbent indeed upon the United States at least to send those subchasers and the antiaircraft and antitank guns to Israel.

If you go into Israel, no matter where you may be you can, with a twist of your neck, look into hostile territory. When you are at Acre you are only a short distance from Lebanon. In the HiKyria, which is the foreign office of Mr. Sharet at Jerusalem, you look out of the window and you see the barbed-wire demilitarized zone and beyond it is Jordan. If you go down to Elath, you look to the south and you see Egypt; you look to the southeast and you see Saudi Arabia; you look to the east and you see Jordan. No matter where you look in Israel you see enemy territory. Israel does not want anything but to be permitted to protect herself. Why, any talk of Israel being aggressive is ridiculous.

Make a comparison between the military budgets of Israel and Egypt. The military budget of Israel is £126 million. The military budget of the Arab States is £700 million, 5½ times more than that of the Israeli military budget. Egypt's military budget equals almost the entire Israeli budget.

Take the comparison of populations. The population of the 7 Arab states is 30 times greater than the population of Israel. The geographical size of the Arab states is three times the size of tiny Israel. The resources of the Arab states are more than 100 times the resources of Israel. Israel is like a gnat unto an elephant. Therefore, any talk about aggression on the part of Israel is just a lot of nonsense, and I hope indeed that when Mr. Eden and his cohorts speak of the aggressiveness of Israel that there will be somebody at that conference table to tell Mr. Dulles the truth. Mr. Eden does not want to know the truth. As I said, he wants to do all and sundry to hurt Israel. In truth, I should remind him of what Winston Churchill said of Stanley Baldwin: "Why, if he stumbled on the truth, he would pick himself up, brush himself off, and walk away as if nothing happened." Well, the truth must be dinned into Mr. Anthony Eden's ears as well as into the ears of Mr. Dulles.

As has been said, Israel is the only democracy in the Middle East, and wher-

ever the flame of democracy burns, it is incumbent upon democracies everywhere to nurture and strengthen that flame of democracy. The United States has a grave responsibility over and beyond that. The United States helped sire Israel. She was one of those foremost in the United Nations to see to it that Israel became a nation. Now the infant needs protection, and the United States is like a mother to Israel. Whenever did a mother desert her child? And therefore it is necessary for the United States to come forward and help.

Mr. Speaker, I shall place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recital of the Arab atrocities, the constant rapine and plunder and murder perpetrated by the Arabs on the Israelis. It is a horrendous record. It indicates over a short period of time there were 1,039 casualties of maimed, wounded, and dead among the Israelis in that area.

So, in conclusion, I do indeed hope that reason and truth and decency and honor will descend upon our State Department to the end that defensive arms will be supplied Israel.

(The article referred to is as follows:)  
[From Israel Speaks of January 27, 1956]

THE RECORD, IN PART, OF ARAB ACTS OF  
AGGRESSION, 1953-55

1953

January 4: Three soldiers and a civilian, on the way to Jerusalem, were kidnapped and detained in Jordan for 3 days before news of their whereabouts leaked out. They were released only 3 weeks later, after a series of Israeli protests.

January 10: A number of attacks were made on Israel patrols during the week by Jordanian armed bands. Near Badrus, in the neighborhood of Bet Naballa, an Israel patrol was attacked from prepared positions, while other patrols were attacked in the Bet Surik area and in the district southeast of Hebron, all in Israeli territory.

January 22: An Israeli soldier was killed by the Jordanians in the "Little Triangle" area.

January 28: An Israeli soldier was wounded when a patrol was attacked by a band of armed Bedouin and Jordan soldiers in the Beersheba district.

February 2: A Haifa-Lydda freight train was derailed after it ran over explosives which tore up over 200 feet of track in the vicinity of Kalkilya. Automatic fire opened from the direction of the Kalkilya police station on the Jordan side of the border signaling the train's approach, indicating the careful planning of this operation.

February 19: An Israeli soldier was killed during a skirmish with a Jordan force that invaded Israel northeast of Bet Govrim.

February 25: An Israeli soldier was fatally wounded when Arab forces attacked an Israeli unit near Hebron.

February 26: Members of Dardara, a settlement on the banks of the Huleh, were fired on from Syrian positions.

February 28: A group of armed Arabs ambushed an Army vehicle northeast of Beersheba, but were driven off.

March 9: An Israeli policeman was killed in the Kalkilya area, about 10 miles east of Natanya, when armed marauders opened fire on an Israeli patrol.

March 10: An Israeli who erroneously entered no-man's land in Jerusalem was shot and killed by Arab Legionnaires. When an Israeli policeman tried to enter the area to give the wounded man first-aid treatment, he was fired upon and was forced to retire.

March 12: In Jerusalem, a carpenter was killed, as he was entering his shop, by an

Arab Legion soldier who shot at him from his position on top of the walls of the Old City.

March 20: An Israeli soldier was wounded in a clash that occurred south of Bet Govrim.

April 6: Two soldiers on leave were murdered near Kfar Hess by two armed Jordanians.

April 8: A mother and her 21-year-old son were shot and wounded in Kfar Saba.

April 11: Two boats attempted to land infiltrators off the southern coast of Israel. One boat was captured by an Israel patrol. The other boat escaped.

April 13: A watchman was severely wounded in an attack of a Jordanian gang of infiltrators on Israel watchmen near Hadera.

April 17: An Israel patrol was attacked near Mevuot Betar in Wadi Fukin south of Jerusalem by a larger Jordanian military force which penetrated into Israel. Two Israel watchmen were wounded and kidnapped and then murdered in cold blood and dragged across the border.

April 18: A woman was killed on the roof of her house in the Musrara quarter in Jerusalem by Arab Legionnaires.

April 20: One Israel soldier was wounded by an armed Jordan band which penetrated into Israel in the vicinity of Dawayima in the Bet Govrim region.

April 20: A father of five children and his niece, an American citizen on a visit to Israel, were murdered in their house in the Kiryat Moshe quarter in Jerusalem.

April 22: Six pedestrians were wounded, two of them severely, when Jordan Legionnaires opened fire across the demarcation line in Jerusalem from the Sheikh Jarrah quarter in the north to Dir Abu Tor in the south.

May 3: A blind 73-year-old Jew was shot dead after being dragged by three Arab Legionnaires into Jordan territory and first being beaten by them. The act occurred near the maabara of Mekor Haim in Jerusalem.

May 17: Two watchmen of a Jerusalem corridor settlement were shot dead by infiltrators.

May 25: A mother of 7 children was killed, 3 women, 1 man, and 3 children wounded by a Jordan attack on 3 villages of new immigrants near Ben Shemen at the border. In the attack at Bet Nabala, grenades and dynamite were used. Throughout the attacks the marauders covered the villages with heavy automatic fire.

May 27: One Israel soldier was killed, another wounded by an armed Jordan unit crossing the armistice line and penetrating into Israel territory in the Hebron district.

May 28: A Jordan unit crossed the border south of Bet Govrim, took up position 1 mile inside Israel territory and attacked Israel soldiers. Two Israel soldiers were wounded.

May 30: An attack occurred on an open truck carrying children on a holiday trip, 1½ miles west of Meron on the Nazareth-Acry Road. One child was killed, 3 wounded. Tracks of the killer led to the Lebanese border.

June 6: A young man was murdered, one woman wounded in Jerusalem.

June 7: Jordan Arab Legionnaires fired on two Israelis near the railway station in Jerusalem.

June 9: Tirat Yehuda near Ramle was attacked. One Jew was killed, the other inhabitants of his house wounded. The neighboring house was blown up by explosives.

June 10: A house in Mishmar Ayalon near Latrun was demolished. One woman was wounded severely.

June 11: Armed Jordanians penetrated into Kfar Hess, threw grenades, opened fire on villagers. One woman was killed, her husband wounded.

June 17: A Jordan unit opened fire on an Israel unit holding exercises near Wadi Ara. One Israel soldier was killed.

June 19: One watchman was killed and another wounded near Bet Nekofa and Kiryat Anavim.

June 22: An Israel patrol was fired upon by regular Jordan soldiers from over the armistice line in Tul Karem area.

July 9: Two Israel soldiers were killed in the Judean hills.

July 17: One watchman was killed and another wounded by infiltrators in the western suburb of Jerusalem.

August 8: Three Israel soldiers were killed by Jordanians in ambush near Bet Govrim. The Israel soldiers were walking along the road near the village.

August 11: An attack by Jordanians on a youth village for retarded children between ages 8 and 16 took place. Hand grenades were thrown into sleeping quarters at Kiryat Yearim in the Jerusalem corridor.

August 16: A man was killed in Ashkelon by an Arab marauder.

September 2: Hand grenades were thrown in the Katamon quarter of Jerusalem.

September 8: Two men were killed and one wounded in Ahiezer near Lod by Arab infiltrators.

September 8: A passenger bus was attacked near Lod, one wounded.

September 19: An attack took place on Migdal Ashkelon. One Israeli was killed.

October 4: A passenger bus was attacked in the Lydda area.

October 6: A Halfa-Tel Aviv passenger train was attacked by fire in the coastal plain.

October 11: An attack occurred on Kibbutz Nevé Ilan. One member was murdered in his bed.

October 13: Several Arab attacks on Yehudiya (Yahud) on the outskirts of Tel Aviv took place. A mother of five children was killed, her 3½-year-old girl and 1½-year-old boy killed. A 70-year-old woman and one child were seriously wounded.

October 21: Two Israel trains were derailed by mines placed by Jordan Arabs on rails near the settlement of Ayal, in the vicinity of Qualqueleyah on the Israel-Jordan border. Thirteen cars were derailed and 130 rails destroyed.

October 30: Armed Jordanians penetrated Neve Ilan, a village in the Jerusalem corridor. They opened fire on the watchmen and stole work tools and other items from the villagers.

November 4: Jordanian National Guardsmen crossed the armistice lines into Israel near Atyr in the northern Negev. The Jordanians seized 3 Israel Bedouins and their flock of more than 350 head of cattle.

November 7: An Israel soldier was kidnapped and killed by Egyptian soldiers. Another Israel soldier was wounded but escaped. The body of the Israel soldier returned by the Egyptians was riddled with bullets fired from 1-yard range, and had knife cuts in the back and stomach.

November 8: Arab Legion soldiers fired on 12 Israel representatives on their way to a meeting of the Israel-Jordan Mixed Armistice Commission near Kfar Budros.

November 12: Arab Legion forces kidnapped 8 Arab women, 2 Arab children, and a Jewish guard while they were picking olives at Bet Safafa, south of Jerusalem, 150 yards inside Israel territory. Later, 7 of the women were returned; the 8th was seriously wounded. Subsequently, the body of the watchman was found near the village. Examination of the body in the presence of U. N. officials disclosed that the guard had been shot seven times in the back.

November 16: Armed infiltrators were discovered by frontier guards in the Jordan Valley.

November 22: A band of Arab infiltrators stole irrigation pipes from the vegetable fields of a village in the western Negev.

November 24: Soldiers of the Arab Legion of Jordan threw stones into the Israel section of Jerusalem from the walls of the Old

City. A man standing in front of his home was hurt, and required medical attention.

December 2: An Israel police boat patrolling the Sea of Galilee was fired upon from Syrian positions on the northern bank.

December 4: Marauders from Jordan entered the village of Hatzov, near Gedera, and stole livestock from farmyards there.

December 6: A watchman on guard in the Mount Scopus area of Jerusalem was wounded, after being fired upon from the other side of the fence of the demilitarized zone.

December 7: Water pipes were stolen from a village near Migdal Ashkelon in the Negev. The thieves' tracks led to the Gaza strip.

December 10: A member of Ein Shemer, a village in the Sharon near the Jordan border, was seriously wounded by infiltrators as she was walking near the "maabara" in which she was employed as a social worker.

December 11: A bus traveling on the northern frontier road between Goren and Shomera was fired upon by automatic weapons.

December 16: The bodies of 2 19-year-old soldiers were found after a day-long search in the vicinity of Bet Govrin near the Jordan border. The soldiers had been shot in the head and their bodies looted. Their rifles, ammunition, army papers, personal belongings and some clothing were missing.

December 18: Infiltrators stole camels from a Bedouin tribe in the Negev. The tracks of the two marauders led to the Egyptian border. On the same night, other infiltrators stole water pipes and other equipment from a village in the western Negev.

December 22: An Egyptian warship fired on an Israel plane in the Mediterranean about five miles from the coast.

December 28: Rifle and automatic fire were opened on an Israeli patrol in the southern Negev by a large group of Jordanians.

December 30: A police patrol boat on the Sea of Galilee was fired upon from across the Syrian border.

December 31: Arab marauders stole irrigation pipes from a settlement near Migdal Ashkelon in the Negev.

1954

January 3: Infiltrators stole fertilizer and water pipes from a western Negev settlement.

January 7: Marauders broke into the village of Neve Ilan in the Jerusalem Corridor and stole quantities of clothing.

January 12: Marauders penetrated Degania Bet in the Jordan Valley. They opened fire on members of the settlement and seriously wounded one of them as the village's guard tried to stop the theft of stores.

January 13: Infiltrators stole water pipes and livestock from two settlements in the Negev.

January 17: Infiltrators stole all of the merchandise of the general store at Menachemia, close to Degania Bet.

January 18: A group of Israel Bedouin shepherds tending their camels in the northeastern Negev were attacked by armed Jordanians who had entered Israel territory. The shepherds and their camels were taken prisoner and transported across the border. A 16-year-old member of the group managed to escape and report the incident to the Israel authorities.

January 19: Israel trains were attacked by armed Jordanians in two separate instances. The first incident occurred when shots from Jordan territory were fired at a Hadera-Lydda train near Kfar Syrkin; the second occurred 1 mile north of Tulkarm on a Tel Aviv-Haifa freight train.

January 25: A Piper Cub plane carrying civilian passengers was fired on while it was flying north of Yad Chana.

January 26: Two Israel Arab residents, a man and a woman of Bet Safafa, a village

south of Jerusalem, were abducted by members of the Arab Legion.

January 27: Jordanian forces entered Israel territory and killed a member of an Israel police patrol near Lifta, on the northern outskirts of Jerusalem.

January 29: Draft animals were stolen from the village of Zakaria in the Jerusalem Corridor.

January 30: An Israel police unit patrolling the armistice lines in the central Sharon was attacked by members of the Arab Legion, from four Jordan positions, including the police station at Kalkilia on the Jordan side of the border.

February 2: Jordanians were intercepted by watchmen in the Jerusalem corridor as the marauders were uprooting olive trees and transferring them across the border.

February 4: A group of marauders tried to force their way into the settlement of Mishamar Ayalon, near Ramle.

February 5: Jordan soldiers penetrated over a mile into Israel territory in the northern sector of the Israel-Jordan frontier. They stole a flock of sheep and goats and kidnapped the shepherd.

February 6: A fishing boat from the settlement of Ein Gev was fired on in Lake Kinneret from a Syrian outpost at Koursi.

February 8: Infiltrators penetrated into the village of Balfouria in the Valley of Jezreel and attempted to steal livestock. The farmers exchanged fire with the marauders who escaped across the Jordan border.

February 11: A large group of Jordan national guardsmen entered the no-man's-land in the Latrun area, to which entry is forbidden by the armistice agreement, and opened intensive fire on an Israel unit patrolling the area.

February 14: A watchman was murdered by armed infiltrators near Machaseya, a settlement in the Jerusalem corridor. Two watchmen were patrolling the area when the shots were suddenly fired at them from close range.

February 15: Jordanian forces killed a watchman at another village near Jerusalem.

February 16: A group of workers were attacked on the road leading to Ajur in the southern part of the Jerusalem corridor.

February 19: An Israel patrol encountered about 50 armed and mounted infiltrators from across the Egyptian border. The gang opened fire on the patrol and killed an Israel soldier.

February 20: An Israel Beduin was kidnapped by Egyptian soldiers in a jeep on their way to the border from the Israel-Egyptian Mixed Armistice Commission camp.

February 21: A group of workers were fired on from the southwest section of the old city wall of Jerusalem, under Jordanian control. The shooting continued for 4 hours.

February 28: A civilian plane engaged in spraying the fields of settlements near the northeastern border of Israel was fired on from Syrian positions.

March 2: An Israel unit was attacked by a band of armed Jordanians who had crossed into Israel territory east of Bet Govrin.

March 4: A gang of Jordanians kidnapped an Israel shepherd and stole his flock.

March 4: A band of armed infiltrators shot and wounded a tractorist in the village of Brur Chayil in the northwestern Negev. They robbed the wounded man of clothing and valuables and escaped across the Egyptian border.

March 7: A border policeman was seriously wounded when a police unit was fired on from across the Jordan border.

March 10: An Israel soldier was killed and three soldiers wounded when a mine exploded under the vehicle in which they were traveling near the frontier at Bet Govrim.

March 11: Syrian military positions opened fire on Israel fishing boats on Lake Tiberias. Two boats were hit and damaged. A second attack occurred on March 15 while the Israel-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission was in

session considering the Israel complaint concerning the March 11 attack.

March 12: Armed members of the Jordan National Guard entered an Israel village south of the Valley of Jezreel and kidnaped an Israel Arab.

March 15: An Israel Beduin was murdered in his tent near Shuval in the Northern Negev.

March 15: Marauders ambushed and shot at a truck of the settlement of G'yulot, in the northwestern Negev, when it was on its way to a maternity hospital with a pregnant woman.

March 17: Eleven Israeli passengers, among them women and children, were massacred in an ambush near Maale Akrabim (Scorpion Pass) on the road from Eilat to Beersheba. The bus slid into a ditch after automatic machine-gun fire instantly killed the driver. The attackers approached the bus and two of them boarded it, firing their machine-guns at the passengers from point-blank range.

March 23: An Israel soldier was wounded when his unit was attacked by Arab marauders near Katana in the Jerusalem corridor.

March 25: Armed Egyptians wounded an Israel soldier and kidnaped a second near the Gaza strip border.

March 26: An Israel watchman was murdered when tommygun bursts were fired at him by Arab marauders near the village of Kisalon in the Jerusalem corridor. The murderers escaped into Jordan territory after stealing the watchman's rifle.

March 29: Four separate thefts of pipes, draft animals, and equipment from Israel settlements in the Western Negev occurred.

April 6: Two Israel soldiers were wounded when fire was opened on them near the settlement of Kissufim.

April 11: Fire was opened from Jordan-held territory on the settlement of Ramat Rachel on the southern outskirts of Jerusalem.

April 14: A farmer plowing in the fields of Yad Chana in the Sharon Plain was attacked and seriously wounded by Jordanian infiltrators.

April 19: Infiltrators from Jordan stole a flock of sheep from the settlement of Ein Gedi on the Dead Sea.

April 23: An Israel border patrol in the Judean hills was attacked from positions in Jordan and was under rifle, machine-gun and two-inch mortar fire for several hours.

April 24: An organized group of marauders attempted to rob the settlement of Kissufim in the Negev. When they were intercepted by an Israel patrol, the Israelis were attacked from across the armistice demarcation line by Egyptian forces stationed in the Gaza strip.

April 24: Both the settlements of B'eri and Nachel Oz were robbed by Arab marauders.

April 29: Arab infiltrators stole irrigation equipment from the settlement of Gvaram in the Negev.

May 1: An Israel patrol was attacked near Ahuzam in the South by a band of Egyptian infiltrators. The patrol killed 1 and wounded 1 of the gang. Information concerning the movements of Israel military personnel and equipment was found on the bodies of the two fallen spies.

May 7: A watchman from the Kastel maabara was killed near the Arza Sanatorium in the Jerusalem corridor. The murdered man was robbed of his ammunition.

May 8: An Israel unit was attacked by Jordanians near Givat Oz, in the Megiddo area. A Jordanian was killed in the clash, and dragged from Israel territory by the Jordanians. An Israel policeman was killed, and a second is missing.

May 9: An Israel border patrol encountered Jordan National Guard men in Israel

territory near Hirvat Illin, southwest of Bet Natif in the Jerusalem corridor. In the ensuing clash, two policemen of the Israel patrol were seriously wounded and dragged by the Jordanians into territory under Jordan control where, medical reports show, they were killed at close range by sharp and blunt instruments.

May 14: The pumphouse of the settlement of Aikim, north of the Gaza strip, was broken into and the pump dismantled by Arab infiltrators.

May 23: A band of armed Egyptians crossed into Israel and attacked an Israel Bedouin camp near Bir el-Malga in the western Negev. They stabbed five of the Bedouin, beat others, destroyed the tents and robbed the Bedouin of their ammunition, cattle and donkeys.

May 28: A fire engine from the settlement of Eyal, near the Jordan border in the central Sharon Plain, was attacked by infiltrators on its way to a fire.

May 31: An Israel patrol was attacked by Jordanians while patrolling the Israel-Jordan armistice lines in the vicinity of Um-al-Fahm in the central Sharon Plain. One of the patrol members was wounded.

June 3: Arab infiltrators robbed a grove near Migdal Ashkelon, in the southern plain, of irrigation equipment.

June 8: An Israel soldier was wounded when the Army vehicle in which he and his unit were on patrol north of Kissufim, near the Gaza strip, struck a mine.

June 8: Houses in Jerusalem, near the old city wall, were stoned by Arab legionnaires. Windows were smashed and furniture broken in nearby apartments.

June 12: Organized Arab marauders robbed the settlement of Ein Hashlosha in the northern Negev of large amounts of agricultural produce.

June 19: Five settlers of Mevuot Betar, which is situated in the Judean hills, were ambushed by Jordanians as they were guarding an orchard near the armistice lines. Three of the group were killed.

June 24: Jordanians killed an Israel Arab woman when they fired across the Israel-Jordan armistice lines.

June 27: Arab marauders killed a villager in the town of Ra'anana in the Sharon Plain. The villager was murdered when he came upon the infiltrators robbing his storehouse.

June 30: The Arab Legion opened fire on Jerusalem along the entire sector of the armistice lines within the city. The attack was launched on June 30, and firing continued through July 1 and July 2. Three Israelis were killed and 25 wounded in the 3-day attack.

June 30: Israel police boats patrolling the Lake of Galilee were twice attacked by Syrians from fortified positions near Noursi. The first attack took place on June 30 when 2 Israel policemen were killed and 5 wounded as the Syrians directed machine-gun and mortar fire at an Israel police boat. On July 1, heavy cannon and machine-gun fire was opened on two Israel police boats patrolling the lake.

July 7: A band of Arab marauders robbed the settlement of Carmiyah, in the Negev, of aluminum pipe stores.

July 9: Arab Legionnaires again shot into Jerusalem. This shooting continued sporadically for 48 hours. Arab Legionnaires also threw stones into the New City of Jerusalem on July 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12. Two Israelis, a 12-year-old girl and a 45-year-old man, were hurt.

July 10: One Israeli was killed and two others wounded when Egyptians attacked an Israel unit patrolling the armistice lines near Kissufim.

July 20: An Israel unit patrolling the Israel-Jordan armistice lines in the Lydda area was fired upon from within Jordan ter-

ritory. A member of the unit was wounded in the head.

July 25: A settler of Beit Gan, a settlement in lower Galilee, was killed by Arab infiltrators.

July 26: The Jordanians attacked Israel farmers operating a combine of the settlement of Netiv Ha-Lamed Heh situated near Jerusalem. An Israel border patrol and a group from the settlement who hurried to the scene were also fired upon by the Jordanians. Five Israelis were wounded during the attack.

August 2-5: Jordan soldiers opened fire upon several sections of New Jerusalem in violation of the Israel-Jordan Armistice Agreement and the renewed ceasefire agreement which followed the 3-day attack on Jerusalem by Jordan forces on June 30, July 1-2.

August 13: The third Jordan attack in as many weeks, upon harvesters from the settlement Netiv Ha-Lamed Heh, in the Jerusalem Corridor, took place.

August 26: Egyptians attacked a group of Israel Beduin in Be'erot Yam, in the Nitzana demilitarized zone. The Egyptian marauders fled with part of the Beduin flocks.

September 2: A bridge on the road to Eilat and telephone wires near the Israel-Egyptian armistice lines were destroyed.

September 4: A tractorist was murdered by Arab infiltrators near Ruchama in the south.

September 5: Armed Egyptians attacked Israel Beduin near Subeita in the Negev. They killed one and wounded a second. The Arab gang escaped across the border with the Beduin's livestock.

September 10: Two Israel soldiers were killed in their observation post near Bir Ma'in, north of the Ayalon Valley in the Jerusalem corridor. The pair were found by a patrol which was sent to investigate their absence. The Arab ambushers had concealed themselves near the observation post.

September 13: A band of armed Egyptians attacked an Israel Beduin encampment at Bir Malaga in the Nitzana demilitarized zone. The Arab gang abducted three young men from the Bedouin encampment after having wounded an old man and the sheikh.

September 20: A house in the village of Hatzav, south of Gedera, was blown up.

September 25: Two brothers, members of the Bet Shikma settlement, were killed in the Negev by Arab marauders who infiltrated into Israel from the Gaza strip.

September 27: Jordanians attacked a shepherd from Ein Hashofet in the hills of Ephraim. They wounded the shepherd and absconded with a flock of 480 thoroughbred sheep. The value of the flock is estimated at IL 75,000.

September 28: Jordanians opened fire across the demarcation line on three watchmen of Bar Giora in the Jerusalem corridor. One watchman was killed and a second wounded.

October 2: Arab Legionnaires opened fire from the Old City Wall upon a group of children playing in the street in Israel's Jerusalem. The children, and a woman, were injured by fragments of stone.

October 11: Irrigation pipes were stolen from Nahal Oz, in the western Negev, by Egyptian infiltrators.

October 29: Guards from the settlement of M'vuot Betar in the Jerusalem corridor were attacked from across the Israel-Jordan armistice lines.

October 25: The water pipe near Mefalsim was blown up by Egyptian infiltrators.

October 28: A band of Egyptian infiltrators stole agricultural produce from the settlement of Sa'ad in the western Negev.

November 1: Jordanians attacked workers near Givat Oz in the valley of Jezreel and were repulsed by an Israel border patrol. One policeman was wounded.

November 5: A bus near Magal was fired upon by Jordanians. A woman was wounded.

November 10: Egyptian marauders stole irrigation equipment from the village of Nir Moshe in the western Negev.

November 22: A group of surveyors near Mevuot Betar in the Jerusalem Corridor were attacked by Jordanians. One of a group of guards, who came to their aid, was wounded.

November 29: Jordanians attacked a unit of the Israel border patrol near Batir in the Jerusalem corridor.

November 30: A border police vehicle on patrol in the Jerusalem Corridor was damaged by a mine planted by Jordanian infiltrators.

December 4: A watchman in Ellat, Israel's southernmost port on the Red Sea, was wounded and a car attacked by Arab infiltrators.

December 8: Five Israel soldiers on patrol in northern Israel were kidnapped by Syrians.

December 11: Arab marauders again attacked and wounded a watchman near Ellat.

December 18: A truck was blown up when it crossed a mine planted near Ein Ya'Hav, north of Ellat.

December 22: Marauders, whose tracks led to the Jordan border, robbed Kfar Shmuel, near Ramle, of livestock.

December 30: Farming equipment was stolen by Egyptians from the settlement of G'vulot in the western Negev.

1955

January 14: Syrians attacked a dredge working on the drainage of the Huleh Swamp in Galilee.

January 16: A Syrian position attacked an Israel fishing boat on Lake Huleh in Galilee.

January 18: Two members of the settlement of M'vuot Betar in the Jerusalem corridor were murdered by Jordanian infiltrators as they slept in a house in Agur, northeast of Bet Govrin in the northern Negev. Their belongings were stolen by the Arab marauders.

January 21: One soldier was killed and one wounded in the vicinity of Nir Yizchak near the Israel-Egyptian border. On the same day, two Israel soldiers were wounded in the Musrara quarter of Jerusalem by shots fired from the Jordan-controlled old city walls.

January 25: Tractorists near Ein Ha'Shlosha in the northern Negev were attacked by Egyptian infiltrators as they were plowing the fields of their settlement. One farmer was killed and a second wounded.

February 1: An Israel soldier was wounded when automatic rifle fire was opened from an Egyptian position at an Israel unit near Nahal Oz in the Negev.

February 2: A Syrian position opened automatic fire at four Israel fishing boats on Lake Kinneret (Sea of Galilee).

February 2: Syrian soldiers fired across the armistice lines at a group of children in Kfar Szold.

February 8: An Israel soldier was wounded by Arab Legion fire in the Sanhedria quarter of Jerusalem.

February 9: An Israel unit was attacked by Jordanian fire southeast of Rosh Ha'Ayin, in the hills of Judea. Two Israelis were wounded.

February 13: An Israel boat at Lake Tiberias was attacked from Syrian positions.

February 18: An Israel patrol southeast of Duweima in the Negev was attacked by Jordanians. One Israel soldier was wounded.

February 25: An Israel cyclist was killed by Arab infiltrators near Rechovot.

February 27: Three students—two Israel Arabs and a young Jewish woman from the United States—were kidnapped by members of Jordan's Arab Legion near Beit Tsafafa, south of Jerusalem. They were returned to Israel the next day after having been interrogated by legion officers.

March 1: A fishing boat from Ein Gev sailing on Lake Tiberias was attacked by fire from Syrian positions.

March 9: Jordanians fired upon workers in fields north of Sde Eliahu in the Beit Shaan Valley.

March 12: An Israel Army vehicle traveling northwest of Kissufim in the south was blown up by a land mine.

March 15: Egyptian marauders blew up a house in the settlement of Sharsheret, not far from the Gaza strip border. The attackers were repulsed by the settlement's watchman and his sister. The watchman was wounded.

March 18: Jordanian infiltrators attacked the settlement of Yizrael near Afule. One settler was killed and a second wounded.

March 24: A 23-year-old woman was killed and 23 persons wounded when Egyptian infiltrators threw hand grenades and fired into a crowd attending a wedding party in the Negev settlement of Patish. The young woman had volunteered to serve as an instructor in the immigrant settlement. Mr. David Ben Gurion and Chief of Staff Moshe Dayan were among the mourners at the funeral which took place the day after the attack.

March 25: Two Israel herdsmen were kidnapped by Arab legionnaires who penetrated into Israel from Jordan territory.

March 28: An Israel Army vehicle exploded when it struck a mine near Nirim in the south. Two Israel soldiers were seriously wounded and died the following day.

April 1: An Israel Army command car was blown up and damaged by a land mine north of Kissufim. One Israeli soldier was injured.

April 2: One Israel command car was blown up by a land mine near Nachal Oz. Five Israeli soldiers were injured. After the explosion three Egyptian Army positions directed mortar, machinegun, and rifle fire at the wreckage, wounding another Israel soldier.

April 9: An Israel command car on routine patrol was blown up by a land mine at Khirbet Maayan in the Nirim area. One Israel soldier was killed on the spot, and another later died of his wounds.

April 16: A house in the Jerusalem corridor village of Zakariya was blown up by Jordanian infiltrators, over the heads of its inhabitants, burying them under the debris. Three women and 2 men were wounded and the house destroyed.

April 18: Syrians opened fire on a number of Israel fishing boats on the Sea of Galilee.

April 28: An Israel patrol uncovered a land mine laid on the road south of Nirim. Members of the patrol, left to guard the site, were attacked by an Egyptian military position.

May 7: Jordanians fired upon harvesters in the valley of Jezreel. An Israel patrol came to their rescue. Four Israelis were wounded.

May 12: Jordanian marauders fired upon watchmen from the Jerusalem corridor settlement of Bar Giora. One of the guards was wounded.

May 17: Three Israel officers were killed and a fourth wounded when an Israel patrol car was blown up by a mine west of Kissufim in the Negev. Several hours earlier another patrol had discovered a mine in the vicinity.

May 18: An Egyptian position opened fire on a group of Israelis traveling near Nitzana. On May 20 Egyptians fired upon U. N. observers investigating the Israel complaint concerning this attack.

May 27: An Israel army vehicle was blown up by a land mine laid in the road northwest of Nirim. Two soldiers were wounded.

May 30: Two Israelis were killed and eight wounded when Egyptian artillery fired upon the settlements of Ein Hashlosha and Nirim in the south. An ambulance rushing to the aid of the wounded was attacked.

June 2: An Israel patrol uncovered a land mine laid by Egyptian infiltrators south of Kissufim.

June 7: Syrians fired on an Israel fishing vessel on Lake Tiberias.

June 17: An 18-year-old girl of Kfar Mena-chem in central Israel was wounded by Jordanian infiltrators.

June 19: Egyptian infiltrators blew up the pipeline south of Kissufim and severed telephone communications to this southern settlement.

June 21: An Israel patrol in Taibe was fired on by Jordanians. One Israeli was seriously wounded and died several days later.

June 28: Syrians opened fire on Israel vessels sailing on Lake Tiberias.

July 2: Syrians fired on a group of settlers from Gonen, in Upper Galilee, trying to extinguish a fire that had broken out in their fields.

July 14: Syrians fired on an Israel vessel sailing on the Sea of Galilee.

July 20: Several Syrian posts opened heavy fire upon the settlement of Hagovrim.

July 23: Hand grenades were thrown into houses in the Negev village of Patish by Egyptian infiltrators. Three persons were seriously wounded.

July 27: Syrians fired on members of Gonen, in Upper Galilee, as they were walking south of the village.

August 22: Three Egyptian strongpoints attacked an Israel mobile border patrol southwest of Mefalsim. Four Israeli soldiers were wounded.

August 25: An Egyptian ambush in Israel opened automatic fire and threw hand grenades at a civilian jeep northwest of Erez. One of the passengers, a civilian, was killed.

August 27: The water pipeline at Gehah, southwest of Ashkelon, was blown up.

August 28: Two military vehicles were mined northwest of Be'eri. Two soldiers were killed on the spot and four, two of whom died later, were seriously wounded.

August 29: The masts of the radio broadcasting station at Yavne, 29 kilometers in a direct line from the nearest point on the border of the Gaza strip, were destroyed by explosive.

August 29: A family, consisting of five persons was found wounded by gunfire near Kubeiba in the vicinity of Rechovot. One of them later died of his wounds.

August 30: The bodies of four workers from Nes Ziona were found near Bet Oved, 25 miles from the border. They had been killed by gunfire.

August 30: A halted motor vehicle was found on the roadway south of Kfar Mena-chem. All four of its occupants had been killed by machinegun fire.

September 1: A well was blown up at Yad Mordechai, near the Gaza strip border.

September 3: The water pipeline southwest of Nitzana, 10 miles within Israel territory, was blown up.

September 7: Arab terrorists blew up the water pump in Tirat Zvi in the Bet Shaan Valley.

September 15: Egyptians attacked an Israel vehicle near Erez in the south. An Israeli was killed.

September 22: Two persons were killed and 10 wounded when Arab marauders ambushed an Israel bus just outside of Meron with machinegun fire and hand grenades.

September 27: Syrians fired on an Israel fishing vessel sailing on Lake Tiberias.

October 4: A member of the settlement of Bitha, in the Negev, was killed by Egyptian infiltrators while on guard duty at Gilat, 10 miles from the Gaza strip. The 32-year-old watchman left behind a pregnant wife and five children. Two other settlers were wounded when they attempted to come to his aid.

October 16: Egyptian troops fired on U. N. observers who were on an inspection tour of

the international frontier of the Nitzana demilitarized zone.

October 18: A young soldier on a hunting expedition in the vicinity of Gonen, in northeastern Galilee, was ambushed by five Syrians, wounded by gunfire, and then forced into Syrian territory.

October 30: Egyptian military positions attacked an Israel patrol 2 miles northwest of Nirim.

November 4: Two Egyptian Vampires flew over Nirim, Nir Izhak, and Ein Hashlosa. Another Egyptian plane lingered over Nirim, Fatish, Be'eri and Nitzana on the same day. The next day, five separate violations of Israel airspace by Egyptian planes took place in the same area.

November 5: Two homes in Sde Hemed, in the Sharon, were dynamited by Jordanian infiltrators.

November 8: An explosion was averted at the reservoir south of Ein Harod, in the Valley of Jezreel, when an attempted dynamiting by Jordanians was discovered.

November 13: A home in Rosh Ha'ayin, in the Sharon, was blown up by Jordanian infiltrators.

November 20: An Egyptian unit entered the Nitzana demilitarized zone south of Berotayim and attacked an Israel patrol.

November 21: The carpenter's shop and pumping station in Avuka, southeast of Beit Shaan, were dynamited by infiltrators.

November 27: Members of the Arab Legion shot at and killed an Israeli who had entered the noman's-land near the Musrara quarter in Jerusalem.

December 10: Syrian army forces heavily shelled Israel fishing boats and a police escort on the Sea of Galilee (Lake Kinnet).

December 26: Syrians fired across the border at Israelis near Susita in the demilitarized zone in Upper Galilee.

December 27: Egyptians fired upon Israel soldiers southwest of Ein Hashlosa.

December 30: Arab infiltrators ambushed an Israel jeep traveling on the Beersheba-Eilat road, in the center of the Negev. The driver was seriously wounded but escaped through the aid of a truck traveling behind him. Two riders in the jeep were murdered.

Arab violations of armistice agreements

JORDAN

Period	Casualties (killed and wounded)	Sabotage and mining	Armed clashes	Robbery and theft
Apr. 3, 1949-Apr. 30, 1950	33			
May 1, 1950-Aug. 30, 1953	421	128	866	3,385
Sept. 1, 1953-Apr. 30, 1954	60	21	222	205
May 1-Dec. 31, 1954	74	2	188	126
Jan. 1-Oct. 30, 1955	32	10	160	154
Total	620	161	1,385	3,870

EGYPT

1951 (as of May 1)	18	10	98	203
1952	29	20	142	541
1953	26	22	90	500
1954	47	9	135	302
1955 (to Oct. 30)	177	47	137	125
Total	297	108	611	1,731

SYRIA

1951 (as of May 1)	83	1	29	8
1952	3		16	13
1953	3		18	5
1954	4		24	10
1955 (to Oct. 30)	5	1	101	4
Total	98	2	188	40

Arab violations of armistice agreements—Continued  
LEBANON

1951 (as of May 1)	3		9	12
1952	1		8	23
1953	9		16	16
1954			8	1
1955 (to Oct. 30)	11	1	6	11
Total	24	1	47	63
Grand total	1,039	272	2,231	5,704

Estimate of damage caused to property by Arab infiltrators and the value of smuggled goods confiscated by Israel authorities and returned through the Mixed Armistice Commissions:

Year	Property returned (IL)	Damage caused (IL)
1952	161,000	517,250
1953	201,620	582,910
1954	210,180	629,250

THE MIDDLE EASTERN DANGER

(An editorial in the Manchester Guardian Weekly)

If Russian MIG fighters have been seen over Cairo, as the Minister of Defense suggested in the House of Commons on Tuesday, the supply of ancient British Valentine tanks to Egypt appears comparatively trivial. Indeed, much of the debate in the House on Tuesday seemed to be on secondary issues. It is important, of course, that any laxity in the administration of arms exports should be tracked down, and Mr. Gaitskell made the most of the fallings which there have evidently been. But a trickle of old tanks to the Middle East—and it has been no more than that—is insignificant beside the delivery of fairly new arms both by Communist countries and by the British Government. The Minister of Defense was justified in his contention that, even if the obsolete tanks which have been allowed out of this country were remilitarized, they would not add materially to Egypt's armed strength. It is a different story with Centurion tanks and jet fighters from this country as with Stalin tanks and MIG aircraft from Russia and Czechoslovakia. These have added greatly to Egypt's power and have unbalanced the military situation in the Middle East. The British Government has placed itself in a weak position to complain about Communist supplies, because it was first in the field. Sir Walter Monckton refused to give details of the arms sold by the Government to Egypt, taking refuge behind the old excuse that it would be "contrary to all practice" to disclose what had been sent. (Why should it be contrary to all practice when in Jordan and Iraq only a few weeks ago we held public ceremonies, with Ambassadors and press photographers in attendance, to hand over tanks and aircraft?) There is, however, no doubt that Centurions and Vampires went to Egypt before the first Soviet deliveries began.

The preponderant supply of arms to Egypt, as Mr. Gaitskell said, has created grave danger. The hope of the Arab States for revenge against Israel has been enhanced, and they may soon feel tempted to try to drive the Jews into the sea. The Israelis, too, may feel that because the balance is clearly going against them for the first time since the war, they should strike before the situation becomes worse. The danger is in part of the British Government's own making. It has been aggravated by the Soviet intervention, but Britain itself must bear part of the preliminary blame. For that reason action ought to be taken to make more plain our intentions under the Tripartite Declaration of 1950. Jointly with the United States and France, we ought to say what we shall do both to restore a balance of arms and to deal

with any renewal of the war. The promise of supplies to Israel would do much to remove her feeling that she should strike while there is time, and the promise of military action against the violation of frontiers by either side would help to deter Egypt. It is ironical that, having said in the 1950 Declaration that an arms race ought to be avoided, Britain has promoted one to the extent that she ought now to send extra supplies. But the damage has been done, and Israel cannot safely be left weak. As to violation of frontiers, the wording of the 1950 Declaration was plain enough. It said:

"The three governments, should they find that any of these States was preparing to violate frontiers or armistice lines, would, consistently with their obligations as members of the United Nations, immediately take action both within and outside the United Nations to prevent such violation."

Our obligation to defend the present dividing line is evident. (The meaning of Sir Anthony Eden's intervention last Tuesday, when he told Mr. Gaitskell that the language of the declaration was not so clear as Mr. Gaitskell thought, is puzzling.) That undertaking ought, nevertheless, to be reinforced by a statement that Britain and the United States would, if necessary, take military action. Britain has its troops in Cyprus and Libya, and the United States has a fleet handy. In Washington this week their readiness should be reaffirmed.

(Presented as a public service by International Latex Corp., Playtex Park, Dover, Del.)

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a letter to Secretary Dulles and a reply.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, this is not a new subject. Ever since the end of World War II and the coming into being thereafter of Palestine as the State of Israel, there have existed tensions and controversies in this area. During that period, when the Secretary of State was Mr. Dean Acheson, many of us urged on the then Secretary of State the importance of the recognition of the integrity of the new state and many of us opposed plans for the shipment of arms and aid of one kind or another to various of the Arab States.

The other day I came across a headline of the year 1950. That headline said: "Scott Raps Acheson on Arab Arms Aid."

It did not get me anywhere, and I have about come to the conclusion that attacks on Secretaries of State, be they Mr. Acheson or Mr. Dulles or anyone else, probably will not be as effective an approach as the continuing logical presentation of the reasons why we believe that the preservation of the integrity of the State of Israel can be achieved by preventing the growth of an imbalance in arms between Israel and the Arab world, at least on a temporary basis, but can only be permanently achieved by the negotiation of peace between the parties to this controversy in their troubled area. These negotiations

have a better chance of success if promptly and vigorously pursued.

Together with several other Members of Congress, and representing 40 Republican Members of Congress, we called the other day on Secretary Dulles, having presented him with a letter which I am including in the Record, stating our views. Those views included our belief that there should be immediate shipment of arms to Israel to counter the Communist activity in the area, and the shipment of arms from Soviet satellites to Egypt. Those views also included our concern over the resettlement of the refugee problem, the Jordan Valley development; but most of all they concerned means by which we might preserve the peace of the area through the implementation of the Tripartite Pact or by use of the framework of the United Nations if, in proceeding within the framework of the United Nations, we would have a reasonable hope of success.

We talked to Secretary Dulles and from that talk emerged several important developments. In the first place, in an editorial in the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 27, I noted that the Secretary of State at that time had implied that it might be months before a decision would be reached on the arms bid. I think it is real progress to be able to report that peaceful negotiations looking toward peace are now presently being undertaken; that those negotiations are with other members of the Tripartite Pact and presumably with other nations; that as one member of this delegation said to the press after leaving Mr. Dulles, it was expected and the clear implication was received that some determination which would permit the Secretary to make some further announcement could be expected in about a month. This is a great improvement over previous reports that decision might be delayed for many months. If we have succeeded in advancing the time limit in that degree, I think that is an important contribution. We have not changed our mind. We still think that arms to Israel to counter this imbalance are necessary. But the position of the Secretary is that he should be given an opportunity to work out peaceful solutions on the basis as suggested in our letter particularly through the implementation of the Tripartite Pact, the guaranty of existing frontiers, as we suggested, and other methods, including the increase in the number of persons engaged in neutral patrols along the borders.

It is, I think, fair to state that it would be the Secretary's opinion that time is needed to work out some of these problems. Some of us think that that time should not be very long, because we recognize the danger to peace and the menace to our own national security through delay.

But we learned something else. We secured from the Secretary in that conversation a firm policy statement which was reported in the press conference, and that statement is this:

It is one of the basic tenets of American foreign policy that Israel be saved.

Another restatement of the same policy as used by the Secretary was:

It is one of the basic tenets of American foreign policy that the integrity of the State of Israel be preserved.

I think we may say categorically that in learning from the State Department something that we have been very anxious to hear for some time, that the Department has a basic intent that the people who live in Israel shall not be attacked without action on our part and on the part of other friends of Israel who are tremendously concerned about her danger, is an important assertion of policy. An even more important development occurred today when President Eisenhower gave flat assurance that every constitutional method would be used by the United States to avoid outbreak of war in this area.

Naturally the negotiations themselves looking to peace cannot be spread open to the public gaze as each step is taken, because to do that would in itself defeat the purpose of the negotiations.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. However, the gentleman, I am sure, feels that arms should be sent immediately?

Mr. SCOTT. I have said so.

Mr. CELLER. I am sure he feels that any kind of a declaration may be unable to save Israel if there is any aggression, a sudden aggression on the part of Egypt. The United Nations brought Israel into being. That was a declaration. We joined in that declaration. Then immediately seven hostile Arab nations converged on Israel and sought to destroy her. Israel therefore was sorely put to and had to defend herself with great difficulty. Israel may not be able to defend herself as well now as she did then because of the superiority of arms that Egypt now possesses. So that it is the arms to which we must address ourselves immediately.

Mr. SCOTT. I appreciate the import of what the gentleman has said and I am particularly aware of the danger through the attainment of air superiority on the part of Egypt. That is why I think that what is called for here in the treatment of this matter is expedition. The sooner we act to assure the free world's security, the better.

I think at the same time we have to take at face value the statement of the Secretary of State that within a near period, within some early period, the United States should be aware of whether its steps directed toward a permanent peaceful solution are going to succeed.

The position of the State Department is, "We believe there are better solutions than are now proposed." They say that in their opinion something can be done within the near future. We say if that cannot be done, then at the very least there should be arms aid at that time. We are going to continue that position, we are going to maintain that view to the State Department. We have stated to the Secretary of State that we would

like to act as a continuing committee to keep in touch with him because, as the gentleman from New York himself has indicated, we do not look with complete trust upon the intent of the enemies of Israel. Therefore, the watchword, I think, is to be eternally vigilant day by day in the hope that an early solution will appear. I believe we will get that solution sooner if we do not at this time waste our energies in an attack on the Secretary of State, as I used to do when I attacked Mr. Acheson. Mr. Acheson and his administration never did anything for us. I think there are better ways to do it, than to make attacks on Cabinet officers, which confuse the issue with partisan politics.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Is it not a fact that in that same conference the Secretary most emphatically made it clear that he was not ruling out the necessity of arms to Israel and that that would be very seriously reconsidered at the time when the present negotiations warranted it?

Mr. SCOTT. The Secretary made the point that what he was saying was more of a revelation and much more of a forward step than had been indicated as American policy up to that time, and, further, that the question of arms to Israel is wide open if other solutions are not arrived at. In fact, the release of arms to Israel remains very much in the picture, if peace negotiations bog down. Yes, in our call on Secretary Dulles, we succeeded in clarifying the picture and we advanced, in our opinion, chances for the solution of this problem.

FEBRUARY 3, 1956.

The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,  
Secretary of State, Department of State,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know many of us, in our individual capacity of Members of Congress, have been in continuing communication with the Department of State concerning the tragic increase of tensions in the Middle East. Your statement of August 26, 1955, outlined the basic concepts which could, through effective implementation, bring peace to this troubled area. In your statement, you outlined certain specific problems requiring solution in order to bring about peaceful conditions. You referred to the lack of fixed permanent boundaries between Israel and its Arab neighbors, the fear of an imbalance of power which might lead to violence on the part of one of the parties to the controversy against the other, and to the tragic plight of the 900,000 refugees whose displacement presents a continual problem.

We, therefore, proceed from the premise that you recognize the great danger to peace in the Middle East. We and the millions of constituents whom we, collectively, represent are gravely concerned about the immediate necessity for finding means to bring about a treaty of peace between Israel and the Arab world.

We, therefore, would like to state in further detail some of the problems which we consider need to be met by our Government and associated governments particularly Great Britain and France. Under the tripartite declaration of 1950, our Government recognized "that the Arab States and Israel all need to maintain a certain level of Armed Forces for the purpose of assuring



their internal security and their legitimate self-defense and to permit them to play their part in the defense of the area as a whole." Because of a fear of growing imbalance of arms, the Government of Israel desires to purchase through private sources defensive arms strictly for purposes of self-defense. We have individually, and now collectively, taken the position that Israel as a firm part of the free world should be allowed to obtain in the open market such weapons as would assure her protection against aggression. What is the position of the State Department on this matter?

We do not contend that tension in the Middle East can be finally resolved by the provision of defensive arms alone. We are convinced that immediate negotiations for the conclusion of a treaty of peace between Israel and the Arab world should be undertaken. These negotiations should be effectively implemented by our Government in association with those governments which joined in the Tripartite Declaration of 1950.

It is vital that prompt and decisive measures be taken to end the threat of war in the Near East.

To achieve this end, the negotiation of formal treaties guaranteeing the existing frontiers of Israel and the Arab nations is essential but essential also is a willingness to negotiate such treaties. We believe that a treaty of peace and a guaranty of existing frontiers should be offered to all interested parties in the Middle East and should be implemented promptly as to the frontiers of that nation or those nations which accept the proposed peace terms. Otherwise we continue to be faced with the refusal of some nations to enter into peace negotiations or even to recognize the existence of the State of Israel. What is the position of the State Department in this regard?

There are two additional matters as to which we seek information from the Department: first, we do not believe that economic aid should be extended to any nation which is engaging in warlike or aggressive maneuvers against any part of the free world. Therefore, we would like to go on record as urging our Department of State to consider most carefully further extension of economic aid, denying such aid to those countries which by their actions endanger the peace and security of free nations. What is the position of the State Department in this regard?

Second, we agree with your August 26, 1955, statement concerning the immediate desirability of economic and technical help in resettling those Arab refugees whose continued presence in their present location delays or impedes the possibility of a total solution of the Arab-Israel problem. What progress has been made by our Government and associated nations toward the solution of this matter?

We recognize that the continuing effort of our Government to counter the spread of world communism has many facets. Action taken anywhere may have repercussions in all parts of the world. But we do urgently feel that our constituents will be better informed by frank statements of the position of the Department of State wherever that is possible, consistent with national security. As Members of Congress, who support the aims and objectives of this administration, we are particularly anxious that our constituents be advised that the Department is taking positive steps toward the protection of free nations such as Israel and toward the dissolution of dangers which in threatening the peace of Israel, threaten also the peace of the free world.

We would much appreciate an early response to this urgent expression of our concern.

HUGH SCOTT, 6th District, Pennsylvania;  
ALBERT P. MORANO, 4th District, Connecticut;  
KENNETH B. KEATING, 38th

District, New York; EDMUND P. RADWAN, 41st District, New York; JAMES G. FULRON, 27th District, Pennsylvania; THOMAS M. PELLY, 1st District, Washington; THOR C. TOLLEFSON, 6th District, Washington; KARL M. LECOMPT, 4th District, Iowa; R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, 35th District, New York; ALBERT W. CRETTELLA, 3d District, Connecticut; HOWARD H. BAKER, 2d District, Tennessee; HORACE SEELY-BROWN, Jr., 2d District, Connecticut; TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, 11th District, Illinois; ALVIN M. BENTLEY, 8th District, Michigan; LAURENCE CURTIS, 10th District, Massachusetts; GORDON CANFIELD, 8th District, New Jersey; ROBERT W. KEAN, 12th District, New Jersey; JOHN P. SAYLOR, 22d District, Pennsylvania; JOSEPH L. CARRIG, 10th District, Pennsylvania; STUYVESANT N. WAINWRIGHT, 1st District, New York; STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN, 2d District, New York; FRANK J. BECKER, 3d District, New York; FRANCIS E. DORN, 12th District, New York; KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, 28th District, New York; BERNARD W. KEARNEY, 32d District, New York; WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS, 34th District, New York; HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, 39th District, New York; THOMAS B. CURTIS, 2d District, Missouri; JAMES T. PATTERSON, 5th District, Connecticut; WILLIAM E. MILLER, 40th District, New York; ROBERT J. CORBETT, 29th District, Pennsylvania; JACKSON B. CHASE, 2d District, Nebraska; PAUL A. FINO, 25th District, New York; RUTH THOMPSON, 3d District, Michigan; GORDON L. McDONOUGH, 15th District, California; DEWITT S. HYDE, 6th District, Maryland; FREDERIC R. COUDERT, Jr., 17th District, New York; CARROLL D. KEARNS, 24th District, Pennsylvania; DONALD L. JACKSON, 16th District, California; PETER FREILINGHUYSEN, Jr., 5th District, New Jersey.

FEBRUARY 6, 1956.

GENTLEMEN: I have your letter of February 3. I share your concern at the continuing tense situation in the Near East, and at the persistent threat it represents to the peace. Let me say that the foreign policy of the United States embraces the preservation of the State of Israel. It also embraces the principle of maintaining our friendship with Israel and the Arab States.

The Government of Israel, feeling that its peaceful existence is threatened by the large amount of arms now made available to certain Arab countries by the Soviet bloc, desires to purchase from the United States and other countries additional armament to balance what it considers to be the increased threat against it.

The United States recognizes that current developments could create a disparity in armed force between Israel and its Arab neighbors. However, we are not convinced that that disparity can be adequately offset by additional purchases of arms by the State of Israel. Israel has a population of under 2 million, whereas the Arab population amounts to tens of millions, and they apparently have been offered access to huge stores of Soviet bloc material. Under this circumstance the security of Israel can perhaps better be assured by means other than an arms race.

The having in hand, by Israel, of equal or superior arms is not the only deterrent to aggression. Israel is a creation of, and member of, the United Nations; the Arab States are also members, and all are solemnly bound by that Charter to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force. The United Nations organization is capable of providing many forms of protection. Furthermore, the United States in

1950 joined with the United Kingdom and France to declare a policy of action within and without the United Nations to deter aggression by either side against the other. United States policy in that respect has recently been reemphasized in the statement issued on February 1, 1956, by President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Eden. The combined influence of the nations which would, under the United Nations Charter and the Tripartite Declaration, be against any armed aggression is a far more effective deterrent to any potential aggressor than any amount of arms which could be obtained by either side.

We do not exclude the possibility of arms sales to Israel. But it is our belief that the security of states in the Near East cannot rest upon arms alone but rather upon the international rule of law and upon the establishment of friendly relations among neighbors. We are actively working toward the establishment of such relations.

In my speech of August 26, 1955, made with President Eisenhower's concurrence, I referred to the fear and tension arising in the area from the lack of fixed permanent boundaries and indicated United States willingness to assist the parties in substituting agreed frontiers for armistice lines. To encourage the parties to work toward such agreement and to assure them that the United States would be prepared to make its contribution to the maintenance of international respect for such boundaries, I stated that the President would recommend that the United States participate in an international guarantee of agreed frontiers. That statement still stands.

You inquire about economic aid. United States policy in the extension of economic aid is based upon the desire to strengthen other free nations. In the case of each aid program we take into account the nature of the project in question and the purpose for which it was intended. I can assure you that United States aid would not be extended for purposes or under circumstances which we judged would undermine peace in any part of the world.

The Arab refugees remain perhaps the most important single source of bitterness existing between the Arab States and Israel. In my speech of August 26, 1955, I proposed that the problem of the Arab refugees be attacked in several ways. I suggested United States participation in an international loan to Israel to assist her in funding her obligation to pay compensation for property left in Israel by the refugees and which is now being utilized by Israel. I recommended assistance to Israel and the Arab States in the rehabilitation of the refugees both by repatriation to Israel to such extent as might be feasible and resettlement in adjoining Arab States. In this connection the Arab States and Israel have accepted, on a technical basis, the Jordan Valley plan which would provide new economic opportunities for several hundred thousand refugees. But final political approval remains to be achieved. Thus, some progress has been realized, but much remains to be done.

I know that you all understand that it is not practical, or in the interest of the goals we seek, to discuss publicly all of the factors involved in this complicated situation. I know you also recognize that the problems of this area must be studied in the larger context of the free world's unceasing struggle against international communism. I have, however, no hesitation in declaring that the United States, seeking for itself to avoid involvement in war, is earnestly striving as a friend of both Israel and its Arab neighbors to relieve the present tension in the area. If the political and economic developments should subsequently become such as to make congressional action desirable or necessary,

the President would, of course, promptly communicate with the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. However, I want to point out I made that statement in my opening remarks prior to yielding to other Members. I do want to bring out this point that as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I took a trip to Europe with a subcommittee and it was only there in Europe that we learned of the Czech-Egyptian arms deal. That is in the record of the subcommittee. It was known to the Department of State as a rumor in the spring. I think it should have been brought to the attention of the House during the session last year. I also feel that had it been brought to the attention of the House, we might have, which I also wrote into the report of the subcommittee, we might have and we should have called off and postponed the Foreign Ministers' Conference in the fall and thus show to the world the insincerity of the Russians.

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

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. We all appreciate the intense interest that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] has had in this problem all through the years and his very sincere approach to it. We all appreciate how important it is that peace negotiations in a delicate situation such as this be carried on behind the scenes, but I would like to have the House advised about, and if it cannot be answered orally at least to have the record completed by supplying for the record, a single instance where the Secretary of State has said to the head of any of the Arab States that the United States as a part of our foreign policy guarantees the integrity of the State of Israel. I think that should be made clear—not to us—not to a press conference, but to the Arab States. Now, if we can supply that for the record, I think we will have moved forward a long way. Can that be supplied?

Mr. SCOTT. I would answer the gentleman by saying that, in effect, that is exactly what was accomplished by the tripartite declaration.

Mr. MULTER. That, too, I am sorry to say is not a declaration to the heads of the Arab States. Let us have a statement from the Secretary of State to the heads of these Arab States that this is it.

Mr. SCOTT. I think the gentleman also said that in August of 1955.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my tribute to the gentleman from New York for the opportunity that has been given here today to bring to the attention of all America the fact that this is not in any way a local problem or a problem which affects just a part of the population of our great country. This is a problem

which too many Americans fail to realize is fundamental to the security of our own Nation and to the peace and security of the entire world.

First, I think that when the record is written there can be no question as to which side is right in this dispute. America has never been hesitant to move forward on the side of right.

But above all else, I think we should understand very clearly that the present situation is but one of the pawns in the great overall effort of Communist Russia to succeed in her plan of world conquest. If she can get rid of the State of Israel, and if she can wipe it out and have a free corridor into North Africa and into Asia they will have accomplished part of their plan. It is perhaps being accomplished by the help and the aid of the Arab nations. Certainly it is up to our Government to see that this does not happen. Certainly, not only for the humanitarian reasons that have been advanced today for the preservation of the rights of the people of Israel to remain a nation, but above all else, because the rest of the free world is looking to us for a plan of action which will safeguard liberty and freedom, and which can be destroyed if we let our weakest link snap, there must be a firm course of action now. So today, if we repeat the truths that have been recited over and over again, it is merely that the truth needs to be repeated in order that the world at large and all Americans may understand the true issues.

I thank the gentleman for giving me this opportunity.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. KLEIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, we are all greatly indebted to the distinguished and lovely gentleman from New York [Mrs. KELLY], for bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress.

This problem is presently also receiving the attention of our Government in conjunction with the governments of France and Great Britain. It continues to be one of the most important matters before the United Nations as well.

Many of us are fearful that the recent conference between the President and the Prime Minister of Great Britain may have resulted in some high level decision to further appease the Arab nations at the expense of that tiny democracy, Israel. We must here raise our voices against any such decision. No amount of oil, which seems to be the factor most affecting our position in the Middle East, or for that matter, any monetary or other pecuniary consideration, temporary or otherwise, that we can obtain as a result of "selling out" Israel will in the long run be of benefit to us. The people of this country, as well as many throughout the world, are looking to our Government for world leadership. Israel, as has been said here many times, is our

greatest bulwark against Communism in the Middle East. This has been demonstrated time and again whereas many of the Arab countries have been playing "footsie," first with the Nazis, and now with the Communists. They have demonstrated that in a time of emergency when we might need them most, they cannot be depended upon.

It is to be hoped that our Secretary of State and the Prime Ministers of the governments of France and England, which were signatories to the Tripartite Declaration of 1950 will at least live up to their obligations under that agreement.

Again I want to thank my colleague from New York [Mrs. KELLY] for this opportunity of presenting here what I believe to be the views of the majority of this Congress.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman from New York on her obviously studied, experienced, and considered presentation today. It is further proof of that which we from New York have known for a long time, that in our colleague on that great Committee on Foreign Affairs we have a Member upon whom we can rely and depend to state lucidly and tersely her position on any difficult subject. It is further justification for us to come more and more to lean and rely upon her judgment in this situation.

The gentleman has expressed views to which I can wholly and entirely subscribe. I therefore need not delay the House any longer, other than to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I am sure that out of this discussion will undoubtedly come the action that seems to be needed.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I want to take this time to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] for his remarks. I only wish that I could have that same effect on the State Department with reference to Israel, but at least I tried.

Mr. KEOGH. If I still have a few seconds, I would say whether the gentleman has any effect upon the State Department is not as important as the effect we know she will have had after today upon all thinking Americans.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I thank the gentleman.

I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD].

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the other Members in expressing our appreciation to the gentleman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] for the great work she has done on this subject and for the fine work done by her committee in the Middle East. I know I express the opinion of many Members of the Congress in stating that we are indeed fortunate to have the gentleman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] play the guiding role she has in this field.

It seems a little presumptuous for a freshman Congressman to come before this great body to make suggestions as to what should be done on such a vital issue as the Middle East. However, I think that is typical of the void that exists because our State Department, who should be expert in this field, have

taken no position whatsoever. It seems to me clear that leadership must be had—and had soon—on this subject or we will lose our position in the Middle East through the very virtue that we have not exercised—that of leadership in this area.

So with the knowledge that this is a highly sensitive field I would like to put forth some suggestions that seem to me would be of some help in this troubled area.

It seems clear to me that the following steps would help resolve some of the problems in this area. Of course, it is conceded that there is a good deal of controversy and many problems to be solved, but some action must be forthcoming and forthcoming soon. I suggest that, first, under no circumstances should the United States sell arms to Egypt. If Egypt desires peace she has more arms than she needs. If Egypt wants war she has more arms than she deserves.

Second. United States should enter a mutual-security pact with all peace-loving nations of the Middle East. A pact which would not preclude the entrance of Israel into mutual defense against non-Middle East enemies and which would guarantee the borders of those countries.

Third. Impose economic sanctions on nations that breach the peace. That is, for example, unload our surplus cotton, for which all our taxpayers have paid their tax dollars to support, in Egyptian foreign markets at a low price, if Egypt should breach the peace in this area.

Fourth. Offer concrete help in order to develop Israel's oil resources to their fullest.

Fifth. Provide defensive arms needed by Israel to protect itself against any aggression.

Sixth. By educational methods and by the pressure of world opinion, try to bring to the consciousness of the Arab States that it is to their own self-interest that Israel survive. So that its men of learning, its doctors, its public health experts, its irrigation experts may be utilized by the people of the entire area. So that the whole of the Middle East may flower and peace again shine on the lands from which all mankind sprang.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, until these things are done it is only logical to expect that the prestige and influence of the United States will fall even lower in this most important and strategic area of the world.

Thank you, Mrs. KELLY, for allotting me this time.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I would like to commend the gentlewoman from New York for her leadership in this matter and to associate myself with her remarks.

I would like also to commend my friend from Massachusetts and to say that I particularly associate myself with the solutions which he has just set forth.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I thank the gentleman,

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very anxious to associate myself with my colleagues and particularly with the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] and to say what a splendid and fine thing she has done today.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt that the situation in the Near East is far different today than it was a year ago. American policy, if it is to be realistic, must face the fact that Soviet influence is now firmly established in Egypt—a highly volatile and nationalistic country under military rule which currently relies on the Communistic bloc not only for arms, but as the main market for exports, and as a source for economic aid and technical assistance.

If we are to be realistic we must recognize that nothing, now, can keep Russian embassies and emissaries out of the Near East, and that it is wisest to enlist them, as soon and as publicly as possible, in the ranks of those who do not want a second Israel war.

I think that it must be made unmistakably clear, Mr. Speaker, that the sale of arms to Israel—as proposed in the joint declaration signed by Republican and Democratic Members of this body alike—is only a short-range measure to preserve the tenuous peace which exists today more by chance than by design. The sale of arms to Israel, all of us agree, is absolutely consistent with the Tripartite agreement of 1950 which recognizes that the nations of the Near and Middle East must have arms for purposes of self-defense and the stability of the area. Only the conditions have changed. Arab nations which were relatively weak in 1950 today are growing stronger by the hour with the delivery of heavy weapons and jet aircraft from the Soviet Union. Surely there can be no question but that the balance of strength between Israel and her hostile neighbors has been dangerously upset. Nor can we dispute the fact that a tiny oasis of democracy, only 8,000 square miles in area and a mere population of 1,600,000, is surrounded by sworn enemies whose total population is 40 million and whose total territory is in excess of 1 million square miles. If the Tripartite agreement was necessary in 1950, as we are all convinced that it was, then surely it is all the more essential today.

The void in United States policy just referred to by the learned and eminent gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MACDONALD, must be filled by thoughtful but positive action. The proposals which he set forth would do much to fill the ghastly vacuum which today is causing the entire world such anxiety.

At the risk of repeating myself, Mr. Speaker, let me again say that opportunities for peace are precious because they are only momentary; they must be taken by free people with courage and conviction.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DONOVAN].

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, needless to say, I am profoundly grateful,

and I know I speak for everybody within range of my voice, for this opportunity the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] has presented to all the Members of this House to express their views on the stark conflict that now exists in the Middle East.

The basic facts in North Africa and Asia Minor are bitter. The Arab league in the driver's seat with Egypt at the reins is against us, playing Russia's game. The Arab league opposes the Northern Tier Pact between Turkey, Iraq, Iran, and Pakistan; so does Russia. The United States supports this Northern Tier arrangement as a keystone in our defenses against Russia, yet the timid in our midst temporize.

Israel, the only democracy as we understand the term, in the Middle East, is on our side. To whom, in the name of common sense should our aid and sustenance go, if not to Israel? Should we comfort our enemies and leave our friend naked?

Apart from these stark reflections on the real politics of North Africa and Asia Minor with one eye on the Dark Age and medieval history of militant Islam and its modern counterpart, the Arab league, and the other eye on the heroic struggle of modern Israel for freedom and self-respect, what kind of man would I be if I looked the other way? I cast my lot with Israel and against the Arab league and to the Arab league, as far as I am concerned, we should give nothing, no economic aid, until they back down and show a willingness to play the game as a civilized western world understands the rules.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE].

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, extend my appreciation to the gentlewoman from New York on her efforts in pointing up the explosive situation which obtains in the Middle East.

On April 27, 1955, in my salute to Israel on her seventh anniversary, I pointed out that the present administration has released arms to Iraq and the Arab nations while refusing arms to Israel since 1952. Today, we find the United States and the West still furnishing arms to the Arab nations, who are receiving arms from the Soviet Union as well now, and our Secretary of State still refuses to sell arms to Israel. My well-intentioned advice in that speech about a treaty arrangement with Israel has been ignored and refused.

Of course, all the emphasis possible must and has to be directed to the goal of peace. Nobody wants an arms race in the Middle East. But I certainly do not want to see Israel put in the position where she is helpless against her enemies. An arms race can be bad but it would be infinitely worse for democracy and for the world if the United States and the United Nations should permit the Arab States to overrun the beacon of democracy in the Middle East—Israel.

Israel, as we know, is a tiny struggling island of democracy surrounded by forces which threaten its very life and existence. These forces, the Arab nations, see in Israel a threat and living refutation of the systems of despotism and abso-

lutism to which most of these surrounding Arab nations, despite certain lip-service to the contrary, are clearly wedded and devoted.

And more than that, we now have the situation where these enemies of Israel are receiving aid not only from the West but also from the nation that is the greatest threat to our own security, namely the U. S. S. R. And our Secretary of State temporizes and continues to be afraid to sell arms to Israel because he "might start an arms race." The sooner our Secretary of State realizes and understands than an arms race has already been started and that Soviet Russia is running very hard in that arms race by arming the Arab nations against Israel the better off will be not only Israel and the United States, but the whole civilized world as well.

Nobody wants war and everybody will do everything possible to prevent a war from breaking out. But it would be even worse to allow the Arab nations to overrun Israel and as the Arab States say drive them into the sea.

It is not necessary to repeat and mention all of the privations and hardships that the people of Israel suffered at the hands of the Nazi before and during the last war. Let us not put them in the position where they might suffer even more of the same sort of treatment at the hands of the Arabs.

In my salute to Israel on April 27, 1955, I advised that—

Our Government should not furnish any arms to the Arab States until and unless they sign treaties of peace with Israel and give indications that they will honor and be bound by the terms of such a treaty.

And that—

Israel should be included in any defense arrangements for the Middle and Near East.

I wish to now repeat those words of advice to our Secretary of State.

Israel needs a security treaty with the United States and she now further needs defensive arms from the United States and the West with which she can deter an Arab attack which she fears is scheduled for this next summer. There are four reasons why Israel fears an attack this coming summer. They are:

First. Progressively increasing Arab hostility. The Syrian delegate to the United Nations has told the Security Council that Israel has no legal or political right to any of its 8,000 square miles of land.

Second. Unconditional Soviet support of the Arab position and Soviet penetration of the Middle East, threatening Israel's national existence and its democratic principles of life.

Third. "A massive infusion of deathly armaments" into Arab countries from both the Communist bloc and the West. This has fused British centurion tanks with soviet MIG jet fighters and bombers, submarines, and artillery, for only one purpose, "war against Israel."

Fourth. The lack of a security alliance with any other nation, causing Israel to feel she stands "alone in her peril."

As I said last April, our Government should make a determined effort to bring about direct negotiations between Israel

and the Arab States so that peace between them can be effected. Formal treaties should be prepared within the framework of the United Nations guaranteeing the existing frontiers of Israel and the Arab nations in the Near East that want peace and are ready to enter into such treaties. But our Department of State must also remember that the Arab States are preparing to drive Israel into the sea. For this reason, and this reason alone, the United States and the West must furnish arms to Israel so the Israeli can protect themselves against attack by the Arabs. Accordingly, I join in making this further specific suggestion: that our Government permit Israel to purchase the \$50 million of defensive arms which she seeks in this country strictly for purposes of self-defense.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to commend the gentleman from New York for her able presentation today and for bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that our Government take firm and decisive action in the Middle East. If the Arab States and Communist Russia are encouraged to believe that the democracies have abandoned Israel, or any country, they will attack as was done in South Korea. I have always believed that if Secretary of State Acheson had taken a firm stand against the North Korean Communists before June 26, 1950, there would not have been an attack on South Korea. A similar situation exists between Israel and the Arab States.

In the face of Egyptian-Soviet arms deals, other Arab States will be emboldened to attack Israel and other countries and, at the same time, follow the Egyptian lead into the Soviet orbit.

In order to prevent another South Korea, this is the time for the West to show clearly that it is ready to defend peace in the Middle East with firm and binding guaranties of support.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlewoman from New York, Mrs. EDNA KELLY, for her outstanding contribution in enlightening the Members of the House regarding the critical situation involving the nation of Israel.

At the time that President Truman recognized the infant nation, the people of the free world hoped that Israel would be a beachhead of democracy in the Middle East. We now find that the complex and intricate infiltration maneuverings of the Kremlin has been stirring up dissension among the neighbors of this small democracy, the Soviets are using the same blueprint, with but few changes, on the strategy, that they used when they subjected the now captive nations in Europe under their tyranny. It is high time that our country, the recognized leader of the free world, take decided steps to protect the democracy of Israel from the encroachments of its adjacent enemies who

would destroy this small country if they did not fear the repercussions from the free nations of the world. I am alarmed at the actions of our State Department that it is not taking a more decided stand through our ally Great Britain in curtailing the shipment of arms and ammunition to the enemies of Israel. If this cannot be done, at least the free democracies should aid in every way to give Israel the needed arms and airpower to defend itself in case of attack.

Through my experience as chairman of the congressional Katyn Forest Massacre Investigating Committee in the 81st Congress and the Committee on Communist Aggression in the 82d Congress, I can readily see that Soviet communism is at work in the Near East using the same blueprint that it used during the last 20 years in creating suspicions and unrest in Central Europe. All the leaders of the captive nations who observed the Soviet strategy in those days, can easily identify the Kremlin maneuverings in stirring up dissension, bitterness and strife in the Middle East. This is part of the Communist strategy and tactics in its slow and ultimate desire for world control and domination. I firmly believe that the free countries, including our own, must now take a decided stand on the Israel crisis before the Communist propaganda and armament will incite Israel's enemies into a vicious attack upon this small democracy in the Middle East. Concrete steps taken now may avert general war in the Near East.

I am happy to be one of the 94 Members of Congress who signed the petition and which today has been presented to the Congress by our colleague, Congressman CELLER, of New York.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the talks this afternoon and I have been moved deeply. Israel is threatened with annihilation, with being wiped from the face of the world. To save her, to prevent one of the great tragedies of all history, we must act now. Today is being raised the voice of the Congress.

Back of Israel lies here in our United States of America an ocean of sentiment and of emotion. Our Americans of the two most numerous religions have a sentimental historic interest in the area wherein has been established the State of Israel. We have seen this State established in a spirit in which our own country was established, by people who have come from oppression, from hardship, and who saw ahead the sun of a new day of hope. They made great sacrifices. They made a great start. They were men and women and children with a purpose and the hardihood and devotion to fulfill a mission. And in the enactment of their laws they followed so much our own pattern. Here in the United States those of the Jewish religion have been in the minority. In Israel they were in the majority, and one of the first enactments of Israel was to guarantee religious freedom, with no handicap upon any minority. So, in everything that Israel has done we have

seen a reflection of the things that were done in the building of this country.

Now Israel has been brought by the wicked designs of an alien theology to the point of great danger. Arms are being supplied her enemies for her destruction. It is not a matter of months, time for long negotiations and study in the closed offices of the State Department. It is a matter perhaps of days, certainly a matter of weeks or of a few months until it all will end in one of the great tragedies of history. Can we stand idle when all the enemies around Israel are being supplied with arms and the threat is out "Israel will be wiped from the face of the earth." That, I think, is why we have in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States are meeting today that all the world may know our demand for prompt action.

And, upon what are we basing our reason? We vote here in the Congress for large sums of money to defend our own country, and we say we are not engaged in a war of armaments. We are not in a race of armaments, what we seek is peace. But in building our own defense we say that to have peace we must have strength. So we would apply that same rule to Israel. We say that in order that there shall be peace in that area, where Israel is our friend, Israel shall have sufficient arms to match the arms that are given her enemies; not to wage war but to preserve the peace by destroying the imbalance that invites war.

My friends—and I am measuring my words—if Israel is permitted to fall, Israel, which is the prototype of our own country in that area, the cathedral of democracy in the Middle East, if Israel is permitted to fall because of our procrastination, because of our cautiousness, because of our lazy indifference, then, my friends, the day may not be far away when our own country will feel the impact because once from the heart of Americans has been lost the spark it may never be regained. What is that spark that carried our country through the years of its founding and through the perplexing problems of growing years? Is it not the spark of our lives and of our traditions that we will not see thrown down and kicked while he is down our brothers and go not to his succor? I hope and pray that never will that spark be lost to us.

Yes, we are striving now to hold high the spirit of these United States which is the spirit of all democracy and in which we find a reflection, brilliant as the rising sun, in our alley, our friend, and brother to our heart, Israel.

For Israel and to all the world we want peace. Peace in this area can be purchased only with strength. We will not stand idly by and permit to grow and expand an imbalance certain to end in war.

In our joint statement calling upon our Government to permit Israel to purchase defensive arms in the United States, close to half of the Members of the House summarized the situation in the Middle East in these words:

Israel is firmly a part of the free world and she may be counted upon not only to defend

herself, but also to join in the defense of the free world.

Being party to an armaments race in the Middle East is a decision fraught with desperate possibilities. Unfortunately Russia seized the initiative. In arming the Arabs, as she is doing through her satellite Czechoslovakia, she has left us no alternative but to arm Israel.

Our own security as well as the security of the free world is now threatened by Communist penetration into the Arab States of the Middle East. Unless Israel is armed an imbalance of armed strength may tempt Egypt to wage war against Israel setting off a conflagration which could be world war III.

The Egyptian-Czech arms deal brings the cold war to the Middle East. The survival of Israel is menaced.

We cannot let Israel down. In abandoning her to the Arabs, an effect which at this point would result from failure to arm Israel would mean that the free countries of Europe and the Far East would be outflanked and our own security jeopardized.

The Arab countries are deceived into believing that Russia is honest and friendly. We know that the Soviet objective is to stymie United Nations action in order to maintain and increase the dangerous tensions existing in that area.

Israel has earned the right to national life. Established in fulfillment of the League of Nations mandate to facilitate the founding of a national home for the Jewish people Israel in little more than a decade has made a remarkable record. Jewish pioneers have restored fertility to the soil and redeemed a land from feudal squalor.

In the few years of national existence, Israel has opened her doors to 700,000 immigrants creating for them new homes and means of livelihood. In Israel equality of opportunity is no myth. Education is a major goal. The country gives the impression of dedicating itself to bringing up and educating its children.

A nation founded upon our own principles of democracy, Israel is dedicated to the betterment of man. Israel must not perish.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in commending the brilliant and devoted Congresswoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] for her masterful presentation today. No better presentment, with the driving power of eloquence combined with compelling sincerity, has been made in this body during the years it has been my honor and my privilege to be a Member. She has rendered a great service to her country, to Israel and to the world.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. I now yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentlewoman from New York. She has made a very wonderful and able presentation. She and the other gentlewomen of this House perform a tremendously great service, not to their country alone but to all of us. They inspire us all to exert the best that is in us, and their courage, their equanimity, and their adherence to righteous principles, strengthen the rest of us in a

way that we can better meet and discharge the manifold and onerous problems which confront us. Walt Whitman stated this thought in a different way when he said:

A man is a great thing upon the earth, and through eternity, but every jot of the greatness of man is unfolded out of women.

So I pay humble tribute to the gentlewoman. She is sincere. I am likewise sure that every Member participating in this discussion today has spoken in the utmost sincerity.

I am now going to take that which likely will be an unpopular position. Certainly it is a position which easily can be misunderstood. There may be some who will accuse me of making a speech for the Arabs. There may be others who will falsely accuse me of being anti-Jew or anti-Israel. But I would rather be falsely accused, and I would prefer that these things be said against me ill-advisedly than to think within myself that I sat idly by and said nothing and, by so doing, betrayed my own conscience and my own country. I am not pro-Israel or pro-Arab. I am pro-America.

I do not think that the answer is arms now. It is dangerous to think that we can solve the explosive situation presently existing in the Middle East by participating in an arms race at this moment. Mr. Speaker, this is not a matter which can be settled on the basis of emotions or passions. You and I know that everything pertaining to this subject cannot be brought out in an open debate, because there is much information that is highly classified and secret and which, therefore, cannot be divulged in an open discussion like this.

In October and November I visited the countries of Lebanon, Jordan, Syria, Egypt, Iraq, and Israel. I was part of a study mission which engaged in conversation with American officials in those countries. We visited the refugee camps in Jericho and Amman. We talked with Colonel Nasser of Egypt, with the king of Iraq, and with leaders in other Arab countries and Israel. We discussed economic, political, and military problems. On the basis of my observations, as a Member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs visiting those countries, I am convinced that the answer is not arms now.

Stephen Decatur said, at the beginning of the 19th century:

My country, may she always be right. But, right or wrong, my country.

I have no doubt that every Member who has spoken today places the well-being of his country first of all. I, too, place the interests of the United States and the welfare of my beloved country—and I hope no one will think me chauvinistic—but I, like you, place the interests and security of my own country above the interests and welfare of any other country or any combination of countries in the world. And speaking from that premise, and on the basis of facts gleaned from my visit to the troubled Middle East, I do not believe that the answer is arms now. Future developments could convince me that this

may be the ultimate solution, and I certainly would hold that the United States should not permit Israel to be wantonly overrun or destroyed. But I do think that for us to supply arms to Israel at this moment would only serve to compound the obstacles to peace in the Middle East. If we furnish arms to Israel, we encourage greater arms shipments to the Arab countries. This can only contribute to an ever-widening vicious circle and perhaps ultimately to the total destruction of Israel itself and to our own involvement in world war III.

I wish to thank the gentlewoman for granting me this time. I told her that my position would not be in accord with the position taken by others who have engaged in this discussion, although I am sure that our ultimate goal is the same. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I have participated only with extreme hesitancy. It is a matter which I would not debate openly with anyone, but I simply could not refrain from having the record show that there are other aspects to the matter which cannot be brought into our conversation here but which are certainly to be evaluated if our Government is to properly determine its course of action and the policies to be followed. I do not want the American people to believe for 1 minute that there is only one viewpoint on this question, nor do I want our own State Department to be pressured into following a course of action which, incidentally, may be politically expedient at the moment but which may not be in our own national self-interests.

The issue is larger than Israel. It is larger than the Arab countries. The issue could well be the peace of the whole world. The strategic waterways and the all-precious oil fields of the Middle East are in the balance and, in the titanic could war struggle presently being waged between East and West, we simply cannot afford to see these slip into the hands of the Communists by default.

May I say in conclusion that I believe that the Secretary of State understands the complexities and the potentialities of this problem. I have not always agreed with him on foreign policy. Actually I have usually disagreed, because, in the main, I think that our foreign policy lacks firmness. I have said upon more than one occasion that we are losing ground because our foreign policy is no longer anchored and founded on the bedrock of moral principles. To be assured of this we have only to review the position taken by our Government on the United Nations package deal so very recently. It is time to take a firm stand for principles, as I said in this House on January 26 and again on February 1. Nevertheless I do believe that the Secretary of State is honestly trying to find a workable solution to the dangerous Middle East enigma. If we can find a workable solution short of agitating and encouraging an arms race between two great peoples, I certainly think it to be in the best interests of all to do so.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I congratulate the gentleman. I, too, visited some of those countries in 1953. I certainly agree with the gentleman from West Virginia that this is a two-sided question. The sending of arms at this particular time is not the answer. I wonder if all sides, including the Arab countries and Israel, could show good faith by being willing to abide by the established boundary lines set up by the United Nations. I doubt if you would get very much cooperation. I just personally believe that. We are responsible for the setup there. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] said, they have about 5,000 square miles now, whereas a few years ago they had 4,000 square miles when this was originally set up. It seems to me, if we are going to take it upon ourselves to force the issue and straighten it out, we should call upon Israel and all the Arab countries to abide by the original setup or the partition until such time as the United Nations or this country, or whoever has the chance, may be able to solve this thing without plunging the whole world into war.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. I know there is no more sincere Member of the House than he. I know there are many who disagree with the speakers today. I hope that we will not always agree. That is our process of government, to bring out those things on which we disagree.

But I do want to say this: I cannot forgive Egypt for taking the arms from the Kremlin and at the same time coming to the United States and asking the United States for economic assistance in building the Aswan Dam. I served notice on the Secretary of State that when the proper time came I was going to oppose economic aid to Egypt unless Egypt agreed to sit down to a peace conference and settle the difficulties, political, economic, and military, with Israel.

I want to mention one thing at this point. There have been many accusations against the State of Israel because of some remarks that she is not willing to adjust borders. At this point I place in the Record a statement of Ambassador Eban in 1952, in which he discussed the territorial question:

These frontiers can only be changed by a process of negotiation and agreement. The peace negotiation would enable the parties to exchange proposals on the manner in which the armistice frontiers might be mutually adjusted for a peace settlement.

I also insert a more recent remark by Mr. Sharett, the Foreign Minister of Israel, in which he expresses the same idea in these words:

Israel has always declared her readiness, and is indeed anxious, to explore the possibility of certain mutual adjustments of the boundary line, but of unilateral territorial concessions on her part there can be no question.

On that I agree. They should sit down to a peace table and adjust their differences. Then, at that time, we can guarantee borders.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOLLINGER] I ask unanimous consent that he may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State Dulles has once again turned down Israel's request to purchase arms; his reason this time is that we must wait until the new Anglo-American plan of Middle East peace has been tested.

In my opinion, there has been too much complacency and waiting. We have not been given the details of the Anglo-American plan agreed on in the Eisenhower-Eden conference and the length of the contemplated waiting period has not been indicated. It is hoped that the plan includes a firm and unequivocal stand by the United States that Israel is our ally, that we will support her in her efforts to remain free, that we will not permit her to be sacrificed in any way, that the situation requires no appeasement but rather that Israel deserves the right to exist as a democracy and to enjoy the peace for which she has always asked.

The crisis which exists in the Middle East has reached explosive and terrible proportions. The survival of Israel is in jeopardy. The cold war has crept to the Egyptian-Israel frontier, constituting a threat to the free world. Should a shooting war begin there, a world conflagration could ensue. We cannot accurately foretell at this point how many nations would be drawn into the conflict; we do not know whether or not the world itself would remain in existence should another world war be precipitated.

It is imperative that the United States use every means possible to bring a quick and decisive end to the threat of war in the Middle East. It is admitted that the solution is to promote an honorable peace settlement between the parties. I repeat—Israel has always wanted peace, but from the very day of the birth of the new State of Israel, she has lived in a constant state of fear and preparedness—fear of attack and preparedness for war. Egypt has consistently refused to recognize Israel and to negotiate for peace, and has sworn Israel's defeat and downfall.

The Egyptian-Czech arms deal, the weapons and technicians now pouring into the hands of Israel's enemies, and the lack of help to Israel, all place her in a vulnerable and tragic spot. The imbalance of arms which exists must be a great temptation to her enemies to accomplish what they have sworn to do—destroy Israel.

We sat back and permitted the crisis to be created; we watched the tensions grow, and now we are too slow to act. Our Nation must, without delay, act with other interested nations to the end that formal treaties within the framework of the United Nations are achieved which would guarantee the existing frontiers of

Israel and such Arab nations in the Middle East that want peace and are ready to enter into such treaties. Agreement to negotiate is a major problem and we must resolutely work toward the necessary agreement by the Arab nations to sit down at the peace table.

However, such agreement to negotiate is not within sight, while grave danger of a major outbreak of hostilities is a reality. The great imbalance of military power, the preponderance of military and manpower on the side of the Arab nations, are a menace to Israel's very existence. For this reason, our Government should permit Israel, without further delay, to purchase the arms which she has requested. Israel wants no arms race, but she does need help in order to be able to defend herself. By granting Israel's request and giving her all possible aid, we will create a stalemate in arms which will help to ward off any open conflict; we will defeat Russia's cold war aims in the Middle East and avert a new war.

Peace must be achieved. Statesmanship of the highest level is called for and we pray that the efforts of those upon whom the burden rests to push the necessary agreements will be successful, for the present threat to Israel is a threat to democracy and to the best interests of free nations everywhere.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the views expressed by various Members today. No one misunderstands the purity and the honesty of the motives of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] even though at times we may disagree with the gentleman. There is not a small thought in his mind. The main question in my mind is what is good for the national interest of the United States. That is the primary question. It seems to me our national interest is more consistent with the national interest of Israel than it is with the national interest of Egypt. Egypt has identified its national interest with the national interest of the Kremlin and the Soviet Union. Certainly our national interest is more consistent with Israel than it is with Egypt, as I said before, and certainly our national interest is completely inconsistent with the national interest of the Soviet Union. All over the world we find what the Soviet Union is doing. They are in French North Africa with Communist arms being sent there by way of Egypt. Why, if France were to withdraw from NATO, in my opinion, they could make a deal tomorrow with the Kremlin to stop the Communist activities in French North Africa. One thing the Kremlin is trying to do is to destroy NATO. This last offer that they made of a 20-year peace with the United States, which the President wisely refused, and then the

later offer to include the United States, France and Britain is for the purpose of undermining NATO. If the three nations made that agreement, then there would be no more need for NATO. A year from now they would start breaking their promises again. We know the history of broken promises in any agreement that has been made with the Soviet Union. Indonesia is not in healthy shape. The promises of the Kremlin have been broken in Southeast Asia. There are Communist guerrillas in pretty much control of two provinces of Laos and that is in violation of their agreements.

All over the world you will find Communist penetration, all for the purpose of bringing about their objective—world revolution and world domination. Of course the furnishing of arms alone is not the solution. But who brought about this imbalance? Certainly it was not Israel. I view Israel not as a nation of Jewish origin but like any other little nation of Irish people or any other little nation that might be over there, viewing it objectively and historically. Several thousand square miles; 1,600,000 people, including men, women, and children; surrounded by other countries numbering in the millions. Able to win now if they wanted to. If Israel wanted to move, they could win. They are the ones who are taking actions consistent with peace, trying to stop aggression, going into warfare; because everyone admits if Israel wanted to now they could win. But the question with Israel is, What about a year from now or 2 years from now; or of any other little nation over there? Their racial origin should be of no concern to us. We were the first nation to recognize the new nation of Israel. They are a real democracy. Their government is, in substance, the same as ours. It is the only democracy in that wide area of the world. So the imbalance of arms was not brought about by this little nation or by the United States. It was brought about by Egypt and the Soviet Union. We have to start doing a little reckoning of our own as to why they did it. Certainly it does not show much regard for the prestige and position of the United States when we see things like that happen. So that the question that addresses itself to me as an American—no matter what others' views may be, what is for the national interest of the United States. As I view the national interest of our country it is more consistent with that little nation over there than it is with Egypt, buying arms from the Soviet Union or Czechoslovakia, one of its satellites. Czechoslovakia would not sell any arms if the Kremlin did not permit it. Technically they say it is Czechoslovakia, but who dominates Czechoslovakia? Not the people, but the Government of Czechoslovakia does this at the orders of the Kremlin. Their word cannot be trusted. They are out to dominate the world, and they admit it. They put on a mask of a smile, but the mask of a smile has not changed the same minds that have contributed to sending millions to imprisonment and their death. We had better not be deceived by the mask of a smile. The same minds are there, intent upon

world revolution and world domination. The quicker we get back to a policy of diplomatic firmness, where America's position is understood and respected, not disbelieved, not changing from day to day—the quicker we get back to firmness and to the basic policy of peace through strength, the quicker there will be respect for this great nation of ours.

So as I view this question, looking at it from the national interest of the United States, I say that the national interest of my country is more consistent with the national interest of Israel than it is with the Kremlin, selling arms to Egypt; more consistent with the national interest of Israel or Israel's national interest; more consistent with ours than it is with the national interest of Egypt or the Kremlin.

Now on the question of arms, I believe that the imbalance already caused by the Communists should be brought into balance but, if the representatives of the United States, Great Britain, and France, as a result of the meetings now going on, make firm statements that under no conditions will they permit this little nation to be destroyed or weakened, then there will be respect for the power, and dignity, and strength of those three nations. That is the kind of firm language that the Communists understand.

When we showed firmness in Iran they acted. They understand the language of firmness; they also quickly understand the language of weakness. The quicker we get back to being firm in the Middle East, and in southeast Asia, and other trouble spots of the world, the quicker we will get back to affirmative action. From the psychological angle we are on the defensive throughout the entire world. We had better get back to firmness and strength and get back to affirmative action not only in the Near East but in other parts of the world.

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

Mrs. KELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, in confirming the statement made by the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], regarding the agreements which the Kremlin makes with other nations I may state that I was a member of the committee which investigated Communist aggression in the last Congress. During our hearing in New York ex-President Hoover testified before our committee. In answer to the question regarding Communist agreements and treaties he answered that between World War I and 1939, at the beginning of World War II, the Kremlin made 36 different agreements with the satellite countries, the countries that today are captive nations, but that when it came time in the judgment of the Kremlin to break those treaties, pacts, and agreements, the Kremlin disregarded, annulled, and figuratively threw those agreements in the wastebasket when they were ready to march and take over those captive European countries.

Further concerning the agreements and the treaties which the Kremlin made during the last 35 years—and this has a very important bearing on the overtures

the Kremlin is now making to our State Department regarding a 20-year truce—United States News and World Report several months ago, published an extended article with a breakdown of the number of agreements and treaties the Kremlin made with the free nations throughout the world. The magazine enumerated those agreements, pacts, and treaties. United States News and World Report stated that out of 52 agreements that the Kremlin made with the free democracies throughout the world during the last 35 years, 50 were discarded, broken, annulled, and thrown in the wastebasket when they saw fit to do away with those treaties, agreements, and pacts.

The only two agreements they kept out of the 52 with the free nations were: first the agreement to go into the Japanese war, to join the Allies against Japan, which was only a two weeks' participation on the part of the Kremlin; and the second was to maintain and give the free world a corridor into Berlin. We know that they even violated that agreement when we were compelled to resort to the air lift several years ago in order to feed the people of Berlin during the blockade.

So, as a matter of fact, out of 52 agreements with free nations the Kremlin really only kept one agreement and that was to go into war against the Japanese nation for 2 weeks at the rear end of World War II. I heartily endorse the statements just made by our majority leader, Mr. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 25, 1950, the United States of America, France, and the United Kingdom made what is known as Tripartite Declaration.

In that statement the three states expressed their concern over the peace and stability in the Middle East and the impact of arms shipments to that area which would inevitably lead to an arms race among the nations there.

Since that time all the powers involved have ignored the conditions in that area and indeed have almost ignored the existence of the declaration.

As we are all aware arms races are very often a last stage preliminary to actual armed conflict and they increase world tension by geometric progression.

We are all agreed that crying need exists for positive action in the area. America must boldly take the leadership in the Middle East as we must elsewhere. We are the only democratic Nation which has the strength and position of leadership in the free world which would enable strong positive action to avert a conflict which might result in the third world war.

American policy has been singularly vacillating and aimless in this time of stress, not only in the Middle East but elsewhere. At the same time the Rus-

sians and their satellites have acted vigorously.

The Soviet bloc has sent, according to recent newspaper releases, some 200 MIG-15 jet fighters, 50 Yushkin fast light bombers, 6 submarines, and large quantities of small arms, artillery, armor, and so forth to Egypt. I presume they have along a number of technicians to train Egyptians and operate some of the equipment itself. Britain, France, and even the United States have sent quantities of arms to Arab countries during recent months. Equally important is the fact that so-called surplus and demilitarized arms have been reconditioned and sent to Egypt and her Arab neighbors by Western European countries.

Two very disquieting things we read in the newspapers are that the Egyptians loudly boast that they will not rest until they have cut out the "Israeli cancer" from the "Arab heart," and they announce to the world how they have completed their first maneuvers with Soviet arms. Does this suggest peaceful intent?

These facts together with other things clearly reveal to us the need for positive action to prevent war. They make crystal clear the precise character of the Egyptian intentions.

As a prominent Israeli said:

If Egypt desires peace she has more arms than she needs. If she desires war she has more arms than she deserves.

It is also interesting to note that Moslem countries like Pakistan, which have long clearly demonstrated their friendship for the United States and have alined themselves with us in the world struggle against Communist expansionism, are slighted by us in our rush to buy off and placate the Egyptians. Yet Egypt shows no friendship for America and no desire to settle the differences in the area peacefully.

I have heard that the British Government proposes to settle the matter by giving up a portion of Israel's territory to secure peace. This is indeed a return to the days of Chamberlain and his umbrella diplomacy which was to result in peace in our time.

The tragic history of Czechoslovakia and the war which followed reveal the folly and uselessness of such methods for the preservation of lasting peace. Such a policy is as likely to produce peace as for the United States to cede Brooklyn or Michigan's Upper Peninsula or for Britain to cede Scotland to the Arabs.

The last war shows that Egypt was at best a weak, indecisive, vacillating ally. At worst, Egypt came so close to selling out to Germany and the Axis Powers that the British had to run tanks into the very courtyard of Farouk's palace to prevent an actual betrayal. Subsequent dealings with Egypt in the postwar years have shown the orientation of that country continues the same. Some but not all the other Arab countries were no more reliable in that conflict.

It appears that Egypt dreams not only of becoming the dominant power among the Arab powers but of actually creating an Egyptian Empire from the Atlantic to India. To that end Egypt and

Egyptian agents foment trouble all throughout that area among other things by inflammatory radio broadcasts into French Morocco, and by fomenting trouble in the Sudan they arouse the more peaceful states to a jihad or holy war. To this we contrast the behavior of our sister democracy, Israel, which has at all times shown herself a stout ally of the West. During World War II and during the troubled period following, she has urged no harsh methods nor stern repression against the Egyptians.

I say that the basis for action by the United States is adequately set forth in the tripartite declaration of May 25, 1955. The principles of that declaration have been ignored, not only by Britain and France but, to our shame, by our own Government.

Our State Department must urge on our friends, France and the United Kingdom, that we together proclaim to the world our continued aggressive espousal of the principles in the tripartite declaration and the three nations will govern our actions accordingly.

The three signatory powers must include in such a declaration that they will immediately take action to prevent country border violations by any country whatsoever.

On January 26, of this year, I made a statement in this RECORD, in which I urged that Egypt be given 48 hours to cease accepting Communist arms and to announce to the world their peaceful intentions. Because of our inaction since that time the situation has deteriorated to such a point that it appears that we must furnish to Israel the defensive arms she asks. I stress that Israel asks only that she be given defensive arms. As to why she must have them we need not speculate. Only 1,700,000 Israelis live in a land the size of our own State of New Jersey. They are surrounded by 40 million Arabs, who are openly and avowedly hostile.

Arab leaders have announced that they now hold Israel like a condemned prisoner on the deck awaiting but the executioner's blow.

We must recognize certain facts. Israel is a country which exists, a de facto country. She is recognized by most governments. We cannot permit an existing country to be overthrown by implacable enemies from without.

Israel is the promised homeland of the Jews, for which they waited for centuries. It was Jewish before the coming of the Arabs and will continue to be so. For that we have the promise of the Almighty through his prophets.

What was previously a desert has become a land of green growing things, of industry, and of villages and cities. It has become desirable to the Arabs after being despoiled for years and having been an economic liability.

This has happened because of the industry and frugality of the Israelis. America must never let a people who love their land so much be overwhelmed.

The long-term problems can be worked out considering the needs of all the countries in the area. They may await deliberate action. The arms needs of Israel cannot wait.



Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY], my distinguished and esteemed colleague with whom I have the pleasure of serving on the Committee of Foreign Affairs, for leading the discussion on one of the gravest problems the free world faces today.

I firmly believe that the people of this country feel we are without a firm policy and are drifting and indecisive in an area of our international relations that should call forth resoluteness on the part of the United States. It seems obvious to me that Israel, a free democratic nation realizing magnificent economic growth in a framework of freedom, is a friend that must be preserved.

The people of this Nation ask firm support for Israel in its present treacherous position. The people of this Nation realize that on our shoulders falls the mantle of leadership in working out a peaceful settlement of the tensions that exist in the Middle East. I commend my colleague [Mrs. KELLY] for her thoughtful proposals for solutions to the problems we face in the Middle East.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief in my few remarks on this subject. I think all of my colleagues have done excellently in expressing their views to the House on this very important subject. I understand and respect those Members who have differed with the majority of the Members who have today indicated that one of the ways of solving the problem is to send arms now to Israel.

I would like to clarify the situation in several respects so that we will know precisely where we are going, and why. First, with specific reference to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] as to the things that are learned behind the scenes and must be kept off the record. I have had the opportunity to travel through the Middle East 3 times—in 1948, 1949, and 1955. I had the opportunity of visiting not only with people in Israel but with people in the Arab States. I had the opportunity of talking not only to the Israeli leaders but to the Arab leaders, both Christian and Moslem.

Upon my return after my last visit, which ended in November of 1955, I went to the distinguished chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and said to him: I would like to attend before your committee and without emotion or statement of opinion recite to you some of the facts I learned while there. Then after hearing in executive session those facts which I learned from the Arabs as well as from the Israelis, from Moslems, Christians, and Jews, you then decide with your committee how much of that, if any, should be made public.

I want to assure you, particularly our distinguished colleague who said there are certain things that must be kept off the record because they are classified things that cannot be discussed in open debate—which causes him to say that this is no time to send arms to Israel, that I am awaiting the call of the chairman of that committee, and will respond any time he wants me. I will give him my testimony under oath if he wants it. I will give him facts, names, and dates.

I am willing to sit by and let any other Member of this Congress or anyone outside of the Congress come before the committee and do the same thing. Let those facts be weighed side by side, and on my oath that I took each time that I came to this Congress after being elected, that I will support the Constitution of the United States, and with the same fervor that every Member here has that the interests of our country come first, I say you will have to agree with every Member who stood on this floor today and said that one of the solutions to this problem is to send arms to Israel now. That is only one of the solutions.

Let me indicate to you very briefly why. The little State of Lebanon to the north of Israel is smaller in geographical size than the State of Israel. It is smaller in population than the little State of Israel. With a population of about a million people it has a total army and police force of only 6,000 persons. It is said that the State of Israel can muster an army of 250,000. What is the situation? I was there in 1948 when most of that territory in Lebanon and Israel was barren, arid, and the people were starving.

In 1955 what is the situation? Little Lebanon is prospering. Little Israel is prospering. There is hardly an incident on the Lebanese border. Whenever there has been an invasion from the Lebanese border it has been traced not to the Lebanese but to the Syrians or the Egyptians, using the Lebanese border as a way of getting in and attacking Israel.

If those two little countries have been able to live side by side since the independence of Israel was declared in 1948, if they have been able with that tremendous imbalance in favor of Israel against Lebanon to live peacefully side by side and each prosper, how can anyone say that Israel needs arms today with which to wage a preventive or an aggressive war? They cannot do it logically.

Now, what is the situation across the border in Jordan or in Syria or in Egypt? Today, as it was in 1948 and for years before, the people are still living in mud huts, one-room shacks, and at night they gather their cattle, if they have any, or their goats or chickens into that little hut and sleep there together, because they dare not leave their animals outside. In Israel and in Lebanon, in both Moslem and Christian communities today, where there were these same kinds of mud huts in 1947 and 1948, you find modern structures, with the people living decently, improving their standards of living and asking for nothing except to be let alone so that they can live in peace. At the same time in Jordan, Syria, and Egypt they are still living as they did in the feudal days, with a few people at the top in control and refusing to allow the masses to improve their standard of living. Now, there is your basic trouble. You talk about refugee camps. There is hardly a refugee family within any of the camps in Jordan, Syria, or in Egypt that would not willingly move out if given the opportunity, and it does not take much. There the fault is that of

the Jordanian Government, the Syrian Government, the Egyptian Government, and, I am sorry to say, of the British Government. If Britain would cooperate and permit these families to move out, you would have no refugee problem.

In addition to improving the balance of arms that is so necessary today as between Egypt and Israel, let me call your attention to this: Sending arms into Israel is not going to create an arms race. An arms race is on right now, and it is on between Britain, Communist Russia, and her satellite nations. They are both pouring arms into that area, into Egypt and into Syria. What our State Department ought to say to Great Britain is "If you are truly our ally, if you are truly our friend, then you stop this arms race; you stop feeding arms into that area, arms that can be used only for aggression." Jet planes, big tanks, and submarines are not being used and will not be used for internal security in Egypt or Syria or anywhere else. Ask yourselves "Where will these submarines be used that are being sent into Egypt and that are there now?" There is not an Egyptian that knows how to operate a submarine. They are in there with Czech and Russian technicians who will operate them. Yes; they are teaching the Egyptians how to use them.

Against whom do you think those submarines will be used?

Israel has no navy.

The only navy in the Mediterranean at the present time that I know of is the United States Sixth Fleet.

Against whom can those Russian submarines be used?

Submarines were never defense weapons but always weapons of offense. So, when you talk about an arms race, let us understand just what is going on there and let us understand that the sooner we, the United States, call a halt to this, the sooner we make our own country more secure and move another step forward toward the security of the entire world.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I have observed statements have been made that Israel could overrun those other countries if they so desired, and also that at the present time and in the past they probably were not in a position to defend themselves. If that be true, where did they get those arms, who supplied them, and how did they get the necessary equipment to be in a position to do just the things it is claimed they can do? The point I am trying to get across, if that be true, if we would not furnish arms to those Arab countries, knowing that condition to exist—and I am not accusing Israel that they would do such a thing—it is conceivable that those people could get arms from America to defend themselves against a situation like that, even though they be mistaken about their opinions that they were being overrun. That is the point that has me worried. Perhaps the problem that we have here is one that we helped to create through the United Nations, making

almost an impossible situation for Israel or anyone else over there so far as a peaceful solution is concerned.

I cannot see but what this country may have fallen short in the past in failing to face up to the situation. My personal opinion, which may not be worth much, would be that we should require all those countries to comply with the original boundaries and then go in there, take the initiative and say what should be done. If we do not do something, we are going to lose both sides and be in a worse condition than we have been since this controversy started.

Mr. MULTER. I shall give the gentleman a twofold answer to the question that is bothering him. The arms that Israel has, it purchased from France, Britain, and the United States under the condition that these countries would supervise their use at all times and have access to what they were getting; that is, as to their kind and what they would be used for, and so forth. When Egypt looked to us for arms, the United States said to Egypt, "You, too, may have arms, and we, the United States, will sell them to you. But if we do the same conditions must apply to you, Egypt, as were applied to Israel. We are going to give you arms for internal security and for defense, just as we gave arms to Iraq and Iran and Pakistan and Turkey. But we are going to have people there to supervise and to make sure that these arms are not used for aggression."

Instead of accepting that Egypt replied, "No conditions," and instead purchased arms from Russia. Russia imposed the condition, that she, Russia, send technicians with the arms. That is what has been done.

There is a further answer, and it is this. The United States can say, as it said to 42 other nations, "We offer you in good faith a security pact." When those nations made those security pacts with us we said to each of them, "In the event of aggression against you, we, the United States, will come to your aid."

A complete answer to any Arab state in this area or any state anywhere else is, "The United States will offer you a security pact," whether the country is Israel or whether it is an Arab state. If Israel enters such a pact, she relies on us to see that there is no aggression against her. If Egypt entered such a pact, she knows that we would not run out on her. If little Israel should attack Egypt, after Egypt had made such a security pact with us, there would be very little left of Israel.

Let me say this further—and there is no secret about this. This has been said before. There is not an Arab leader who does not admit that Israel would never wage a preventive or aggressive war against any of her neighbors because Israel knows that if she did she would immediately have world opinion turn against her and she could not survive. She might win the battle, but she would lose the war. Every Arab state knows that.

I have tried to answer the points that are bothering the gentleman. I cannot

see how he can gainsay that logic. A security pact would guarantee each side against aggression. I do not want any anti-Arab feeling or any pro-Arab feeling. Nor do I want any anti-Israel or pro-Israel feeling. I do not want any "anti" feeling as to any of these people. I want us to be friends to all. I want the United States to go in and secure the friendship of all of them. But we must say to them, "We want you to be friends to one another."

Mr. WINSTEAD. If the gentleman will yield further, the point I am making is this. I do not know what the answer to this is. I know that we have a very complicated and very involved problem on our hands in this particular area. But is it not true that we are more or less largely responsible, as has been stated here, for this division over there, for setting up Israel?

Is it not true that all these Arab countries who were our friends before we took such an aggressive stand in that determination are now not our friends? Should we not reckon with that problem?

I have not given up the idea that we can maintain friendship with both sides if we would face up to the issue and stop playing with it, stop playing both sides against the middle, as we have in the case of so many other problems throughout the world. Should not all these countries, the Arab countries and Israel comply with the terms of the original boundaries until through the United Nations, we can get a determination of this question? I do not believe personally an arms race will solve that problem.

Mr. MULTER. The gentleman has just skirted one of the important difficulties in that area. If our American diplomats in that area instead of running away from the facts would stand up to every Arab who says to our American diplomats, "You, the United States, are responsible for little Israel, therefore you are more friendly to them and antagonistic to us Arab States"—instead of running away from that or acquiescing in it, they should stand up and say, "We, the United States, are as much responsible for the State of Jordan as for the State of Israel." There was no Jordan until there was this partition by the United Nations. There would have been no independent State of Lebanon if the United States had not stood up for the Wilsonian doctrine of self-determination. There would have been none of these little nations that have come into being since World War II, which today are free and independent and trying to live in the democratic way, except that the United States came forward and said, "We will help you."

We are trying to do the same thing there. The United States' foreign policy does not say to Egypt, "You are totalitarian," or to Syria, "You are totalitarian," or to Jordan, "You are totalitarian, controlled entirely by Britain," nor do we say to Lebanon, "You are not truly democratic." We say, "No matter what your internal government may be, we want to help you in peace." That is what we should continue to do.

The important thing to remember about boundaries in that area is that

the 1949 armistice agreements were signed by Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, and Israel and were approved by the United Nations and fixed the international boundaries as they now exist. They should not be changed without agreement of those countries. That is what the United States must now unequivocally guarantee.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks following Mrs. KELLY of New York.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, it is all right to have secrecy when public welfare is to be protected, but it is another matter when the people are denied their constitutional right to know what is going on in their Government.

For instance, a newspaper photographer is not free to enter a Federal building for purposes of making a picture—any picture—without first having special permission from the General Services custodian for Federal buildings and grounds in West Virginia. If the custodian is not available, if he is ill or at lunch, this ridiculous situation works a hardship on the photographer and denies the public its right to news. It curbs a free press.

It is somewhat astounding to learn special permission must be obtained before a newspaper cameraman can take a picture of taxpayers waiting in line to pay their income taxes. That sounds mighty foolish, but it's true.

Therefore, in the name of freedom of the press I speak out against Public Law 566, enacted by Congress in 1948, which says that "taking of photographs for commercial or publication purposes within property is prohibited unless prior permission is obtained." There should be modification of the law to incorporate common sense.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members the fact that the Treasury Department in Decision No. 56-977, dated February 3, 1956, has clearly and finally put at rest allegations which have heretofore been leveled against the Swiss watch industry. These irresponsible charges over the past several years have caused serious damage to the fine trade relationship that has existed between the United States and Switzerland. It is very gratifying to see this matter resolved once and for all and I should like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article on this subject which appeared in today's New York Journal of Commerce entitled "Treasury Rejects Charge Swiss Dodge Watch Duty."

#### ORGANIZATION FOR TRADE COOPERATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the Department of State has issued a grossly

misleading pamphlet entitled "Introducing Organization for Trade Cooperation."

In issuing this transparently disingenuous document the Department has turned huckster at public expense. It is using tax money collected from all the people to propagate one side of a highly controversial issue. This represents statism and the outright contempt of fair play so often characteristic of statism.

The use of publicly appropriated funds for such flagrant propaganda reflects an obtuseness and crudity of sensibility that does not belong in our Government and should be stamped out forthwith.

The misrepresentation of the OTC on the eve of legislation in Congress to approve or reject United States membership in the OTC not only represents executive lobbying but lobbying of a low order. The Department of State should be required to register as a lobbying organization and called upon to set forth the cost of issuing and distributing its pamphlet.

Even the form of the pamphlet makes it indistinguishable from the usual literature of privately financed pressure groups. In the contents there is little that is objective. What is said of the OTC—Organization for Trade Cooperation—forms a distorted account of the realities in the case, both by omission and by false emphasis. Many of the most despised tricks of hucksterism are present in the pamphlet. This should be beneath the dignity of our Government, and its pursuit will unquestionably debase the standing of any executive department that engages in such tactics.

If the OTC were designed to be as innocent a Little Red Ridinghood as the State Department's false description would have us believe, that Department would not waste 1 second of time on it, much less any of its appropriation. The State Department is not out to hunt rabbits with an air rifle in its attempt to launch the OTC. It is out for bear with high-powered weapons.

Unfortunately the Department has so far swallowed the despicable art of the totalitarians to deceive the people that it seems to have lost contact with straightforward methods of informing the public. The Department knows that the OTC is not designed to be a mere forum where members of GATT can meet and adjust their differences across the conference table.

In this presentation I have been aided materially by the comments of Mr. O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy.

What is concealed in the OTC and thoroughly covered up in the State Department pamphlet is the design to take the regulation of our foreign commerce out of the hands of Congress and lodge it first in the Department of State and then in the international trade organization called the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

The pamphlet is so concerned with disclaimers of OTC powers that it forgets that articles 1 and 3 of the OTC agreement make it clear that the new organization is to give full effect to the purposes and objectives of the General Agreement

on Tariffs and Trade, which it would administer.

To say that the OTC would have no power is therefore sophistry or worse. Only the members of GATT acting together under OTC would have power. That is "a distinction without a difference."

Why, if OTC and GATT were to be mere agencies seeking to prevent impairment of the General Agreement, should OTC be provided with an assembly? Assemblies are provided for quite different purposes.

The State Department, for reasons of its own, falls in the pamphlet to point out that the OTC could become a specialized agency of the United Nations if the OTC assembly agreed to take such a step. That is provided in Article 11.

On the other hand, it quotes from the OTC agreement as follows:

The Organization shall have no authority to amend the provisions of the General Agreement; no decision or other action of the Assembly or any subsidiary body of the Organization shall have the effect of imposing on a member any new obligation which the member has not specifically agreed to undertake.

What does this mean? It sounds most harmless. With respect to the United States it would mean that the OTC could impose no new obligation upon us unless we first agreed to such obligation. That should be most reassuring.

But the question of central importance is who would be we? Who would accept or reject any such new obligation on behalf of the United States?

Would it be Congress?

The answer is "No." It would not be Congress: It would be the State Department. It would be the delegate of that Department speaking for the United States who would act in the Assembly, uninstructed by Congress, thoroughly outside the influence of Congress, perhaps unheard of by Congress and in no way responsive to Congress. In fact, not one person in a million in this country would know what he might be up to. That would be the State Department's own secret.

This is the great bypass of Congress built into the OTC. It has in it a carefully designed pitfall, painstakingly camouflaged by trained hands. That is why the State Department is so strongly in quest for United States membership in the OTC. It could then forget about Congress and the annoyance of congressional elections. It could rise above the storms of democracy and go on its own way. In short the State Department, with congressional approval of the OTC, would have gained its objective of the past 10 years which is, so far as foreign trade regulation is concerned, to drop Congress into the bottom of the well, where the sound of its voice would be muffled and lost.

Is this a mere mirage of the imagination? Can the State Department really have such designs? Can that Department really entertain such a low opinion of Congress?

The record speaks for itself:

First. The State Department has agreed in GATT to the elimination of

existing import quotas and to nonestablishment of new ones. This is a responsibility and power of Congress, imposed by the Constitution.

Second. The State Department has likewise agreed to the binding of many tariff rates at particular levels, against increase. This, again, is a function of Congress to be exercised at its will.

Third. The Department has agreed to maintain particular items on the free list. In other words, it has pledged the word of future sessions of Congress. By what right?

The question arises, Where is the voice of the people reflected in biennial elections to be registered? The answer is, Nowhere. At least, no place where anyone would listen. Thus has Congress already been rendered impotent in one of the most important fields of its constitutional authority. The purpose of the OTC is to nail down this impotence, but a reading of the pamphlet gives no hint of that.

The pat answer is that Congress is not really bound by these agreements; that it can still legislate as it sees fit.

Does the State Department say that to the nations with which it negotiates? If not, what kind of a record is the Department writing for this country?

Is it fair play for the State Department to place Congress in the position of legislating at the price of dishonoring the word of the United States in international agreements?

And if Congress did so, what are the names that this body representing the American electorate would be called? Would Congress not be described as irresponsible and lacking in any sense of honor? Would it not call down upon itself all the abuse that minds impatient of the restraints of democracy could generate?

The State Department has been clever, and no doubt its pamphlet on the OTC was devised to be very, very clever. But it may be that the grand design to make boobs out of Congress has been just a little too clever. The I. Q. of Congress may be several cuts above the level attributed to it by the State Department professionals.

#### THIRTY-EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on next Thursday, February 16, all freedom-loving Lithuanians and Americans of Lithuanian descent will commemorate the 38th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

Lithuania is a nation that has existed for over eight centuries. During this time, its people have enjoyed liberty, freedom, and self-government for long intervals and has also been the victim of aggression and attack during which time independent government disappeared temporarily.

Back in the 14th century, Lithuania enjoyed one of its greatest periods of power and independence after its great

victory at Tannenberg. In the 16th century, Lithuania was compelled to fight a defensive war to maintain its defenses and freedom. Again in the 18th century, Lithuania was exposed to outside attack and brought under Russian domination. During the 120 years of Russian domination, the liberty-loving people of Lithuania revolted against the tyrants on five different occasions. Regardless of the brutalities and treatments inflicted on the Lithuanian people during these revolts of the 18th century, Lithuania continued its drive for freedom and national independence.

During World War I, the German armies overran the Lithuanians and remained there until the end of 1918. The Nazis failed to make Lithuania a German province. Lithuania's official proclamation of independence was issued on February 16, 1918, which was unanimously adopted by the Lithuanian Council and established Vilna as its capital. After the evacuation of the Germans, Soviet troops arrived at the borders of Lithuania. The Red army occupied Vilna in 1919. Again the Lithuanian patriots organized and instituted the Lithuanian army in a battle against the Reds and regained its freedom late in 1919. By a peace treaty, the Soviet Government recognized the sovereign rights of Lithuania over its people and territory.

Lithuania was admitted to the League of Nations on September 22, 1921, and became a full-fledged nation of international status. Lithuanian people instituted land reform, reestablished industry, set up transportation facilities, enacted social legislation, and expanded its educational institutions. No country made greater progress as a free and independent nation in so short a time as Lithuania did up to World War II.

I will not repeat the sordid history of the Soviet duplicity, infiltration, and aggression which again brought slavery and loss of independence to the Communist tyrants. The fight for freedom in Lithuania continues and will continue as long as the Soviet despots inflict their despotism on Lithuania. As long as Lithuania and the peoples of other Soviet captive countries continue their fight for freedom, self-government will surely be reestablished within their borders.

The United States as the world leader must marshal the free nations of the world to aid our captive nations in their fight for freedom.

The American Lithuanian Council at East Chicago, Ind., under the supervision of its president, Mr. Albert G. Vinick, will observe the Lithuanian's 38th Independence Day at St. Francis Hall at East Chicago on Sunday, February 12, 1956. The Lithuanian Council of greater New York will honor Lithuanian's Independence Day at Webster Hall on East 11th Street in New York on Sunday, February 19, 1956. I expect to be present at both these observances which will be only two of the hundreds of similar gatherings throughout the country commemorating this day and urging the people of all free countries, as well as those behind the Iron Curtain, to continue the fight for world freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to incorporate with my remarks a proclamation issued on Lithuanian Independence by Gov. George N. Craig, of Indiana:

PROCLAMATION FOR REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA  
DAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1956

Whereas the 16th day of February 1956, will mark the 38th anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of the Republic of Lithuania; and

Whereas on that day the citizens of the State of Indiana who are of Lithuanian origin or descent will convene in various communities throughout the State to commemorate that occasion and to join their countrymen in the grief of a liberty-loving nation caused by the aggression and the acts of injustice of the Soviet Union which took over Lithuania by force of arms, usurped the sovereign and inalienable rights of the Lithuanian people and proceeded with the extermination of them by mass deportation, imprisonment, and execution; and

Whereas the Lithuanian people are strongly opposed to foreign occupation and oppression and are determined to restore their freedom and sovereignty which has been always recognized by the Government of the United States of America; and

Whereas because of their unmistakable attitude toward communism, which has been struggling for world domination, the Lithuanian people together with over a million Americans of Lithuanian descent represent an important force in the present fight of free nations against Communist aggression; and

Whereas the residents of the State of Indiana feel deep sympathy for the gallant people of Lithuania and of other countries, presently enslaved by the Kremlin imperialism;

Now, therefore, I, George N. Craig, Governor of the State of Indiana, do hereby proclaim Thursday, February 16, 1956, as Republic of Lithuania day in Indiana, urging appropriate observance of the occasion.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Indiana, at the capitol, in the city of Indianapolis, this 18th day of January 1956.

GEORGE N. CRAIG,  
*Governor of Indiana.*  
CRAWFORD F. PARKER,  
*Secretary of State.*

THE PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE ON  
IMMIGRATION POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today the House received a special message from President Eisenhower on our immigration policy and in that message he made a series of recommendations for changes in the law as it now exists. As you Members of Congress know, there has been a great deal of discussion and controversy over our immigration laws during these past several years. A great number of recommendations have been advanced for changes in our basic immigration law in addition to those made by our President today.

The message of the President today calls for sweeping changes in our basic immigration policy. These recommendations call for a reexamination of our national origins system because the President has proposed a new criteria for determining the number of immigrants to be admitted annually and a new formula by which quota numbers

will be allocated to various parts of the world. Other recommendations have been made, several of which have been under consideration by the House Committee on the Judiciary for a considerable period of time. Then there are some other recommendations which are completely new.

The President has called upon Congress to take immediate action on legislation which would enact into law his proposals, which obviously means he urges Congress to take action one way or the other during this session. As acting chairman of Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary which has special jurisdiction over immigration and nationality laws, I think that public hearings should be commenced as soon as possible on the recommendations advanced by the President as well as those recommendations which have been advanced hitherto by Members of Congress and others. I shall do my part to see that such public hearings are begun as soon as possible so that Congress will have the benefit of all important views on this subject.

The President's message appears to underline the need for a more elastic immigration policy than now exists. I say this because it was necessary to enact special legislation in 1948 to meet the problem of displaced persons who were the victims of World War II, and then again in 1953 Congress found it necessary to enact special legislation in the form of the Refugee Relief Act in order to help out with the many human problems caused by Communist tyranny and aggression in various parts of the world. The likelihood exists that so long as the conspiracy of communism exists in this world and continues its inhumanities and tyrannies against people, we will continue to have refugees who plead with us for religious and political asylum. Since the Refugee Relief Act expires at the end of this year, the possibility exists that Congress will be asked for more special legislation in succeeding sessions unless we are able to find a way of meeting such problems through our normal immigration laws. This, of course, emphasizes the importance of Congress getting all the facts and points of view with respect to the President's recommendations as well as those made previously by Members of Congress, so that Congress can take whatever action is necessary before this session has adjourned.

AN ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT  
EISENHOWER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks the Nation has been enduring the rather sorry performance of a former President trying to whip up the lagging spirits of his party with inflammatory speeches at money-raising dinners.

In his fuming and foaming, ex-President Truman shows little regard for fact. He continues to write his own version of history. He relies heavily on his newly developed psychic and intuitive powers to predict an awful fate for the Nation now enjoying peace and prosperity unprecedented under his administration.

In his intemperance, Truman continually sets new low records for personal attacks on the President and Vice President of the United States. For example, he continues to compound the myth that Vice President Nixon once called him a traitor. Despite a challenge to explore the Vice President's well-reported remarks, he has failed to come up with the time and place such a statement was alleged to have been made.

A week ago today in a speech before the New York State Democratic Committee, Truman again escaped the bonds of decency by quoting a sign posted at a meeting last month in St. Paul, Minn., which he claimed read:

In Ike we trusted,  
Now we are busted.

He then went on to promise the Democrats would "give the American people a chance to vote for President and not a regency or part-time chairman of the board."

It ill behoves a former President to engage in personal attacks on his successor. Such remarks are especially unfitting for an ex-President who at the highest point of his steadily declining popularity in office, as revealed by national polls, never came within range of the continued high regard of the people of America for President Eisenhower.

I believe the record high public esteem enjoyed by President Eisenhower reflects to a great degree the sincerity, intelligence, and selfless dedication he brings to his work.

I recently made a grassroots tour of California and other trips to the Middle West and I am aware of the great surge of emotion and affection for President Eisenhower and the prayerful desire by most Americans that he will be able to continue the leadership that has brought us so many heartfelt gains. When the results of his forthcoming medical examination reveal him to be physically fit, I pray the Nation will let him know in a resounding fashion of their confidence in him and of their desire to see him continue to work for lasting peace.

Mr. Speaker, just as an obvious contrast exists between the present and past administration of the highest office of our land, I wish to contrast today the unseemly remarks of the former President on last Thursday with a brief speech made the same day by President Eisenhower at the annual prayer breakfast of the International Council of Christian Leadership at the Mayflower Hotel. Most of us heard President Eisenhower make this impromptu speech that morning. His obvious sincerity and alertness made a deep and favorable impression on all of us regardless of political backing. I include his remarks as a part of my remarks today:

Mr. Chairman and Mr. Hilton and my friends, it is a touching thing that Mr. Hil-

ton has done in presenting to me this plaque and the desk and the chair where I wrote the little prayer that I used at the inauguration some 3 years and more ago.

That incident brought to me a great lesson. It seemed to me a perfectly natural thing to do. I was seeking some way to impress upon the audience at that moment that all of us realized a new Chief Executive was being inaugurated over a Nation that was founded on a religious faith.

Our founding documents so state. In explaining, you know, our Government and what we intended to do in the Declaration, our Founding Fathers held it was our Creator that gave us certain rights, and this Government was set up to sustain them.

So that seemed to me a perfectly natural thing to do, as an emphatic way of showing that I also realized it.

Now it was with some astonishment that I began to see this response—literally thousands of messages coming in, some of them from people who did not particularly think I was the man to occupy that place that day—still applauded that act.

And here is the lesson as I see it. I know very few men, I know very few people that tell me they are atheists or they are even agnostics, but we find among the laity a curious diffidence in merely stating the fact that they believe there is a God and He is more powerful than I and I am dependent upon Him. That is what the prayer did, and it was because a layman as I see it, did do so—and of course, in such a position—that this response came in.

Now I think that that prayer is somewhat related to these prayer breakfasts. We can stay in our quarters—we can pray. But by gathering occasionally—and I understand this whole celebration is a week long—the whole ceremony something of a week long—by announcing to the world that we come up as laymen and meet, making the same acknowledgments that are made in that prayer, we are doing exactly the same thing: We are telling people that this Nation is still a nation under God.

This is terrifically important today. There has been too much of the world that believes the United States to be completely materialistic, boastful, proud, and arrogant. It makes no difference how they have achieved it or how they have been misinformed in order to achieve such a feeling, but it is there. Traveler after traveler, poll after poll, have reported the same thing.

It is such meetings as this, continued, repeated, and brought home to them, that help to dispel this very great and dangerous delusion. It still is a Nation that is founded on the religious faith, with great concern for the sentiments of compassion and mercy that Mr. Hilton so eloquently spoke about. That is what we want others to think about when they think of the United States.

People have talked of the spirit of Geneva. The thing that the spirit of Geneva did accomplish, and at least so far has not been destroyed—one part of it that is valuable—is that people there, in watching that conference, gained a belief that the United States was truly trying to follow in the footsteps of the Prince of Peace, and to establish a just peace for the world.

That is a tremendous gain, in this day of fears, hysteria, and too great—sometimes too great a reliance on force.

Though we be strong, I believe, if I am not misquoting, even the Bible says, "When the strong man armed keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace." We intend to remain that strong, but let us always do it with the certainty that anyone who will come in integrity, observing the moral values that we know are imbedded in this great religious faith, that he will be received as a friend and taken with us down the road to the future in peace.

I had no intention of making a speech. As a matter of fact, I was promised I didn't have to—and I don't know how I got started. But thank you very much.

#### YALTA AND POTSDAM AGREEMENTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to one of the great tragedies and gross injustices in the wake of those agreements of Yalta and Potsdam, resulting in the present separation from Germany of East Prussia and the expulsion of its population of 2,519,000 people. The expulsion of the East Prussians, and of the 10 million other people of the eastern provinces of the Reich, was a violation of human rights, of international law, and of solemn covenants.

Section 2 of the Atlantic Charter states that the signatory powers "desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned." The Atlantic Charter was signed not only by the United States President and the British Prime Minister but also by the plenipotentiaries of many governments, including those of Poland and the Soviet Union.

On June 5, 1945, when the zones of occupation were arranged in Germany, the representatives of the four occupying powers, that is, of the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union, in their official declaration expressly spoke of Germany within her boundaries as of December 31, 1937.

In their notes of March 25 and May 13, 1952, addressed to the Soviet Government on the question of a peace treaty with Germany, the governments of the three Western Powers have made it abundantly clear that the delimitation of Germany's eastern boundary shall be done at a future peace settlement, following a reunification.

The Government of the United States as well as the Governments of the United Kingdom and the French Republic should not leave the shadow of a doubt that East Prussia and the other German provinces east of the rivers Oder and Neisse are, according to international law, a part of Germany within her boundaries of December 31, 1937, that are today still under wartime Red Polish and Soviet administration. The Government of the United States should seize upon a proper moment to restate the legal position in no uncertain terms.

Two million East Prussian expellees eventually reached West Germany with nothing but their bare hands. It was the obvious scheme of the Kremlin rulers to turn this disappropriated mass of humanity into an advance guard of communism. Such plans fell completely flat. There are no Communist sympathizers to be found among the East Prussians. Their experiences with the Soviets can never be obliterated from their minds. Quietly, and without any hullabaloo, the

East Prussian expellees went to work and in a modest way reestablished themselves in the West German economy. They organized themselves into a fellowship, the Landsmannschaft Ostpreussen, headed by Dr. Alfred Gille, former mayor of Loetzen, now a respected member of the Bundestag—federal assembly—in Bonn.

They have sent to this country as their representative a man who is in an ideal way prepared to speak for them, since his background is a rather unique mixture of East Prussia and the United States. I refer to Dr. Richard Sallet, who is now in this city. He was born in East Prussia at the turn of the century of a family whose history in that country goes back to the original inhabitants, prior to the arrival of the Teutonic knights in 1226. This gives him an unchallengable right to speak for his fellow East Prussians.

When in the early part of the First World War, Russian armies twice invaded East Prussia, Dr. Sallet, then just 15 years of age, followed his brothers, volunteered for infantry service, fought the Russians, and held an officer's commission at the end of the war.

He came to this country in 1921 and assisted, later succeeded, his uncle in Minnesota in editing a weekly newspaper with a sizable circulation among the farmers of the Middle West. Five years as a country editor gave Dr. Sallet a grassroots education in American democracy—incidentally his intense historical interest then made him a life member of the Minnesota Historical Society—and it prompted him to study American government and history at Harvard College where he was graduated with the class of 1928.

He went back to East Prussia and, in 1930, obtained the degree of doctor of philosophy at Königsberg, the university made famous by one of the greatest of all philosophers, Immanuel Kant. Returning to this country, he was appointed to the faculty of Northwestern University, where his courses in the field of government were greatly appreciated.

Before returning, he had with the Soviet regime in Russia a most tragic experience, which left its mark on his thinking. At the time of Stalin's ruthless enforcement of collectivization of the peasant lands, he visited, by horse and buggy and camel, dozens of villages of Volga German peasants. Deeply moved by the cruelty of Soviet policy, he prepared, among Midwest farmers of Russian-German stock, a relief action, only to learn that the Communists had followed his trail through the Russian villages, arresting and carrying off to prison and death every peasant who had shown him hospitality.

The challenge which, in 1933, the Nazi regime in Berlin presented to American-German relations was clearly perceived by Dr. Sallet and stirred him to action. He decided to put his hands to the wheel and, during the following years, was attached to the German Embassy in Washington. Aware of the everwidening rift, and of his own inability to turn the tide, he felt compelled, one day in 1937, by taking up the receiver in the Embassy and calling Berlin over the trans-Atlan-

tic telephone, to request the immediate stop to an anti-American outburst in the Berlin press. The outburst ended abruptly; so did the diplomatic chapter of his career. He did not ask for asylum in this country. Courageously he went back into the dictator's den, still thinking that he might be able to avert the catastrophe. It was of no avail. He was used in a technical capacity in the Berlin foreign office. But the leaders of the revolt against Hitler regarded him as one of the very few in his division whom they planned to appoint to an important post.

At the end of World War II, two young American Army officers, one a Harvard, the other a Northwestern graduate, escorted Dr. Sallet out of Soviet occupied territory and into the Western zones where he became engaged in the reopening of the universities of northwest Germany.

Close observation of foreign service institutions led Dr. Sallet to devote several years to research in this field, the result of which is a painstaking work on the diplomatic service of the three Western countries, France, Great Britain, and the United States, tracing foreign service institutions from the opening of the first French consulates in Egypt in 1251 to the lateral entry reforms in our Department of State in 1953. The book has been hailed as a piece of accomplished scholarship. He has since written a handbook on the United States for the official use of officer personnel of the West German defense forces.

In 1953 the expellees from east of the Oder and Neisse sent Dr. Sallet on a mission to the United States. At that time his aim was to call attention to the 300,000 expellees who were then still living in sub-normal conditions in transient camps. His conversations with Secretary of State Dulles, FOA Director Harold Stassen, Assistant Secretary of State Livingston Merchant and others resulted in a substantial grant to the West German Government to provide housing units for those expellees who were then still living in camps. A bill, introduced at that time by Representative Kersten, Republican, of Wisconsin, requested our Government to grant a \$70 million loan for this same purpose.

This time Dr. Sallet has come to the United States as the representative of his East Prussian friends. The feeding, clothing, and housing of the expellees is no longer a pressing problem. They are all working hard and making progress in a modest way. But their aim is definitely to return to the soil of their native land.

The Government of the United States will be well advised to take full account of this aim.

Kremlin policy schemes to uproot humanity, to detach people from their homes, their family, their religion, to shift like cattle the thousands of workers and peasants, following the whims of Communist dictators.

These East Prussians are the very negation of Kremlin policy; they love their homeland, and they hold on to the title to their home, undismayed, undiscouraged, tenaciously.

Dr. Sallet has made the following statement on the position of the East Prussians:

#### MEMORANDUM ON EAST PRUSSIA

As a result of illegal machinations of Soviet Communist leaders the 2.5 million inhabitants of East Prussia have been expelled from their native land 10 years ago. Hundreds of thousands of these fled in terror ahead of the advancing Soviet forces, whose reputation for mass rape and wholesale murder had preceded them. One million nine hundred thousand East Prussians eventually reached West Germany and the Soviet occupied zone (central Germany) while more than 600,000, i. e., 24 percent, perished on the way. They were either killed or died of starvation and diseases, or committed suicide following outrages to their person.

Of the 75,000 who remained in the Red Polish-administered part, holding on to a meager life on the soil of their ancestors, most had no option but to accept Red Polish citizenship papers. Not more than a handful of German today survive in the Soviet-administered part of East Prussia, the Pregel Valley and Königsberg. The latter, since 1255 an important center of the Order of Knights of St. Mary's Hospital at Jerusalem, crusader and later defender of the faith at these eastern ramparts of Christendom, also is known as having comprised one of the early lodges in Germany of the Masonic Order. Before the last war, Königsberg was a thriving city with close to a half million inhabitants, the seat of a 400-year-old university, world-renowned through the philosopher, Immanuel Kant.

The East Prussians now living in the Federal Republic of West Germany and their kinsmen in the Soviet occupied zone (central Germany) are firmly resolved that title to their native home shall not be lost, and that some day their peaceful return to a free East Prussia will be realized. Occupation by the Soviets and their satellites does not change legal title to the land. It cannot do so. A hundred years of wrong will not add up to one single day of right.

And, citing the great English jurist, Sir Edward Coke, who once had staunchly set forth that his King's edict cannot change the law, "vigilantibus et non dormientibus jura subveniunt,"—the laws aid those who are vigilant, not those who sleep upon their rights. This is the position taken by the nearly 2 million East Prussians living in West Germany. Quite a few of these people are descendants, as are the people of the United States, of families who centuries ago had migrated because of devout religious beliefs, and had found East Prussia a haven of tolerance: Scottish and English Dissenters, French Huguenots, Dutch Mennonites, Austrian and Swiss Reformed. They will not abdicate their right to return to the homes founded by their ancestors.

For the time being, East Prussia seems to lie below the horizon, lost sight of in the darkness behind the Iron Curtain. However, wrongs have the peculiar, and salutary, tendency to be only of temporary nature, though the odds at first may overwhelmingly point the other way. Nazi persecution of Jews led to the doom of the Third Reich while a sovereign State of Israel is now an accepted member of the family of nations. Hitler's conquest of Poland and parts of Soviet Russia did not last. Soviet Russian and Red Polish occupation of East Prussia will not last. It is logical, therefore, and important to plan for the time when we shall face the problem of East Prussia, and to contribute our share that this land, through seven centuries a bulwark of Western civilization, shall again be within the orbit of a free world.

The importance to the West of a free East Prussia should not be overlooked. Relinquishing their hold of Königsberg may, or may not, mean to the Soviets more than the

recent withdrawal of their military forces from Porkkala in Finland. However, the beacon from a lighthouse in East Prussia would bring into view the intervening land up to the Iron Curtain. With the Baltic no longer a closed Soviet lake, it would strengthen the position of Sweden and thus be of advantage to all the Scandinavian countries.

It might prove of great future value if a few enlightened citizens of the United States—later perhaps to be joined by several thoughtful Europeans—should have the vision to take an active interest in, and recommend the study of, the problem of East Prussia. Having in mind the wider aspect of East European cooperation, these men could avail themselves of proper occasions to call the attention of statesmen of the Western World to the problem of a free East Prussia within a free Europe.

Though we do not cross a bridge until we come to it, it is worth noting that Soviet policy gains its points by surprise tactics. It may be wise, therefore, to plan ahead so that we are prepared to cross the bridge when we come to it.

#### OUR AGED DESERVE A BETTER LIFE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, within the last few weeks some very cold, hard facts were published which must certainly command the attention of all of us. For they show very forcibly that one of the major problems before this Congress is that of finding means for providing a happier and more abundant life for the aged members of our national community.

Listen carefully to these figures. According to this report, issued by the Twentieth Century Fund on January 8, of this year, nearly three-fourths of Americans over age 65 have no income of their own or get less than \$1,000 for an entire year. Here is the brief statistical summary of the pitifully small incomes upon which our senior citizens are trying to manage to live:

Over one-third—or 36 percent—have no income of their own whatever.

About 4 out of every 10—or 38 percent—have a yearly income of under \$1,000.

About 1 in every 10—or 11 percent—have annual incomes of between \$1,000 and \$2,000.

And only 15 percent have income amounting to \$2,000 or more for an entire year.

I quote these figures because I believe we must bear them constantly in mind. For the truth of the matter is that we have not faced up to our new responsibilities for the aged which have arisen, ironically enough, because of the very abundance which they have helped to produce during their working life.

We like to remind ourselves that one of the most incredible contributions of our last half-century of progress in this country is the fact that we have added 21 years to life expectancy in less than one full modern generation. That is about the same gain that was made in

all the centuries from the time of Christ up to 1900.

We are equally proud of the fact that the miracles of modern production have substantially reduced the number of hours of work required to build a better life for our people. As someone put it recently, the average man at the turn of the century could expect to live 40 years and to work about 70 hours or more a week. In our time, on the other hand, we can expect to live for 70 years, and to work a 40-hour week.

We are justifiably proud of these developments.

But, Mr. Speaker, let us never allow ourselves to disregard the equally challenging figures I have just quoted, which show that one segment of our people have been forced by circumstances to bear the heaviest consequences of these great changes in our national life. I refer, of course, to the older men and women who, after a lifetime of productive endeavor, are now facing the new and distressing problems of maintaining themselves in the years of retirement.

I have long been concerned, as you know, with these problems. On numerous occasions, I have called for congressional action to explore the nature and extent of these problems in the belief that we must act more directly and more constructively at the national level—as well as in our States and our home communities—to insure that years of retirement may be happy and useful years, instead of periods of prolonged misery.

Fortunately for all of us, there is increasing evidence of a growing concern with the problems of the aged in our country. One of the most important publications of recent months, in my opinion, is the challenging study published by the Council of State Governments, entitled "The States and Their Older Citizens." This significant volume documents the story of the tragic consequences of lack of adequate income for too many Americans in the older age groups. Moreover, it emphasizes the fact that lack of adequate financial resources is just one of the problems they are facing. For, in the words of the report:

The problem of old age has many other facets. They include unequal opportunity for employment; inferior housing; separation from family and friends; widowhood for more than one half of older women; inadequate medical care; lack of insurance against hospitalization; tremendous increase in placement in mental hospitals; loneliness; lack of social participation; underrepresentation in programs of prevention, rehabilitation, and education; and lack of personnel especially trained for helping older persons with their problems.

But, someone may say, how can we possibly find solutions for all of the complexity of problems named in this bill of particulars? Fortunately, most Americans do not accept this defeatist attitude. A single sentence from the conclusions in the report places the responsibility and sets the goals which most of us can subscribe to. It reads:

These problems, in their totality, represent the failure of our economy, our Government, and our society to design a program which

permits older citizens to contribute to our economy and to live healthful, useful, and happy lives in accordance with accepted American standards.

Moreover, as we look about us, we find that action in this direction is already beginning to appear on a variety of fronts. Here and there, throughout the country, action on the part of church groups, unions, individual communities, certain industries and—most challenging of all—on the part of the aged themselves is producing the kind of results which suggest the vital importance of a nationwide attack on these problems.

Faced with the problem of inferior housing and lack of adequate medical care, some communities in the country have instituted foster home care for elderly people who prefer to live with families or out-resident programs in which persons can find suitable living quarters near a center and can come to the center for meals, medical care, occupational therapy, and recreation. Some of our churches are establishing homes for the aged which feature small cottages constructed around a central building. Recently, for example, the Catholic archdiocese of Detroit converted a 700-room downtown hotel into a residential building for persons 65 and over where most patrons pay \$110 to \$150 a month for lodging, meals, recreation, and medical services.

Universities in all sections of the country have sponsored annual or occasional conferences on different aspects of the problems of aging. In scattered communities and in some industries we are beginning to see the establishment of courses in preparation for retirement, and individual counseling to assist people to plan wisely for their later years.

More and more aged men and women who have been consigned to institutions are being restored to productive lives through rehabilitation programs of geriatric centers associated with general and mental hospitals, and staffed by general practitioners, psychiatrists, social workers, nurses, and other persons experienced in working with the aging.

On the basis of accumulating evidence that most of our senior citizens do not want to retire, unless they are forced to do so, new emphasis is being placed upon the importance of creating new job opportunities for those older men and women who now find it difficult to find employment because of their age. In some States, sheltered workshops have been organized to meet the demand for re-employment by retired workers. In others, training and placement programs are beginning to appear as part of the job-placement procedure. Last year, you will recall, Congress appropriated some \$160,000 to finance a number of special research studies on the older worker to cover six major areas: productivity and performance of older workers; the impact of pension costs on hiring policies; an analysis of collective bargaining provisions affecting the employment and retention of older workers; employment patterns, policies, and practices in seven major metropolitan areas; counseling and placement demonstrations for older workers in the same seven

areas; and the recruitment and training of mature men and women to meet labor shortages in such fields as teaching, white collar operations and health services.

These are hopeful signs. But all of us will recognize that they are the small beginnings to the better solution of very great problems. We need more information on all of the problems which face our older people, as a basis for better answers for the future. We need to know more about how adequately, and to what extent, present retirement policies are meeting the needs of our economy as well as the day-to-day needs, having to do with enough food, adequate shelter, and proper medical care for this group in our population.

In this, as in previous sessions of the Congress, I have introduced a bill which would establish a commission on old-age and retirement benefits, because I know our present knowledge in this area is excessively fragmentary. And as long as we have the incomplete story, we shall have conclusions based on half-truths and prejudice. Because adequate income for our aged people lies at the root of so many of their problems, I believe we must start with a complete knowledge of the character and amount of present old-age benefits in terms of their adequacy and in terms of the number of people who are affected.

At the same time, I am convinced that there are many other areas which would be equally fruitful areas for investigation. As the Council of State Governments has pointed out, the prevailing form of service to older persons today is custodial care in the traditional county home, nursing home, or in the chronic illness hospital or old people's home. As a result, the costs of existing services for the aging—largely in terms of custodial care—are excessively high, in spite of the fact that the care which older people are receiving is frequently inadequate. Yet we know that we have developed techniques of rehabilitation which have demonstrated their tremendous potentials in restoring men and women to a high degree of physical self care and mental capacity—facilities which, so far, have been used on behalf of our aged people to only a slight degree.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we must be greatly concerned with the human as well as with the statistical story of what is happening to thousands of Americans who have reached their 65th birthday. It may well be that one of the most important contributions each one of us could make would be to bring our own thinking up to date in this regard. We know that the transition from a rural to an urban community has produced tremendous changes in the living conditions of older men and women, and has contributed to the loneliness and isolation which many of them experience. We know that it is usually not possible for the older members of the family to live in the homes of the married children. For too many of them the price of progress has been the loss of a reasonable self-sufficiency and an established role in the family life in their declining years.

Indifference and apathy have taken their toll.

Too often, according to most evidence, older people are made to feel that the public expects them to withdraw from activities and community life, resigning themselves to anonymity or to custodial care, rather than to active, productive and useful lives. This apathy on our part is, in the opinion of the Council of State Governments, a chief obstacle to be overcome because "a prime requisite is an extensive program of public education—one that will dispel popular myths about aging. Once the myths about aging and its inevitable helplessness are dispelled, the major roadblocks to constructive action for older citizens will have been removed."

In marked contrast, by the way, is the attitude of most members of the aged group about themselves. The majority of persons 65 and over do not think of themselves as old. Instead, they think of themselves as middle aged. In a recent study of 3,515 employees 63 and 64 years old, representing 265 industries, 68 percent of the median industrial group reported that they think of themselves as middle aged or younger. This finding confirms the results of an earlier study of 3,000 men and women, the majority of whom classified themselves as middle aged up to the age of 75.

As I have said, the scattered evidence which is now being accumulated must rest heavily upon our consciences and our sense of responsibility toward our senior citizens. I am encouraged by the action which has already taken place at community and State levels in various parts of the country, and through individual and group initiative. I am just as convinced that we are only beginning to understand all the potentialities which lie with further activity in this important area. I believe the Federal Government must assume a more active role in encouraging further development on a broad front, aimed at all of the problems which face our older people. I have expressed my concern in these matters repeatedly on the floor of this House and I promise you, Mr. Speaker, that I shall continue to do so until we have found more positive and more equitable solutions.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 5 minutes today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. BAILEY, for 15 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. KEATING, for 15 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. MADDEN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. UDALL, for 40 minutes, on Tuesday next.

Mr. MUMMA, for 30 minutes, on February 20.

Mr. ANDREWS (at the request of Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi), for 60 minutes tomorrow.

Mr. BAILEY, for 1 hour on Wednesday next.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

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

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. FORAND and to include a statement he gave before the Committee on Banking and Currency and discussion which followed.

Mr. CORBETT.

Mr. MADDEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YATES to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter and some computations and compilations.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDONOUGH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACK of Washington.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles.

S. 1352. An act for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.; and

S. 1584. An act for the relief of Raymond D. Beckner and Lulu Stanley Beckner.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 9, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1497. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations and other authorizations for the fiscal year 1956, and for other purposes, in the amount of \$565,560,965 for various agencies (H. Doc. No. 330); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1498. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of the Department of the Interior on the Ainsworth unit, Nebraska, of the Missouri River Basin project, pursuant to the provision of section 2 of Public Law 612, 83d Congress (68 Stat. 757) (H. Doc. No. 331); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1499. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to stating that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Shafter-Wasco Irrigation District, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1500. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Secretary of Labor, relative to correcting a typographical error which appears



in a letter from Secretary of Labor Mitchell dated February 6, 1956, which forwarded a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide temporary disability insurance benefits for employees in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes." The figure of "\$26.00" which appears on page 2 of this letter as the maximum amount of weekly benefits payable under the bill should read "\$36.00"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1501. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting the Eighth Annual Report of the United States Tariff Commission on the operation of the trade-agreements program, pursuant to section 3 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955, and Executive Order 10082 dated October 5, 1949; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2108. A bill to repeal certain laws relating to professional examinations for promotion of medical, dental, and veterinary officers of the Army and Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 1751). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2111. A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to cause to be published official registers for their respective services; with amendment (Rept. No. 1752). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 8107. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1753). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 9166. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 9167. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 9168. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 9169. A bill to amend subparagraph (c), paragraph I, part I, of Veterans Regulations No. 1 (a), as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases becoming manifest within 3 years from separation from service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 9170. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing import quotas under specified conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 9171. A bill to amend and liberalize the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 9172. A bill to amend the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, so as to require that certain reports and other communications of the executive branch to Congress contain information pertaining to the number of civilian officers and employees required to carry out additional or expanded functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 9173. A bill to amend the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, so as to require that certain reports and other communications of the executive branch to Congress contain information pertaining to the number of civilian officers and employees required to carry out additional or expanded functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 9174. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 9175. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 9176. A bill to amend Public Law 314, 78th Congress, to provide that retired reservists may waive receipt of a portion of their retired pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 9177. A bill to amend section 405 (a), part IV, of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 9178. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the period for amortization of grain-storage facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 9179. A bill to prohibit the use of real property owned by the United States for the production of agricultural commodities, including livestock, which are disposed of by sale; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 9180. A bill to authorize the admission to the United States of certain aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9181. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9182. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, to regulate judicial review of deportation and exclusion orders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9183. A bill to amend sections 201 and 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 9184. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building in Williston, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 9185. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, authorizing the

Secretary of Agriculture to make disaster loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 9186. A bill to authorize a 5-year program of grants for construction of medical educational and research facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 9187. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 9188. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to contributions and gifts by corporations to or for the use of schools of engineering and related technical subjects; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 9189. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit children adopted by United States citizens to be naturalized in certain cases without satisfying the residence and physical presence requirements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 9190. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 9191. A bill to reduce the local contributions required for construction of the Navarro Mills Reservoir on Richland Creek, Tex., from 36 percent to 25 percent of the total cost of the project; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 9192. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act in order that a greater number of local organizations may qualify for assistance under the provisions of such act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. J. Res. 523. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to confer certain additional powers upon the Interstate Sanitation Commission, established by said States pursuant to Public Resolution 62, 74th Congress, August 27, 1935; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. J. Res. 524. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to study the economic and engineering feasibility of acquiring riparian rights from the Republic of Mexico to water in the Gulf of California for the piping and pumping of water from the Gulf of California to Arizona for irrigation purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. J. Res. 525. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the 1st conference of State governors for the protection in the public interest of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. Con. Res. 211. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the creation of a commission on the Arab refugee problem within the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. Con. Res. 212. Concurrent resolution providing that the United States mission to the United Nations shall take such steps as might be necessary to have each day's session in the United Nations opened with a prayer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 9193. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephine Bajada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9194. A bill for the relief of John T. Lipset; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 9195. A bill for the relief of Wickham Courtney Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 9196. A bill for the relief of Evangelos Christos Mirtsopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9197. A bill for the relief of Lucienne Canicio Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 9198. A bill for the relief of Aly Wasil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 9199. A bill for the relief of Sagrario Gonzalez Arrivillaga Yanguas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 9200. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Guadalupe Aguilar-Buenrostro de Montano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H. R. 9201. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property of the United States to Harvey V. Lashus; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 9202. A bill for the relief of Joseph (Josef) Ams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

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

501. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of the American Legion, Department of Pennsylvania, urging enactment into law of H. R. 7886; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

502. By Mr. ROOSEVELT: Petition of the officers of the 26th Congressional District Council, California, of Townsend Member-

ship, in favor of the adoption of H. R. 4471 and H. R. 4472 as amendments to the Social Security Act in place of old-age and survivors insurance and old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

503. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolutions adopted at annual meeting of the Racine Milk Producers Cooperative Association on January 16, 1956; one resolution pertaining to the support program, and the other to the soil-bank program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

504. Also, resolution unanimously adopted at a mass meeting of Americans of Lithuanian descent of the city of Racine, Wis., held under the auspices of the local branch of the Lithuanian-American Council, Inc., on February 5, 1956, to commemorate the 38th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

505. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Lithuanian-American Council, Inc., Racine, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to asking for bipartisan leadership and cooperation in the field of national defense and foreign policy, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

**The Railroad Retirement Act Should Be Amended To Increase Benefits and Permit Optional Retirement at Age 60 or With 30 Years' Service, With the Annuity To Be Computed on the 5 Years of Highest Earnings**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

**HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, recently a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which our colleague OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas, is chairman, held hearings on 53 bills designed to amend the Railroad Retirement Act.

After taking testimony from the sponsors of the bills, the hearings were recessed temporarily and when resumed representatives of railroad management, railroad labor organizations, and agencies of Government will be heard.

At the conclusion of the hearings, the subcommittee will make recommendations to the full committee which is expected to perfect a bill for House action during the early summer.

As a sponsor of several bills pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, it was my privilege to appear before the committee on January 24, at which time I testified on behalf of my bills to increase benefits for annuitants, pensioners, and widows, and permit optional retirement at age 60 or after 30 years' service, with the annuity to be computed on the 5 years of highest earnings,

The legislation which I have introduced over a period of years represents the wishes of the active and retired railroad employees and their families in my congressional district.

It is in their interest and at their request that I have been making a determined effort for the past several years to have full consideration given to my bills to amend the Railroad Retirement Act.

My statement before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce follows:

Mr. Chairman, once again I am grateful to you and the members of this committee for accord me the privilege of appearing before you to explain the bills I have introduced to amend the Railroad Retirement Act.

As all of you know, I represent a large group of active and retired railroad employees and at their request and in their interest I introduced proposed amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act.

Before discussing these amendments I should like to convey to you the attitude of the active and retired railroad employees of my district, as I talked to many of them last fall during the congressional recess.

Not only did I find a lot of dissatisfaction—and may I repeat dissatisfaction—among the retired people because of the failure of Congress to increase benefits, but I also found a general feeling among active railroaders that the Railroad Retirement Act should be revised for the purpose of providing more adequate benefits at the time of retirement.

Mr. Chairman, the basis of the majority of complaints stems from the action of Congress last summer in approving an increase in spouse benefits. The widow and widower are the chief critics of what they call discriminatory action on the part of the Congress.

Frankly, I found it very difficult to answer a widow whose average monthly benefit check is in the neighborhood of \$40 when she asked me if I could exist on the scale of benefits paid those in her category.

In addition to the criticism that I received from the widow and widower on my visits to my congressional district last fall, I encountered a concerted and organized drive by

actively employed railroaders—especially those in the Altoona, Pa., area where the largest railroad shops in the world are located—in support of amendments to permit retirement after 30 or 35 years of service, or at age 60, with the retirement annuity being computed on the 5 years of highest earnings and not less than one-half of the individual's monthly compensation.

In addition to the personal contacts I had with active railroaders in regard to the new formula of computing annuities, I have received postcards and petitions that contain in excess of 5,000 signatures in support of the proposed change in formula. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that this committee has received similar communications urging approval of these proposed amendments.

In all my statements regarding the possibility of liberalizing the Railroad Retirement Act and increasing benefits, I have stressed the absolute necessity of maintaining the stability of the retirement fund and keeping it in a solvent condition to guarantee the payments of present and future benefits with the highest degree of certainty.

Regardless of the repeated admonition that the solvency of the retirement fund is of paramount consideration, there is an honest difference of opinion in disputing the assertion that benefits cannot be increased without a corresponding increase in payroll taxes.

I called attention to this difference of opinion during the last session of Congress when I pleaded for an across-the-board increase in railroad retirement benefits.

In this connection, the views I voiced the past 2 years that my constituents felt an increase in benefits would not impair the financial stability of the retirement fund are worthy of your close examination.

While there is always room for an honest difference of opinion, in view of the widespread insistence that the Railroad Retirement Act be liberalized and benefits increased, I am certain that this committee will review the entire subject and hold adequate hearings at an early date so that final action can be taken on proposed amendments before the 84th Congress adjourns next summer.